Ms. DEGETTE, regarding funding for Internet Crimes Against Children task forces;

Ms. DELAURO, regarding funding for sexual assault services grants;

Mr. ENGEL, regarding funding limitation on energy efficiency standards;

Mr. ETHERIDGE, regarding the Hometown Heroes Act;

a funding limitation by Mr. FLAKE on each of the following: Rochester, New York Tooling and Machining Association for a workforce development program;

Bronx Council for marketing of local business arts initiatives;

Arthur Avenue Retail Market for local business requirements and improvements;

Wisconsin Procurement Initiative;

JARI for a regional business incubator;

Fairmont State University for a small business development initiative;

Fairplex Trade and Conference Center;

Southern and Eastern Kentucky Tourism Development Association;

JARI Workforce Development Program and Small Business Technology Center;

Oil Region Alliance of Business, Industry and Tourism;

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, regarding funding limitation on manned space mission to Mars;

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, requiring annual report on U.S. contributions to the U.N. and affiliated entities;

Mr. GINGREY, regarding funding limitation on participation under the Visa Waiver program;

Mr. HINCHEY, regarding funding limitation on ''Knock and Announce'' policies;

Mr. HINCHEY, regarding medical marijuana and transfers of funds for certain State and local programs;

Mr. HINCHEY, regarding funding limitation for FCC licenses based on ownership;

Mr. HINCHEY, regarding funding limitation on private phone records from data and credit brokers;

Mr. INSLEE, regarding funding for children and youth programs and the national tribal sexual offender registry;

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, regarding funding for juvenile justice programs;

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, regarding funding for the juvenile delinquency prevention block grant program;

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, regarding funding limitation on the EEOC National Contact Center;

Mr. KING of Iowa, regarding funding for enforcement of section 642 of the IIRIRA;

Mr. KUCINICH, regarding funding limitation on NASA involuntary separations;

Mr. LIPINSKI, regarding funding for Law Enforcement Tribute Act;

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, regarding funding limitation on U.N. peacekeeping missions in which U.N. employees under investigation have not been removed;

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, regarding funding limitation on the U.N. Human Rights Council unless certain members are removed;

Mr. MCCOTTER, regarding funding limitation on filing under FARA unless certain conditions are met;

Mr. NADLER, regarding funding for the Jessica Gonzalez Victims Assistance Program;

Mr. NADLER, regarding funding for FBI salaries and expenses;

Mr. NADLER, regarding funding limitation on issuance of NSA letters to health insurance companies;

Mr. SHERMAN, regarding funding limitation on detention of enemy combatants;

Mr. SODREL, regarding funding limitation on enforcement of the final judgment issued in Hinrichs v. Bosman;

Mr. TIAHRT, regarding competitiveness;

Ms. WATSON or Mr. ISSA, regarding funding limitation on accession of the Russian Federation into the WTO unless USTR makes certain certifications;

Mr. WAXMAN, regarding funding limitation on Industry Trade Advisory Committee on Chemicals unless certain membership requirements are met;

Mr. WEINER, regarding funding for COPS hiring program; and

an amendment or amendments by Mr. WOLF.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member named in this request or a designee, or by the Member who caused it to be printed in the RECORD or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Except as otherwise specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. An amendment shall be considered to fit the description stated in this request if it addresses in whole or in part the object described.

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

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to make the point again that if all of these amendments are offered, we could be here for as much as 25 hours.

So I would hope that Members would consider whether or not these amendments are duplicative and that some of them might not be offered, if we are going to finish this in a timely fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 890 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5672.

□ 1907

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5672) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the bill had been read through page 2, line 8.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

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

My amendment proposes to move $1 million from Justice General Administration in order to restore funding eliminated from the budget request for the Missing Alzheimer's program. This program is critical to supporting law enforcement efforts to find missing adults suffering from the terrible disease of Alzheimer's.

This is very important because Alzheimer's is a very difficult situation for both the individual with Alzheimer's and the family members. I offer it on behalf of Mr. MOLLOHAN, and I know Congresswoman Maxine Waters strongly, strongly supports the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman intend to offer an amendment?

Mr. WOLF. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLF:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, the Chair must query

whether any Member raises a point of order against provisions of the bill addressed by the amendment but not yet reached in the reading: to wit, the paragraph beginning on page 22, line 18.

If not, the gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Well, I won't repeat myself. The amendment proposes to move $1 million from Justice General Administration in order to restore funding eliminated from the budget request for the Missing Alzheimer's program. It is a very important and very needed program.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, how is the time controlled on this amendment; and how much time is on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. There are 10 minutes of debate. Nobody has claimed the time in opposition as of yet.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. We have no opposition, Mr. Chairman, but I will claim the 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the fact he is not opposed, to have the time in opposition?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of the amendment.

There are 4.5 million Americans suffering from this terrible disease, Alzheimer's, and by 2050 we are looking at over 16 million potential victims of this dementia disease.

Wandering is a terrible condition and of great concern to the loved ones of individuals with Alzheimer's. This program addresses that and addresses it very effectively. I compliment the chairman for the amendment and compliment our colleague from California, Ms. WATERS, who has been a champion in this field.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time on this side. I know my colleague has a group who want to speak.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for offering this amendment with me to restore funding for the Safe Return Program for Alzheimer's patients. I would also like to thank him and my colleague from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for all their hard work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman and Members, I did become rather alarmed when I learned the Science, State, Justice, Commerce bill for fiscal year 2006 reported out of the Appropriations Committee had not funded Safe Return, and I am just so appreciative for Mr. WOLF's leadership and Mr. MOLLOHAN's leadership in agreeing to make sure that this funding was restored.

An estimated 4.5 million Americans have Alzheimer's disease, including one in 10 individuals over 65, with nearly half of those over 85. Sixty percent of Alzheimer's patients are likely to wander from their homes. Wanderers are vulnerable to dehydration, weather conditions, traffic hazards, and individuals who prey on those who are defenseless. Up to 50 percent of wandering Alzheimer's patients will become seriously injured or will die if they are not found within 24 hours.

The Safe Return Program for Alzheimer's patients is a Department of Justice program that helps local communities and law enforcement officials identify wandering Alzheimer's patients quickly and ensures their safe return home. Under the Safe Return Program, patients are enrolled in a confidential national computerized database and provided with an identity bracelet or other identifying materials, such as necklace, key chain, wallet card, or clothing labels. The identifying materials contain the patient's name and a toll free number to contact their family.

Since its inception 10 years ago, the Safe Return Program has registered over 143,000 individuals who may wander, and has united over 11, 200 wanderers with their families. The Safe Return Program was able to carry out its lifesaving work with an appropriation of $840,000 in fiscal year 2006. Unfortunately, this had, I guess, been overlooked for a while. But now that our colleagues have provided the leadership to put in $1 million, this program will remain in the budget. The Wolf-Waters amendment would restore the funding for this critical program and provides $1 million in fiscal year 2007, a slight increase over the 2006 funding level.

I know that we are all very pleased about this, so let me just remind my colleagues that we have families now, working families, and sometimes their parents, both parents, have Alzheimer's disease. We have many families that are struggling to take care of their children, go to work every day, and take care of their parents. This program helps so much because they will wander away. But with this funding and the Alzheimer's Association, working with the Justice Department, they can return many of these wanderers back to their families, and of course keep them safe.

I thank you so very much.

□ 1915

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment again, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert: ''(reduced by $6,736,000)''.

Page 62, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert: ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

Page 86, line 17, after each of the dollar amounts, insert: ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply adds $25 million to the Legal Services Corporation, returning it to the 2003 level from which it has fallen since that time. We have a bipartisan letter to Chairman WOLF from Ranking Member MOLLOHAN signed by 160 Members of this House led by Representatives RAMSTAD and DELAHUNT, calling on the committee to restore funding for this program.

This bill cuts LSC by $12.7 million below last year's level. LSC-funded programs are the Nation's primary source of legal assistance to women who are the victims of violence. Seventy-three percent of those seeking assistance under this program are women.

This budget has declined from $400 million in 1996, and we are not even restoring it to that level. We are simply asking to restore $25 million of the massive cut that has occurred since that time.

Because of the cuts already incurred by this program, 16 field offices have already been closed. I don't think we want to see any more of that.

The offsets are very simple. We are taking $6.7 million from the Department of Justice general administration funds. The account is below the request, but the mark funds an 18 percent rent increase for management.

We would secondly take the rest of the funding out of the Department of State Administration of Foreign Affairs, Diplomatic and Consular Programs. The account includes a $76.9 million increase over the current year. This cut leaves in place increases for Intelligence and Research, Public Diplomacy, Foreign Language Training, Reconstruction and Stabilization and Border Security.

Mr. Chairman, we stand on this floor every day, and we recite the pledge of allegiance to the flag. In the process of doing that, we pledge to support ''liberty and justice for all.''

You simply cannot have justice in this country if you do not have adequate access to its court system. It seems to me that this amendment is on its face self-evident. There is no reason

why we cannot, with all of the money we spend for so many other programs, there is no reason that we cannot provide such a small restoration of funding for people who have nowhere else to go to be able to participate in what is supposed to be a system that produces equal justice for all.

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I want to salute the gentleman. He made some very important points. But we have had to make some difficult decisions putting this bill together.

The bill already includes $314 million for the Legal Services Corporation. This used to be politicized. It has not been politicized. It is an increase of $3 million above the President's request. That means we cut $3 million from some other part of the bill to increase funding for the Legal Services Corporation.

There are a number of areas in the bill that we would increase funding for if we didn't have to restore $1.1 billion for State and local law enforcement.

Unlike the Legal Services, which is funded above the request, we have already cut from the request of State Department's Diplomatic and Consular Affairs operations account by $147 million. Our bill provides a modest increase of $77 million or 2.1 percent to cover pay and inflationary costs for the Department.

The only increases that the funding supports are new positions for critical posts around the world to support our national interests in emerging nations like India, China, Egypt and Indonesia.

In addition, we have supported an increase for the Office of Stabilization and Reconstruction and for new critical language training positions.

We are in a global war on terror. This amendment cuts into already reduced amounts to support the diplomatic side of this effort. North Korea has just threatened to test a nuclear weapon. Iran continues its efforts to develop a nuclear program.

Further, this amendment would cut $5 million from the Department of Justice administration account. The bill already reduces that request for general administration by $25 million or 22 percent below the request. The Acting Assistant Attorney General for Administration has written us to inform us that, at the current level of funding in the bill, 58 positions will be eliminated at the Department of Justice headquarters.

Additional cuts will hinder the Department's abilities to effectively manage more than $20 billion in appropriations, operate hundreds of DOJ facilities, manage 100,000 employees and coordinate public policy.

We have done the best we can. We have also got the Manufacturing Extension Program up. We have increased drug courts by 300 percent. So a bill that treats the diverse accounts within our jurisdiction, I think, has been done as fairly as we can. Therefore, I urge the rejection of the amendment.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. The gentleman's amendment would increase the Legal Services Corporation by $25 million. That is up to the recent high water mark of $338 million that was enacted in fiscal 2003.

Since that high water mark, the funding trend for the Legal Services Corporation has been disappointing. It has decreased incrementally until this year, like a lot of other domestic discretionary programs in this bill, but none more important than Legal Services Corporation.

If we are to fulfill the promise of this great Nation that everybody in our society has equal access to the law, obviously having the resources to have access to the law is extremely important. That is what this program does for those who are the least able to pay for legal services, to afford legal representation in time of need. It is often this group of people who have a lot of legal problems. They need a lot of assistance.

This year, we see a precipitous drop in the funding as it plummets by $13 million below last year's level.

Forgive me for citing West Virginia's example, but I think it is a good one which reflects this downward trend and what its disastrous effect is. Since 2003, due to the census adjustment and decreased funding, the program has laid off 13 to 18 staff members in my State. The program currently has 92 staff members, including 37 lawyers. The layoffs are about 16 percent of the workforce. The program has lost $400,000 in funding, had to close four or five services in small counties in southern West Virginia.

In 2002, Legal Aid of West Virginia closed 6,145 cases. In 2005, that number decreased to 5,257 cases. The West Virginia program has estimated that it is unable to serve approximately 15,000 people a year due to lack of resources. That is a lot of people, Mr. Chairman, who are unable to access the legal system for want of resources. All of us can appreciate the hardship that that entails.

I rise in strong support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I will be introducing, at the appropriate time, a letter from the national Legal Aid & Defender Association that says, in part, that the LSC-funded program simply cannot keep up with the demand for services. Documenting the Justice gap, a year-long study released by the LSC in October of 2005 revealed that at least 50 percent of eligible clients were turned away from LSC-funded programs due to a lack of resources.

In other words, for every client served, at least one eligible client was turned away. This statistic reflects the vast unmet need and is, nonetheless, an underestimate and does not take into account the countless people, eligible people, who did not seek assistance because they were not aware that the LSC programs could help them.

This letter says that we are extremely concerned that cuts to LSC-funded programs will have a harmful effect on our judicial system, our economy and businesses, and our society in general.

Mr. Chairman, it is significant that this letter is signed by approximately 60 general counsels of our Nation's leading corporations who are asking for this kind of amendment. Actually, they are asking for more resources, but at least this modest amendment ought to be adopted in response to this letter.

NATIONAL LEGAL AID & DEFENDER ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 26, 2006.

Hon. ROBERT C. SCOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SCOTT: As the general counsel of some of our nation's leading corporations, we are asking for your help. The Legal Services Corporation (LSC), the primary legal lifeline to millions of Americans in times of need, is in jeopardy of having its already inadequate funding further eroded. Today, LSC's funding is less than one-half of the inflation-adjusted dollars that Congress appropriated in FY 1980, and ten million dollars less than the FY 2003 appropriation. In his FY 2007 budget request, President Bush has proposed an additional 4.6 percent decrease from the current $326.6 million appropriation to $310.9 million. We are asking you to reverse this diminution of critical funds by supporting the Corporation's FY 2007 budget request of $411.8 million.

Due to recent cuts to the LSC appropriation and rising inflation rates, LSC-funded programs have struggled to help the growing number of our country's impoverished. Poverty statistics show that between 2002 and 2004, the number of people eligible for LSC services increased from 47 million to 49.7 million, which is about one in every six Americans. Sadly, of these nearly 50 million people, more than one third of them are children. To put clients' need in perspective: a family of four must earn a meager $25,000 or less to qualify.

LSC-funded programs simply cannot keep up with the demand for services. Documenting the Justice Gap, a year-long study released by LSC in October 2005, revealed that at least 50 percent of eligible clients were turned away from LSC-funded programs due to a lack of resources. In other words, for every client served, at least one eligible client is turned away. While this statistic reflects the vast unmet need, it is, nonetheless, an underestimate and does not take into account the countless eligible people who did not seek assistance because they were not aware that LSC-funded programs could help them.

We are extremely concerned that cuts to LSC funding will have a harmful affect on our judicial system, our economy and businesses, and our society in general. While we

are mindful of the severe fiscal constraints under which the Congress finds itself, we ask you to act now to ensure that essential civil legal services continue to make differences in the lives of those in need. Please support a FY 2007 LSC appropriation of $411.8 million and join us in upholding the American promise of ''justice for all.''

Sincerely,

Kenneth C. Frazier, Merck & Co., Inc., Chair, NLADA Corporate Advisory, Committee; Peter Arakas, LEGO Systems, Inc.; Richard N. Baer, Qwest Communications Corporation; Theodore N. Bobby, H.J. Heinz Company; Paula Boggs, Starbucks Corporation; Charles Burson, Esq., Monsanto Company; Carl J. Busch, Northrop Grumman Corporation; Jim Carter, Nike Inc.; Robert J. Cindrich, UPMC, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center; Mike Cockrell, Sanderson Farms, Inc.; Bert Cornelison, Halliburton Company; Julie A. Davis, Retail Ventures Inc.; Morris Davis, Temple-Inland, Inc.; Dodds M. Dehmer, W.G. Yates & Sons Construction Company; Catherine A. Lamboley, Shell Oil Company, Immediate Past Chair, NLADA, Corporate Advisory Committee; Nancy C. Loftin, Pinnacle West Capital Corp. and APS; Louis M. Lupin, QUALCOMM Incorporated; Charles W. Matthews, Jr., ExxonMobil Corporation; Ron McCray, Kimberly-Clark Corporation; Kevin M. McDonald, Anadarko Petroleum Corporation; John H. McGuckin Jr., Union Bank of California; Lee R. Mitau, U.S. Bancorp; O. Kendall Moore, U-Save Auto Rental of America, Inc.; Richard Olin, Costco Wholesale Corporation; Patrick T. Ortiz, PNM Resources, Inc.; Joy Lambert Phillips, Hancock Bank; Thomas E. Richardson, Town Pump, Inc.; Scott E. Rozzell, CenterPoint Energy, Inc.;

Deborah Dorman-Rodriguez, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of New Mexico; Paul Ehrlich, adidas International, Inc.; Glenn M. Engelmann, AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP; Stephen F. Gates, ConocoPhillips; Craig B. Glidden, Chevron Phillips Chemical Company LP; Storrow Gordon, Electronic Data Systems Corporation; Thomas A. Gottschalk, General Motors Corporation; Andrew D. Hendry, Colgate-Palmolive Company; Jim Hornstein, Moldex Metric, Inc.; Michael Jines, Reliant Energy, Inc.; James J. Johnson, The Procter & Gamble Company; Murray L. Johnston Jr., Zachry Construction Corporation; Guy Kerr, Belo Corp.; Ky Lewis, Sharp HealthCare System; Mark I. Litow, Esq., Enterprise Rent-A-Car Company; Dan D. Sandman, United States Steel Corporation; David A. Savner, General Dynamics Corporation; John Schulman, Warner Bros.; William F. Schwind, Jr., Marathon Oil Corporation; Karen E. Shaff, The Principal Financial Group; Lauri M. Shanahan, Gap Inc.; Laura Stein, The Clorox Company; Ronald Taylor, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Texas; Vivian Tseng, Welch Foods Inc., A Cooperative; John E. Tucker, First Tower Corp.; Rita Tuzon, Fox Cable Networks; Jack VanWoerkom, Staples, Inc.; Jennifer L. Vogel, Continental Airlines, Inc.; Michael T. Williams, Sony Electronics Inc.; Wayne Withers, Esq., Emerson Electric Company; Christopher J. Littlefield, AmerUs Group.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REICHERT:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

Page 23, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

Page 46, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his great work in helping local law enforcement officials strengthen their efforts to combat drugs in their communities.

I rise today to offer an amendment to increase funding for local law enforcement communities to reinforce efforts to keep drugs out of our communities.

During my 33 years in law enforcement, I have seen how Byrne-Justice Assistance Grants have help local law enforcement fight the war on drugs. Washington State received $9.6 million under the Byrne grant formula. Without this funding, our State would not have been able to effectively reduce violent and drug-related crimes in our communities.

However, since 2001, funding for the Byrne-Justice Assistance Grants program has declined from over $1 billion in 2001 to less than $412 million in 2006. The efforts of State and local law enforcement officers account for over 90 percent of all drug arrests and prosecutions. We cannot afford to turn our backs on law enforcement if we want to continue to achieve success in the fight against drugs and gangs.

My amendment would increase funding for drug task forces under Byrne JAG grants by $25 million. The offset would be $10 million from the Department of Justice salaries and expense administration accounts and $15 million from program support, operations, research and facilities under NOAA.

I have the greatest respect for the President's efforts and members of the Appropriations Committee to scale back government spending. However, adequate funding for law enforcement and anti-drug task force efforts are critical in order for our police officers to protect our communities against drugs.

I am not alone in my efforts to increase funding for Byrne JAG grant funding. Many Members from both sides of the aisle have been leaders in the fight to fully fund our local drug task force.

I would like to especially thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) for their leadership in support of local law enforcement efforts in their fight against drugs and meth.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington for introducing this modest amendment to help families across the Nation that are dealing with meth issues, and not only the families that have to deal with them but the law enforcement community, the people on the front line.

I want to thank you for your leadership, Mr. REICHERT. Your experience and background as a law enforcement officer, somebody on the front line, has been instrumental to us in the United States Congress in this fight to empower our local police officers.

But I also want to thank the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee in charge, because Chairman WOLF knows what drugs has done to our families. The budget that was sent over to us zeroed these out, eliminated them. The chairman fought to get as much put back as he could, but we still need more. So I appreciate your efforts.

In Omaha, we have a real meth problem. It is affecting suburban housewives, teenagers, all segments and demographics of our community. I have personally seen how it ravages these families. I think it is important that we step up our efforts to rid this nasty drug from our communities. The only way to rid it from our communities is to empower the local law enforcement agencies.

Now, we have passed a meth law in this House that allows for pseudoephedrine to be put behind the counter. That makes it hard to do the labs now. Frankly, in States like Nebraska, Iowa, Oklahoma and Missouri that have done that, they have seen the number of labs go down. But now we have got gangs running meth from super labs in Mexico.

□ 1930

So as we take labs down, we still get inundated in our communities from these drugs from gangs now. And so it is extremely important that those people that know the gang members, know what they are doing can run the task forces. And here is a chart up here that shows just with meth, from the task

forces funded by this 5.54 kilos of meth taken off.

The National Association of Counties reports that 58 percent of counties ranked methamphetamine as their No. 1 drug problem in 2005, and CDC estimates at least 20,000 Americans die each year from drug abuse/overdose.

Byrne-JAG grants incentivize multi-jurisdictional drug enforcement and cooperation between local, state and federal law enforcement agents. These grants are the primary federal funds to discourage domestic production of methamphetamine.

The White House's 2007 budget request to Congress again eliminates funding for Byrne. In 2004, Congress provided $634 million to law enforcement agencies nationwide. Last year, the Senate voted to provide $900 million—closer to the original funding level for this program—but the proposed bill provides just $367 million.

Since FY01, funding has been cut from over $1 billion to less than $367 million in the H.R. 5672. The effect of these cuts has been clear: many States have been forced to cut or completely eliminate their gang and drug task forces.

The $558 million reported as the funding level of Byrne-JAG includes $115 million in discretionary earmarks, and $75 million for Boys and Girls Clubs—leaving $367 million for state formula grants supporting drug and violent crime task forces.

The proposed $367 million funding level would cripple the effectiveness of drug task forces nationwide, and jeopardize the gains made in reducing nationwide violent crime to a 30-year low. The collaborative task forces built over the past 15 years to combat drugs cannot be easily rebuilt.

State and local agencies will take the brunt of meth investigations without federal assistance. More than 90 percent of drug arrests nationwide are made by state and local law enforcement.

Tom Constantine, former head of the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) testified that the majority of DEA cases begin as referrals from local and multi-jurisdictional drug investigations. He was unaware of any major DEA case during his tenure that did not originate from information gathered at the state and local level.

Last year, Byrne task forces nationwide seized 5,600 meth labs, 55,000 weapons, and massive quantities of narcotics, including 2.7 million grams of meth. These results demonstrate the power of using federal dollars to leverage state and local partnerships.

Nebraska will be forced to eliminate 9 of 11 task forces unless Byrne-JAG funding is increased; Texas has already eliminated its task forces due to lack of funding, and New Jersey is considering the same course of action. Minnesota may be forced to discontinue its rural drug task forces, and only three of Missouri's 28 Byrne task forces would survive on state funding alone.

The fight against meth is the frontline of the Nation's war on drugs. The fastest-growing drug in the Nation, meth has produced a wider and more expensive array of problems than any other narcotic we have ever faced. And midwestern states such as Nebraska bear much of the brunt.

According to Nebraska Attorney General Jon Bruning, 60 percent of inmates in Nebraska jails have problems with meth. The number of people in Nebraska jails for possessing, selling or manufacturing meth has more than doubled since 1999.

Jails are overcrowded with meth addicts, many of whom require special medical care. Meth labs quickly become toxic waste dumps that can only be cleaned up with large amounts of manpower and financial resources. Worst of all, children in homes where meth is used or made are more often violently abused and neglected, and exposed to highly toxic chemicals.

Nationwide, law enforcement officers have dismantled more than 50,000 clandestine meth labs since 2001. Nearly half of those incidents occurred in just nine Midwestern and Plains states, including Nebraska.

The number of meth labs in Nebraska rose from 37 in 1999 to almost 300 in 2004. Fortunately, my State joined a growing coalition of States fighting against meth by enacting a new law in September to restrict the sale of pseudoephedrine. Since that time, the number of meth labs has fallen by a phenomenal 70 percent.

However, the problem is far from being solved since 80 percent of the meth in Nebraska is being trafficked from Mexico. This meth is far more addictive than what can be cooked in a typical "Mom and Pop" meth lab.

Thanks to Nebraska's new law, instead of using 80 percent of their resources to fight the home labs that comprised only 20 percent of the State's meth problem, Nebraska narcotic officers can now use more of their time to stop the inflow of Mexican meth.

Congress has played a role in combating the Nation's growing meth problem through Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grants for State and local law enforcement agencies. Unfortunately, these grants are endangered by the failure at the White House to recognize the significance of Byrne grants in combating meth and other illegal drugs nationwide.

Byrne task forces are the underpinning of our Nation's successful drug control strategy that brought us the lowest violent crime rates in 30 years. We must not turn back the clock in the war on drugs.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, not because it doesn't increase funding for a worthy program. I am extremely supportive of the Justice Assistance Grants Program. But understand that it increases the Justice Assistance Formula Grants Program from $367.8 million to $392.8 million, by $25 million, if my math is correct there. And that is all well and good.

The difficulty is that this amendment increases a general grant program for which this money could go for anything. It could go for meth; it could go for any law enforcement purpose. And again, I repeat, it is all good and well. The problem is the offset. And that is the problem with so many of these amendments that will come forward. It is $10 million from the Department of Justice General Administration Salaries and Expenses account. Well, the Department of Justice does have to run these programs. It has to operate these programs and it has general administration and salaries and expenses costs. This subcommittee has very carefully looked at the needs of the General Administration and Salaries and Expenses Account and determined that it needs the amount of money that is appropriated. This is already a tight budget; so funding in that account is tight.

And to then offset $15 million from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's operations, research and facilities really hurts an agency that is already $514 million below fiscal year 2006-enacted level. So we are $514 million below and we are taking another $15 million off that. At the current mark level, NOAA will be required to RIF over 700 employees; at the current mark level, program cuts are estimated to cost the U.S. economy $1 billion to $2 billion per year.

The proposed reduction will only further compound these impacts to NOAA's critical public safety and stewardship mission. Great amendment, terrible offset. I would just suggest that the gentleman think about these tough budget decisions when this budget resolution next comes to the floor. We just don't have enough money in this bill. And his amendment is for a worthy cause. But his offsets are too damaging to the agencies that they hurt.

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, there is a lot I want to say. I don't know if I can say it in that much time. The gentleman's amendment would increase Justice Assistance grants by $25 million, reduce Justice General Administration by $10 million, and NOAA by 15. I understand and I appreciate the gentleman's passion for law enforcement. These programs have helped a lot. The bill already includes a $50 million increase for JAG, and an increase of $1.1 billion for local law enforcement above the request. Sometimes it doesn't matter, but it is above the request. And the gentleman's offsets would create some difficulties at Justice and NOAA.

But the gentleman has worked. I think he has made a good point in crafting the amendment. I know he and others would actually prefer higher amendments. There were other amendments rolling around here in the 40 to $50 million range. Somehow, this Congress is going to have to deal with the issues of all of the spending that is coming on and how do we get control.

Now, there will be others to come up, some that are actually good amendments, because they really help people. But we are going to devastate other programs. And it is sort of like Dietrich Bonhoffer with Cheap Grace. You can go into some general administration area that nobody understands

or knows anything about, and then there will be no money for general administrations.

I have introduced a bill, I sent out a Dear Colleague letter asking people to cosponsor a national commission based on the base closing commission with everything on the table to deal with these issues, because it is fundamentally immoral for one generation to live on the next generation and our children and our grandchildren and the whole spending issue. I share what the gentleman from West Virginia said, on some of these amendment passes, and then there is no money for administration, no money for this, and no money for that.

But there is probably not a more sincere individual on this issue, probably because of his work. And my father was a policeman in the city of Philadelphia. I understand these issues, and we want to give our law enforcement the resources, particularly with crime growing up.

So I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman and express my gratitude to him for his leadership and hard work that his staff and my staff have put into this amendment, and I appreciate his willingness to help us and assist us and look forward to working with him on other issues in the coming year.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOSWELL

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOSWELL:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,500,000)''.

Page 26, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $1,500,000)''.

Page 27, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $1,500,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, before I begin, I too would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. MOLLOHAN for their hard work and leadership in these very challenging times and these issues.

Once again, we find ourselves faced with a budget that is less than favorable, and they both have done a tremendous job in funding priorities when faced with this reality, and I thank them for that.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to amend something similar to what I did a year ago. I offered this amendment and it was accepted by the chairman and ranking member when the House considered fiscal year 2006 Science, State, Commerce, Justice appropriations bill.

Last year I requested an increase in funding for the Criminal Records Upgrade Program by $2.5 million. This year, considering the budget we are dealing with, I am asking for even less.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment proposed to increase the Criminal Records Upgrade Program by $1.5 million, offsetting this increase with a reduction in the Department of Justice General Administration Salaries and Expense Account by the same amount.

Mr. Chairman, the goal of this program is to ensure that accurate records are available for use in law enforcement and to permit States to identify, among other things, persons ineligible to hold positions involving children. This program helps States build their infrastructure to connect to the national record check systems, both to supply information and to conduct requisite checks.

I firmly believe that having accurate criminal records are essential in a State's ability to protect children from those who wish to do them harm and those who have histories of causing such harm. We must continue to provide law enforcement agencies across the Nation with as much information as they need to stop sex offenders and others who have a history of violence and exploitation of our children.

Mr. Chairman, there will be other amendments offered during the course of debate on this bill asking for tens of millions of dollars. But my amendment is not one of them. Times are tight when it comes to spending, and I am not asking to move the mountain. But anything we can spare to ensure that our States and our communities can have access to information that can be used to protect the children of our Nation must be spared.

With that, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. If the gentleman would yield, it is a good amendment. We accept the amendment. I think we took it last year too, if I recall. And I thank the gentleman for offering it. And on this side we strongly accept it.

Mr. BOSWELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. GINNY BROWN-WAITE OF FLORIDA

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 20, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 40, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 40, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

Page 40, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that will increase funding for the Violence Against Women Act, also known as VAWA. It increases it by approximately $10 million.

Congress has recognized the importance of these programs in bringing hope and a safe future to women across our great Nation by reauthorizing VAWA last year.

Although the committee increased funding for this program, there are still a number of vital programs within it that are not going to be adequately funded by the bill. Such programs include funding to assist children exposed to domestic violence, such as the various counseling and education programs, the Sexual Assault Services Program, and also inclusion of Indian tribes in the national sex offender registry.

As a cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, and also serving on a local shelter board, I know firsthand the reprehensible effects of domestic violence on a woman's dreams and success.

Every rape crisis center and domestic violence program in my district has brought hope to women and children who have been devastated by assaults.

As you know, domestic violence affects our most vulnerable constituents, battered women and their families. Evidence suggests that VAWA has been effective in reducing violence. For example, the rate of domestic violence against females over the age of 12 in the United States actually showed a slight decline.

But domestic violence is not just a man-against-woman phenomenon. When a man hits a woman or vice versa, often children and young adults are left with lasting impressions of that violence. Studies show that men who are exposed to domestic abuse are much more likely to be abusers themselves in the future. And young women who see abuse are much more prone to be victims of abuse as adults themselves.

This vicious cycle is one that we can genuinely affect through violence against women programs that provide education support networks, increased law enforcement and certainly a very important component of family counseling.

It is frustrating but realistic for policymakers to know that we can't just wave a magic wand and eradicate violence in our society. Yet, I firmly believe that this amendment is a step in the right direction.

The amendment takes funding from the Department of Justice's General Administration Fund and the Census Bureau and helps to fund the violence against women programs.

□ 1945

This add-on actually helps in the fight against domestic violence without breaking the bank or tipping the very careful balance that Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN crafted in the underlying bill.

Chairman WOLF, you have done a great job, and Members on both sides of the aisle respect you and the work product that we have before us.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the amendment to increase funds for VAWA programs.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition?

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

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

The gentlewoman's amendment would increase funding for grants to prevent violence against women by $10 million by decreasing funds for the Justice Department's General Administration by $5 million and the Census Bureau by $5 million.

I understand and appreciate the gentlewoman's passion for her efforts to prevent violence against women. The bill already, though, includes a $9 million increase for these programs, but we recognize that an increased investment is important.

I just wanted to say, for the record, although it will be difficult for the Census Bureau, this offset will neither impact the ramp up of the 2010 decennial census nor the American Community Survey.

With that understanding, I have no objection to the amendment.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his support, and I urge a favorable vote.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Inslee-Brown-Waite amendment which would fund three newly authorized programs under the Violence Against Women Act.

Domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking are crimes of epidemic proportions, exacting terrible costs on individual lives and our communities. Nearly one in four U.S. women report that they have been physically assaulted by an intimate partner during their lifetimes and one in six have been the victims of attempted or completed rape.

Without full funding for VAWA programs, families cannot access the services they need to escape from violence. The continued support of Congress is crucial to helping victims and their children find safety and security and build self-sufficiency.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 50, line 21, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

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

Page 89, line 17, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 91, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $40,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, when we talk about targeted policies that are aimed at improving the economic environment for small businesses, we are talking about this amendment. This is a bipartisan measure that has passed the House for the past 2 years.

Lowering the cost of the Small Business Administration's 7(a) loan program is a fiscally responsible, commonsense solution that will result in job growth and increased revenue.

The truth is that the program is simply too costly for this Nation's small businesses. The cost for start-up loans has increased by nearly $1,500 to $3,000, and for more established small businesses, the total cost can be as high as $50,000. This is money our Nation's small businesses are paying directly to the Federal Government.

As a result, entrepreneurs today are getting a more expensive loan that is almost 50 percent smaller than what it was just a few years ago, limiting their ability to start and expand their ventures. In fact, recent SBA figures show that the program is doing $160 million less than it was during the same time the previous year, showing how these rising costs are having an impact on lending.

This amendment would reverse this effect and would lower the cost of the 7(a) loan program.

To compound the problem further, entrepreneurs are also finding that they have fewer places to go to access this financing. In fact, the number of lenders willing to offer 7(a) loans has dropped in half over the past several years, leaving small firms scrambling to find vital sources of capital.

Today is an opportunity for us to take action to help relieve our small businesses of these burdens.

Fees have been raised four times over the past 2 years and are already at their maximum level. If we were to see a significant increase in interest rates, experience an economic downturn, or a regional crisis like what we saw in the gulf coast, this program would not be able to support itself. The result would be caps, limits on loan sizes, and even the shutdown of the program altogether. The adoption of this measure will enable us to avoid this type of lending crisis in the future.

This amendment is fiscally responsible and uses offsets from four different salaries and expense accounts so that no one agency is disproportionately harmed. In fact, it only takes $10 million from each agency, which amounts to less than 1 percent of the four S&E accounts.

Nearly 20 prominent small business groups are in support of this amendment, up from 14 last year, illustrating the demand from our Nation's small businesses for this type of action.

This is a program that is now doing nearly a half billion dollars less since the fees were raised. It is clearly not doing better, and it is certainly not benefiting this Nation's small businesses.

A ''yes'' vote is a vote to help this Nation's small businesses move forward as the drivers of our economy. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. The 7(a) program has been operating at record levels without subsidy appropriations since the beginning of 2005. If this amendment passes, do not ever go home and say that you are going to balance the budget. Just forget it. This is the ''forget to balance the budget and get control of the budget'' amendment. We have had record loans with no 7(a) fees, and now we want to do this.

The SBA administrator continues to assure us that the program is running strong. I have a letter from them confirming the success at redesigning the 7(a) program so it does not require a subsidy. No good deed goes unpunished. It does not require a subsidy, and we are going to spend all these millions of dollars? How would you ever explain it? How would you say we have got record

numbers, but we are going to subsidize it? Forget it. We would never, ever, ever, ever solve the deficit of this Nation.

The new model has brought down the stability of the lending community and borrowers. This is a ''bail-out the banks'' amendment. Bail out the banks. Only the bankers care about this, a small portion of the bankers, and I do not know if the bankers are writing us about the deficit either.

Demand has skyrocketed. Since lending levels are no longer tied to an appropriation, the program has been able to meet the demand. That, by not being tied, has been able to meet the demand. This is a good government success story.

There is much more that I could say. It goes on and on and on, but I just urge Members, do not pass this amendment. This is the ''how do you spend $100 million without needing to spend it,'' and I guess the question is if we really care about the future generations of our children and our grandchildren. We will never get control of it. I mean, I cannot even believe we are out here doing this. If this were the Violence Against Women or some of the programs that are here that your heart goes out to but you do not have the money, but there is no need for it and they are at record numbers.

I urge a ''no'' vote against this amendment.

U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2006.

Hon. FRANK WOLF,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to thank you again for your support of America's small businesses. I would also like to take this opportunity to reiterate the Administration's strong support for a zero subsidy rate for the U.S. Small Business Administration's (SBA) 7(a) loan program. In what will certainly be another tight appropriations cycle, a zero subsidy rate for 7(a) will save the taxpayers approximately $170 million, while at the same time providing unprecedented stability to the program.

In the past, some have expressed unrealized concerns that zero subsidy would stifle the 7(a) loan program because of a very slight fee increase required. As you can see from the enclosed explanation and charts, 7(a) lending has increased significantly while taxpayer dollars have been saved. Further, current 7(a) fees—previously a source of significant industry concern—are in line with historical rates. Like other costs in business, these fees fluctuate based on market conditions. In fiscal year (FY) 2007 there will need to be a slight fee change of .5 basis points. This equates to approximately $2.80 per month on an average loan size of $160,000.

It is also important to note that zero subsidy is not only good for the taxpayer but for the stability of the program, the most crucial aspect of the program according to borrowers and lenders. (Zero subsidy began in FY 2001.). As you know, in January 2004 the SBA was forced to temporarily close the 7(a) program because it had exhausted its funding under the Continuing Resolution. Once the program was restarted, and after Congress passed the Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY 2004, the SBA was forced to manage the program through restrictive loan caps because demand continued to outpace the program's funding level. Regardless of the amount Congress appropriates for 7(a) in any given fiscal year, there will be the chance that demand could exceed that level, forcing either another shutdown or caps on loan amounts. By eliminating the need for an appropriation, potential program ''shortfalls'' may be avoided. Program levels in the form of authorization limits would still apply, of course.

It should also be noted that SBA's other major loan programs, Section 504 Guarantee Program and Small Business Investment Company (SBIC) Guarantee Program., have functioned at zero subsidy for several years. This provides our lending partners with what they want most from our loan programs—consistency and continuity.

Mr. Chairman, zero subsidy for the 7(a) program is a simple, common-sense approach that has brought the program in line with our other major financial programs. Zero subsidy is still the best policy for the long-term stability and growth of the 7(a) loan program. We have been able to maintain record lending during the past few years under zero subsidy. Lending has not been hampered by appropriations shortfalls, such as those that occurred in 2003 and 2004. For these reasons the Administration urges you to continue the successful zero subsidy policy in the FY 2007 Appropriations bill.

Sincerely,

HECTOR V. BARRETO,
Administrator.

ZERO SUBSIDY—THE BEST POLICY

Zero subsidy is still the best policy for the long term stability and growth of the Small Business Administration's various loan programs. The SBA has been able to maintain record lending during the past few years under the zero subsidy policy. The benefits of zero subsidy also results in a funding structure that adds stability and independence while ensuring that the lending process is not hampered by appropriations shortfalls such as those which occurred in 2003 and 2004.

In FY 2005, the SBA served more small businesses than ever before. In SBA's two major loan programs, they increased the numbers of loans funded by 22% in one year. These record level lending numbers are possible because of the zero subsidy policy that was adopted at the beginning of FY 2005.

The SBA guaranteed a record number of loans last year, with double digit increases in the percentage of loans to women, Hispanics, African Americans and Asian Americans. Maintaining zero subsidy will allow the SBA to build on the success they've had in these important loan programs, and will provide more businesses with the capital needed to start up and expand.

Moving to zero subsidy allowed the Agency to continue to meet the financing demands of small businesses without the need for taxpayer subsidy. In today's tough budget environment, SBA has proven their ability to provide more loans to small businesses and entrepreneurs while reducing the burden on taxpayers.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), chairman of the Small Business Committee, who has convinced me of the merits of this.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, the 7(a) program at the Small Business Administration has operated on full cylinders, breaking record after record of program usage throughout all demographic and regional groups.

Look at this chart and look at the number of 7(a) loan approvals. It is going off the charts ever since the subsidy got removed. In fact, there have been more 7(a) loans made thus far in the 9 months of fiscal year 2006 than in all of fiscal year 2001. By removing the 7(a) loan subsidy from the uncertainties of the annual appropriations process, this has produced a stable and predictable program.

When the 7(a) program has subsidies, then it is subjected to yearly shutdowns when there is not enough money, as what happened in December of 2003. When the subsidies get removed and taxpayers save $40 to $100 million a year, no shutdown will ever occur because the program will never run out of money. So why would you want to subject a good program to a shutdown by running out of money? It simply does not make sense.

The noble intent of the Velázquez amendment is to reestablish a lower 7(a) fee structure exactly as it existed in 2003 and 2004. However, with a higher 7(a) program level, an appropriation of $168 million would be required, according to the SBA. The $40 million in the Velázquez amendment would not result in the cutting of any fees to small businesses. The Velázquez amendment directs the funds to pay for the salaries and expenses of the employees at the SBA who work in the business loan division, not to the 7(a) business loan subsidy account.

This amendment would not help any small business owner or lender. It does not make sense to take a program and ask the taxpayers to dig into their pockets for $40 million to $100 million a year on a bill that does not do anything. It saves no money whatsoever, and I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this.

Three years ago, I was in favor of this subsidy; and then I found out one thing: To get rid of the subsidy, to save the taxpayers $40 to $100 million a year, to have stability in the program costs 10 bucks a month per loan for the loans of under $150,000. You tell me, what small businessman cannot afford an extra $10 a month just to have stability in the program and to know that the program will never run out of money?

And why are we doing this? You got me. It does not make sense. The small business owner has no legal or constitutional right to a subsidized loan by the rest of the taxpayers in this country. What kind of an entrepreneurial thing is that?

So I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Small Business Committee is saying that it will cost small businesses only 10 bucks a month. Well, these are the facts coming from the Small Business Administration: Costs have gone up $1,500 to $3,000, and now many small businesses are paying as much as $50,000 to the Federal Government.

Lending is down $160 million from this time last year and $400 million below before the fee increases were adopted. Fees are at the statutory limit, which means that any more costs will result in program caps or a shutdown.

Today, there are only half as many lenders making 7(a) loans. The 7(a) loans are 40 percent smaller than they were a few years ago. Lending last year was $2 billion below what the agency claimed they would do.

Those are the facts. And the chairman keeps talking about the banks and how taxpayers' money is paying $50,000 to the government, benefiting the banks. The only greedy one here is the Federal Government, which has increased four times their fees in the past years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

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

I rise in support of her amendment. I know from my own experience in my congressional district, which is a rural district and in need of loans, by small entrepreneurs, there is a disappointment in the way the 7(a) program is being administered.

□ 2000

These fee increases particularly are causing lending to drop. Recent lending figures from SBA show that entrepreneurs received $160 million less through the 7(a) program for the first half of fiscal year 2006 when compared to the same period the previous year. I don't know what you do with that statistic. They are receiving less. We are providing less funding, and certainly the need is not less. I can tell you in rural areas it is not.

Over this same span, entrepreneurs received 1,000 fewer loans, demonstrating that fewer small businesses are able to benefit from the 7(a) program. Fees increase. Businesses are responsive as consumers are responsive; and, of course, businesses are consumers of this program. When fees go up, when costs go up, people stop participating in the program. That is marketplace economics at work here in a government program.

The damage to our economy is even more severe when you consider that the 7(a) program is $500 million below where it was before the fee hikes were imposed, another indication that the current program of charging fees and increasingly charging fees and continuing to charge fees and having increased four times in the last 2 years is resulting in the program not being able to be accessed the way it was in the past.

The gentlewoman's amendment addresses some of these concerns, and, while we are in a tight budget, this is an important program.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support it.

Mr. WOLF. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, if I could address the statement made by my colleague from New York where she said up-front fees can exceed $50,000, the issue is how much of an increase would there be if we get the subsidy eliminated? Well, on a $1.5 million loan, the biggest increase would be $3,500, and over a period of 10 to 20 years, that sum is almost negligible.

On loans over $700,000, the fees have never changed, and what is going on with the total amount of the dollar loan is the SBA is concentrating on small businesses. It is the small businesses themselves that are asking for the dollar amount. They are the ones that are driving this. So I think it is extremely important that the Small Business Administration concentrate on giving these loans to the real small businesses. In fact, those that are at $1.5 million, I am sure they can afford an extra $3,500 over the course of the next 10 to 15 years.

Now, small firms received $160 million less and 1,000 fewer loans through the 7(a) program from the first half of fiscal year 2006 as compared to the same time the previous year. But this mixes apples and oranges. Lending under $150,000, regardless of the exact size of the small business, is down slightly from FY 2005 levels, but it is slightly higher than the FY 2004 levels when there was no loan subsidy and lower fees.

In comparing year-to-date figures, there were more than 12,300 smaller loans made worth $212 million in fiscal year 2006 versus fiscal year 2004 in the under-$150,000 category. So we got rid of the loan subsidy and the volume goes up.

This is a ''no'' vote. It is an easy ''no'' vote.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of the debate, the chairman said that only 10 bucks a month small businesses were paying. Now he admitted it is $3,500, at least, and the smaller small business loans are down.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN).

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Chairman, as a former small business owner, I am a strong advocate for providing entrepreneurs and small business owners access to affordable capital. For that reason, I rise to speak in support of Representative VELÁZQUEZ's amendment to restore funding for the Small Business Administration's 7(a) Small Business Loan Program.

Small businesses are the economic drivers of our country, providing the stimulus our communities need. Oftentimes, small business owners are unable to obtain reasonably priced financing and instead turn to higher priced forms of capital, such as credit cards. In an effort to fill this financing gap, the SBA's 7(a) loan program was created.

The program works as a public-private partnership that combines financial institutions' knowledge of their communities and the government's ability to mitigate risk.

The SBA's current business loan portfolio of roughly 219,000 loans worth more than $45 billion makes it the largest single financial resource of U.S. businesses in the Nation.

During the 108th Congress, legislation was passed that terminated funding for the 7(a) program. As a result, small businesses and lenders were forced to pay the full cost of the program. This has led to a sharp rise in loan fees, with borrower fees doubling in 2 years and lender fees rising by 118 percent.

For smaller loans, roughly $150,000 loans, fees have doubled, translating into nearly $1,500 to $3,000 more in upfront closing costs for entrepreneurs and innovators. For a larger loan, say $70,000, fees have been raised by approximately $3,000, and for some loans by as much as $50,000.

Last year the House voted and passed a similar amendment during consideration of the SSJC appropriations bill to restore $79 million in funding for the Small Business Administration's program. Unfortunately, that amendment was later removed in conference.

In the FY 2007 budget proposal, no funding has been requested again for the program, and a new set of fees has been proposed for participants, making the program even less accessible and more costly for small businesses.

It is time that Congress steps forward to support the small business community through access to affordable capital. The Velazquez amendment would reduce fees to small business owners. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, where do they get this money from? $5.9 million would be provided to cover the cost for blast mitigation in windows at the Department of Commerce. So you are basically saying to the Department of Commerce, we don't care if there is a blast here; you can't get your blast windows. You can't get your windows, so you can give a subsidy to the banks that will give no additional loans.

Also, this will result in RIFs at the Small Business Administration. So if you don't want loans to go to the small businesses, support this amendment, because there will be RIFs and they won't be able to make the loans. Zero subsidy means more loans. Loans are up almost 20 percent from 2005 over 2004.

I think the people at the Department of Commerce have every right to have the same protection that the people in this building have. They are not second-class citizens. They are covered by this bill. They need blast protection windows. Also it is not right to RIF the employees at the SBA to give a subsidy to bankers who don't need the subsidy.

Lastly, don't ever give another deficit reduction speech if you vote for this amendment. Don't ever, ever give

it, because the loans are up with it; and actually the adoption of this may very well reduce the loans.

So I urge Members to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a point of clarification that the $10 million is not taken from the blast mitigation, but from salary and expenses.

Mr. Chairman, today's amendment is about improving the economic environment for this Nation's small businesses. 7(a) loans cost twice as much today for small businesses, are nearly 50 percent smaller and the program is doing nearly a half a billion dollars less than before the fee increase was implemented. Women and veteran business owners receive $100 million less in lending this year, and rural business owners receive $300 million less. Just look at the numbers here. Enough is said.

This amendment will change this and allow small businesses to invest back into the firms, and, in turn, the U.S. economy. If you believe that small businesses, which make up the majority of our taxpayers, should be able to keep their money, then you need to vote ''yes'' on this amendment. However, if you prefer to see our government grow, rather than the U.S. economy, then you should vote against this measure today.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this measure.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 5672, the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2007, offered by the gentlelady from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that would lower the fees associated with the U.S. Small Business Administration's 7(a) loan program and ensure that the program continues as a public-private partnership. The 7(a) program is an important financing mechanism relied upon by entrepreneurs to gain access to lifeblood capital they need to strengthen, diversify, and expand their businesses and to hire new employees.

Small businesses are particularly vulnerable to failure due to the difficulty in accessing capital, especially during a firm's formative stages. Most banks look upon making seed loans to small businesses as risky. Entrepreneurs, as a result, are left without the resources to afford to buy new equipment, hire new employees, and make other necessary operational investments in their businesses. These are the investments that are necessary to strengthen and grow businesses.

The 7(a) program was designed and has been implemented specifically to address this gap in access to capital for American entrepreneurs. The program provides funding to underwrite loans made by local banks to small businesses. Funds provided through the 7(a) program relieved banks of the risks associated with lending to start-up small firms. In turn, small business gained access to important capital markets.

Integral to the 7(a) program was the approximately $79 million provided annually to offset a large portion of the fees charged to small business borrowers associated with their loans. These fees are paid upfront during the loan process. These fees present small businesses, especially cash-strapped start-ups, with a potentially prohibitive cost to accessing capital. The Administration has zeroed out this aspect of the 7(a) program in its budget proposals for fiscal years 2005, 2006 and 2007. Entrepreneurs wishing to borrow under the 7(a) program now pay the full amount of the fees associated with their loans, raising the barrier to capital for at-need companies.

In fact, small businesses on Guam paid $17,862 more in fee costs on the 57 loans made to them during fiscal year 2005. This is nearly $18,000 above what they would have paid during fiscal year 2004 on the same 57 loans. This additional amount is the direct result of the Administration cutting this aspect of 7(a) program funding. That is almost $18,000 dollars that small businesses in my district were unable to invest in equipment, training, salaries and other necessary operating costs.

The amendment before us today would restore $40 million of the approximately $79 million previously needed to offset fees associated with loans made under the authorities of the 7(a) program. This amount would significantly reduce the amounts small business owners are paying to receive 7(a) program loans. This amendment would not, however, reduce fee amounts to fiscal year 2004 levels. The U.S. Small Business Administration budget has been reduced significantly under the current Administration. It is becoming increasingly difficult to find offsets within the lean U.S. Small Business Administration budget to pay for necessary amendments such as this one.

Congress has shown bipartisan support for similar amendments in previous years. I urge my colleagues' support again this year. By supporting this amendment you will help ease the financial burdens on American small businessmen and women, so that they can continue their hard work driving our country's economy, producing innovative goods and services, and creating good jobs for America's talented workers.

I urge my colleagues' support for the Veláquez amendment.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Congresswoman VELÁZQUEZ's amendment to the SSJC Appropriations to restore funding to the Small Business Administration's 7(a) loan program. This amendment would enable us to lower the costs—in turn, opening up access to affordable capital for small businesses.

For the last two years, the House overwhelmingly voted in a bipartisan fashion to provide funding for this amendment. This amendment proposes to use offsets from four different Salary and Expense accounts—Justice, Commerce, State and SBA. There will be $10 million taken from each S&E account to equal $40 million, an amount that will ease the burden on small businesses.

Unfortunately, due to recent changes, the 7(a) loan program is falling short of its ability to serve as an affordable source of capital for small businesses. In the last two years, the fees small businesses pay to secure a loan through the SBA's 7(a) program have doubled. For small loans this translates into nearly $1,500 to $3,000 more in upfront closing costs for entrepreneurs—and can grow to a total cost of as much as $50,000. Without this amendment, my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, can potentially see an average increase in loan fees of $13,901 for 7(a) loans. In 2005, the total 7(a) loans made to U.S. Virgin Islands small business was approximately $3 million.

Funding for the 7(a) program has garnered wide support from the small business community. Without funding the 7(a) program, small businesses will be negatively impacted. The Velázquez amendment will allow us to restore stability to the 7(a) program once again so that economic changes will no longer threaten the viability of the initiative—and most importantly the lending for small businesses.

I urge my colleagues to once again vote for the Velázquez amendment to restore funding to the 7(a) loan program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

JUSTICE INFORMATION SHARING TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses for information sharing technology, including planning, development, deployment and Departmental direction, $125,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TACTICAL WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT

For the costs of conversion to narrowband communications and the Integrated Wireless Network, including the cost for operation and maintenance of Land Mobile Radio legacy systems, $89,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That the Attorney General shall transfer to this account all funds made available to the Department of Justice for the purchase of portable and mobile radios: *Provided further*, That any transfer made under the preceding proviso shall be subject to section 605 of this Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For expenses necessary for the administration of pardon and clemency petitions and immigration-related activities, $229,152,000.

DETENTION TRUSTEE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Federal Detention Trustee, $1,331,026,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be derived from prior year unobligated balances from funds previously appropriated, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any unobligated balances available in prior years from the funds appropriated under the heading ''Federal Prisoner Detention'' shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation under the heading ''Detention Trustee'' and shall be available until expended.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, $70,558,000, including not to exceed $10,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Parole Commission as authorized, $11,500,000.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $20,000 for expenses of collecting evidence, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia, $668,739,000, of which not to exceed $10,000,000 for litigation support contracts shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $1,000 shall be available to the United States National Central Bureau, INTERPOL, for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 105 of this Act, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for litigation activities of the Civil Division, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to ''Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities'' from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to the previous proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NADLER:

Page 4, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $40,000,000)''.

Page 10, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $40,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, 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 yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases funding for the FBI by $40 million to conduct security background checks. Since the attacks of September 11, the FBI's National Name Check Program has remained dangerously underfunded and has accumulated a significant backlog of uncompleted required security checks. Backlogs in security checks requested by the Immigration Service have led to major delays in the processing of immigration applications and, therefore, to a very real national security risk.

If some of these applicants pose a genuine national security risk, they need to be found, arrested and deported immediately. Instead, there is a backlog of over 116,000 applications for permanent residency in the New York district office alone awaiting FBI background checks.

In fiscal year 2006, the National Name Check Program received 3.3 million requests for background checks, but it has only 125 people to process them and an anemic operating budget of $12.4 million. The program does charge fees, but the fee structure was set prior to 9/11 and falls far short of covering the program's cost.

Program employees have to search FBI files, often manually, in over 265 different locations across country. Having to spend so much of its resource on background checks dilutes the FBI's responsiveness, limits information sharing, and hampers counterintelligence and counterterrorism work.

People who are here legally seeking residency or citizenship are prevented from renewing work or travel documents while awaiting the okay from the FBI. Those receiving Social Security face termination of their benefits if they don't become citizens within 7 years, even though their citizenship applications cannot be processed while awaiting the FBI report.

Last year, the committee included report language directing the FBI to conduct a review of the fee structure for background checks done for the Immigration Service. As far as I know, the FBI has yet to send this review to Congress.

This year the committee report says it ''expects the FBI to work with these agencies to ensure that sufficient resources are made available to eliminate the backlog as soon as possible.''

□ 2015

''The committee expects the FBI to set the Name Check fee at a level that adequately covers the cost to conduct requested background checks.''

This is not an adequate fix to this problem. Congress should do more than tell the FBI it expects it to do more. That is why I am offering this amendment. CRS estimates that $40 million is needed to eliminate the backlog. This amendment will enable the FBI to create a centralized records repository where all of its paper files can be located and to develop, design, implement the system to store its active files electronically.

It will reduce the burdens on people who are here legally seeking permanent residency and citizenship, and it would get would-be terrorists out of America swiftly.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the adoption of this amendment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, our Members should know that this cuts the Justice Department litigating division by $40 million. The bill already cuts this account by $16 million below the level requested. This account that they are cutting funds critical justice litigating activities such as the criminal division. Wow, this is good news for the criminals, because they will not be litigated; we are going to cut the funding.

To combat gangs. Gangs are spreading. MS–13 are spreading around the Nation. But we cut it. Prosecute intellectual property rights crimes. Wow. Are you going to cut Katrina fraud cases. No way. The civil rights division prosecution of human traffickers. Women and children are being trafficked. Justice prosecutes, but we are going to cut the money so they cannot do it.

For all of you who care about the environment, the environmental and natural resources division prosecution of organizations that violate our environmental laws go away. The tax division prosecution of tax fraud, impacted. This account also funds the U.S. dues for Interpol. We are in a global war on terror. We need to work with Interpol. So we cut them.

The Name Checks that the gentleman is concerned about are funded through a fee. There is a backlog in the Name Checks Program because the fees the FBI charges are not sufficient to adequately cover the cost of the program.

In the fiscal year 2006 report, we directed the FBI to review this fee structure and submit a report to the Committee. The fee review is ongoing and a report is estimated to be submitted in August. In addition to this year's bill, we also include additional report language in this bill directing the FBI to work with the agencies that request these background checks to ensure that sufficient resources are made available to eliminate the backlog.

The gentleman is on the authorizing committee that oversees the FBI and immigration issues. If he wants to address the issue, he would go to the Judiciary Committee that he serves on, introduce a bill, try to convince Mr. SENSENBRENNER to deal with it.

This amendment also would cut 200 employees; we just added Justice Assistance grants here not too long ago, because we are concerned about crime. This would cut more than 200 employees working to combat crime such as organized crime, gangs, human traffickers, Katrina fraud, and environmental crimes in order to fund the FBI Name Checks that are fee-funded.

This would be a blow to the Justice Department litigating capacity. If you wanted to say do not prosecute organized crime, do not worry about the environmental convictions you have to go after, do not worry about the tax frauds, how will you do it then? You cannot say you are going to go after them and take their money away.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge a ''no'' vote for this amendment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman makes a good point. If we were not splurging all of our money trying to get rid of the estate tax, we could put $40 million more into the Department of Justice. That would be preferable. But the fact is, we are limited to the amount we are, and I have to take an offset from somewhere.

This $40 million will enable people not to lose their Social Security because their time limit runs out while they are waiting for the FBI background check. It will enable this country to be safer because we will find out about some would-be terrorists while they are still within the clutches of the law.

That makes sense. Yes, it will take money away from the rest of the Justice Department. And the account that it will take the money away from will go from $669 million to $629 million, a 5.9 percent cut. Yes, we are cutting the rest of the Justice Department by 5.9 percent to fund this crucial area of the FBI.

Now, the gentleman says that it is fee-based, that he asks for a report to the fee. But where is that report? If they increase the fees, if the FBI increases the fees, they are still taking the money from the other agencies within the Departments of Justice or Homeland Security. The immigration service would pay a bigger fee.

Other agencies within DOJ that are asking the FBI for the background check would pay a bigger fee. It is all the same pot of money. So the question is, Do we want to be able to catch would-be terrorists and get their names by getting the background check on time?

Do we want people who are legal immigrants to be able to get their citizenship processed and not wait 7, 8, 9, 10 years? Yes, it would be most preferable if we did not have to rob Peter to pay Paul. But because of what that side of the aisle is doing, we have to rob Peter to pay Paul. I submit we ought to pay Paul here and Peter can afford it better than Paul can, because we are reducing a $669 million account, which is an important account, by 5.9 percent; but we will get justice done on time.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think that the committee has looked very carefully at this. And the committee has, in its report language, if the gentleman who is offering the amendment would look, stated that the committee expects the FBI to set the Name Check fee at a level to adequately cover the cost to conduct the requested background checks.

So the provision that allows them to move forward and to be funded is contained in our report, number one. Number two, the gentleman sits on the committee that could address this issue in an authorization, and obviously he is not in the majority so he would have to go to the majority to have this issue addressed. But I would suggest that that might be a good way to approach it if he wants to change the way that the appropriations committee has dealt with the issue.

Secondly, the offsets coming from the criminal division, the civil rights division, and the office of immigration litigation are difficult offsets. And again I go back to comments in the opening statements before this committee, before general debate, when we considered general debate on this bill. There are going to be a lot of good amendments. I wish there were more money. We have tried to provide for how this function would be funded by directing the FBI to set a reasonable fee.

But the offsets here are difficult offsets. And they cut programs that are important programs. So regrettably, I rise in opposition to the amendment on that basis.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, since the committee had the same language in last year's report, do we have any reason to expect the FBI will, in fact, change the fee structure this year?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think that is an interesting question. I think that is a question that the authorizing committee in the first instance has the responsibility to explore with the FBI.

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, for reimbursement of expenses of the Department of Justice associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, not to exceed $6,292,000, to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL SECURITY DIVISION

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the National Security Division, $66,970,000; of which not to exceed $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 105 of this Act, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for the activities of the National Security Division, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to this heading from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to the previous proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, $145,915,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18a), regardless of the year of collection (and estimated to be $129,000,000 in fiscal year 2007), shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2007, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2007 appropriation from the general fund estimated at $16,915,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For necessary expenses of the Offices of the United States Attorneys, including intergovernmental and cooperative agreements, $1,664,400,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $8,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $20,000,000 shall remain available until expended.

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND

For necessary expenses of the United States Trustee Program, as authorized, $223,447,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the United States Trustee System Fund: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, deposits to the Fund shall be available in such amounts as may be necessary to pay refunds due depositors: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $223,447,000 of offsetting collections pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 589a(b) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation and remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2007, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2007 appropriation from the Fund estimated at $0.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $1,431,000.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Marshals Service, $825,924,000; of which not to exceed $6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses; of which $4,000,000 for information technology systems shall remain available until expended; of which not less than $9,425,000 shall be available for the costs of courthouse security equipment, including furnishings, relocations, and telephone systems and cabling, and shall remain available until expended; and of which $3,282,000 shall be available for construction in space controlled, occupied or utilized by the United States Marshals Service in United States courthouses and Federal buildings, and shall remain available until expended.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For fees and expenses of witnesses, for expenses of contracts for the procurement and

supervision of expert witnesses, for private counsel expenses, including advances, and for expenses of foreign counsel, such sums as are necessary, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $10,000,000 may be made available for construction of buildings for protected witness safesites: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,000,000 may be made available for the purchase and maintenance of armored vehicles for transportation of protected witnesses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $9,000,000 may be made available for the purchase, installation, maintenance and upgrade of secure telecommunications equipment and a secure automated information network to store and retrieve the identities and locations of protected witnesses.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Community Relations Service, $9,882,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 105 of this Act, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for conflict resolution and violence prevention activities of the Community Relations Service, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to the Community Relations Service, from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to the previous proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND

For expenses authorized by 28 U.S.C. 524(c)(1)(B), (F), and (G), $21,202,000, to be derived from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund.

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

INTERAGENCY CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for the identification, investigation, and prosecution of individuals associated with the most significant drug trafficking and affiliated money laundering organizations not otherwise provided for, to include inter-governmental agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking, $498,457,000, of which $50,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any amounts obligated from appropriations under this heading may be used under authorities available to the organizations reimbursed from this appropriation.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for detection, investigation, and prosecution of crimes against the United States; including purchase for police-type use of not to exceed 3,500 passenger motor vehicles, of which 3,000 will be for replacement only, $5,959,628,000; of which not to exceed $150,000,000 shall remain available until expended; and of which $2,307,994,000 shall be for counterterrorism investigations, foreign counterintelligence, and other activities related to our national security: *Provided*, That not to exceed $210,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. JOHNSON OF CONNECTICUT

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

Page 10, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $3,300,000)''.

Page 39, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,300,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

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

Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman for crafting a bill that very effectively addresses so many of our national priorities and includes critical funding for increases in the COPS program, the Byrne Justice Assistance Grants, the National Science Foundation, and many other initiatives, key to making our communities safer and preparing our young people to succeed in a competitive global economy.

I also respect, Mr. Chairman, the commitment that you have shown in this bill to programs that protect our children from exploitation and abuse. However, I think we must do more to safeguard our children from the growing threat imposed by online sex predators.

Last Friday, I visited the FBI's Innocent Images Task Force in New Haven, Connecticut, and was astonished and disturbed to see the shear number of predators trolling the Internet for young girls and boys, the explicit nature of their online interaction, and the ease with which they contacted our children.

Despite the 2,000 percent increase in the number of these sexual exploitation cases opened in the past decade, Congress has not allocated funding commensurate with either the menace or the workload. The FBI is currently dedicating twice as many agents to tracking online sex predators as they have the resources for.

As the Internet has exposed our children to new dangers by allowing these predators to invade our homes, law enforcement has not been given the tools to adequately combat this epidemic of sexual stalking and abuse of our children.

My amendment will provide the FBI's Innocent Images Program, the nucleus of the Federal efforts to pursue and prosecute online sex predators and curtail the distribution of child pornography, with an additional $3.3 million offsetting these funds from the Bureau of the Census which received an $87.7 million increase over last year.

When combined with the resources the committee has already provided, we will better enable the Innocent Images Program to meet the challenge of the explosion of sexual predators pursuing our children on the Internet.

I urge support of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), the coauthor of this amendment and a strong advocate for our children.

Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer this amendment with my friend from Connecticut to increase by $3.3 million the FBI's Innocent Images Task Force.

This vital FBI program targets a real and growing problem. Sexual predators are increasingly taking to the Internet to victimize our Nation's kids. The FBI's Innocent Images Task Force is the focal point of our Federal law enforcement's efforts to combat online sexual predators.

While they do great work, our field agents are being overburdened by the rapidly increasing caseload they find in the Internet's target-rich environment. In the past 10 years alone, Mr. Chairman, the FBI has seen a 2,000 percent increase in its caseload of crimes involving online sexual predators.

As a father of six children, I recognize the dangers of the Internet, especially with social networking sites. As a result, I introduced the Deleting Online Predators Act to protect our children from these sites while they are at school or in the public libraries.

Recognizing that chat rooms and social networking sites represent a clear and present danger to millions of children, I believe that a key component of protecting our children is to crack down on these online predators. That means we must provide law enforcement with the tools necessary to track these criminals down.

I want to commend the leadership of Chairman WOLF for his efforts to increase funding for a number of programs in the Department of Justice to protect our children both on- and offline.

□ 2030

I reached out to Chairman WOLF, requesting his assistance in securing increased funding for a number of law enforcement programs, and I am pleased to see that he has taken the initiative to include that language to do just that.

Through Chairman WOLF's leadership, this legislation comes to the floor with increased funding not only for the Innocent Images Task Force but also for other vital law enforcement programs like the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Forces and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. This bill also includes funds to add 26 new U.S. attorneys to prosecute these crimes.

I requested Chairman WOLF's assistance in increasing funding for these programs, and I am grateful for his work to provide the necessary funding to protect our Nation's children while on the Internet.

The Johnson amendment to fund law enforcement will protect children and will save lives. Congress must act to

make the Internet a safer place for kids, not a virtual hunting ground for child predators. This amendment will help accomplish this goal, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment. The committee, working with Mr. MOLLOHAN, has tried to increase this as much as possible. I would urge any Member that has not been out to the Center for Missing and Exploited Children in Alexandria, that they ought to go. As a father of 11 grandchildren, I commend both of you and thank you very much and think we should accept the amendment.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I thank you, but I thank you also for a very thoughtful bill in very tough times, truly one that does support safer communities and one that does help prepare our young people for a global environment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to claim the time in opposition? If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses to construct or acquire buildings and sites by purchase, or as otherwise authorized by law (including equipment for such buildings); conversion and extension of Federally-owned buildings; and preliminary planning and design of projects; $80,422,000, to remain available until expended, of which $2,000,000 shall be available for equipment and associated continuing costs for a permanent central records complex.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Drug Enforcement Administration, including not to exceed $70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530C; expenses for conducting drug education and training programs, including travel and related expenses for participants in such programs and the distribution of items of token value that promote the goals of such programs; and purchase of not to exceed 1,134 passenger motor vehicles, of which 1,004 will be for replacement only, for police-type use, $1,751,491,000; of which not to exceed $75,000,000 shall remain available until expended; and of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, including the purchase of not to exceed 822 vehicles for police-type use, of which 650 shall be for replacement only; not to exceed $40,000 for official reception and representation expenses; for training of State and local law enforcement agencies with or without reimbursement, including training in connection with the training and acquisition of canines for explosives and fire accelerants detection; and for provision of laboratory assistance to State and local law enforcement agencies, with or without reimbursement, $950,128,000, of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for the payment of attorneys' fees as provided by 18 U.S.C. 924(d)(2); and of which $10,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no funds appropriated herein shall be available for salaries or administrative expenses in connection with consolidating or centralizing, within the Department of Justice, the records, or any portion thereof, of acquisition and disposition of firearms maintained by Federal firearms licensees: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay administrative expenses or the compensation of any officer or employee of the United States to implement an amendment or amendments to 27 CFR 478.118 or to change the definition of ''Curios or relics'' in 27 CFR 478.11 or remove any item from ATF Publication 5300.11 as it existed on January 1, 1994: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be available to investigate or act upon applications for relief from Federal firearms disabilities under 18 U.S.C. 925(c): *Provided further*, That such funds shall be available to investigate and act upon applications filed by corporations for relief from Federal firearms disabilities under section 925(c) of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further*, That no funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to transfer the functions, missions, or activities of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to other agencies or Departments in fiscal year 2007: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated under this or any other Act with respect to any fiscal year may be used to disclose part or all of the contents of the Firearms Trace System database maintained by the National Trace Center of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives or any information required to be kept by licensees pursuant to section 923(g) of title 18, United States Code, or required to be reported pursuant to paragraphs (3) and (7) of such section 923(g), to anyone other than a Federal, State, local, or foreign law enforcement agency or a Federal, State, or local prosecutor solely in connection with and for use in a bona fide criminal investigation or prosecution and then only such information as pertains to the geographic jurisdiction of the law enforcement agency requesting the disclosure and not for use in any civil action or proceeding other than an action or proceeding commenced by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, or a review of such an action or proceeding, to enforce the provisions of chapter 44 of such title, and all such data shall be immune from legal process and shall not be subject to subpoena or other discovery, shall be inadmissible in evidence, and shall not be used, relied on, or disclosed in any manner, nor shall testimony or other evidence be permitted based upon such data, in any civil action pending on or filed after the effective date of this Act in any State (including the District of Columbia) or Federal court or in any administrative proceeding other than a proceeding commenced by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to enforce the provisions of that chapter, or a review of such an action or proceeding; except that this proviso shall not be construed to prevent the disclosure of statistical information concerning total production, importation, and exportation by each licensed importer (as defined in section 921(a)(9) of such title) and licensed manufacturer (as defined in section 921(a)(10) of such title): *Provided further*, That no funds made available by this or any other Act shall be expended to promulgate or implement any rule requiring a physical inventory of any business licensed under section 923 of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further*, That no funds under this Act may be used to electronically retrieve information gathered pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 923(g)(4) by name or any personal identification code: *Provided further*, That no funds authorized or made available under this or any other Act may be used to deny any application for a license under section 923 of title 18, United States Code, or renewal of such a license due to a lack of business activity, provided that the applicant is otherwise eligible to receive such a license, and is eligible to report business income or to claim an income tax deduction for business expenses under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 2007, the Attorney General may establish and collect fees of not less than one-half cent per pound of explosive material manufactured in, or imported into, the United States by licensed manufacturers and licensed importers, pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Attorney General, which fees shall be credited as offsetting receipts to the ''ATF Regulatory Activities Fund'' established by the Attorney General: *Provided further*, That of the amount so credited, not to exceed $30,000,000 shall be available for carrying out chapter 40 of title 18, United States Code.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the two provisions on page 15, line 18, through page 16, line 4. The provisions constitute legislation on an appropriations bill in violation of clause 2, rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rose for the same point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a provision that the chairman and I understand the dilemma which he is in.

For the last 2 years, the President, when he has submitted his budget request, has proffered this tax increase on the commercial explosives industry, which is particularly oppressive.

Mr. Chairman, in West Virginia, as a matter of fact, of course we use explosives in mining and extraction and for road building purposes, and this would have a very injurious effect on the customers of explosives in my State, costing a tremendous amount of money.

As I say, the President has requested this for the last 2 years in order to fund BATF functions. It constitutes a tax, and the committee appropriately disapproved this request from the President last year.

This year, the chairman, in an effort to make the point I think, and certainly from my standpoint to make the point, that this is an inappropriate way to try to fund the functions of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, and making the request and not knowing that it probably would not be approved by the Congress, makes a huge hole in our bill.

The chairman is putting it into the bill at a much lower level, and I do not know whether he anticipated this particular action, and I am not going to speak for him on that, but this I think demonstrates to the administration that this kind of a tactic, knowing that the administration, relying on the fund and the Congress not approving it, and then have to take the money out of some other account, we are just not going to continue do that.

So, by striking it, I hope that what results is that there is a hole in BATF's budget at the end of the year, and making the point that this is probably not a good idea for the administration to do if they, in fact, want all of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearm programs to be funded into the future.

So I hope after this is struck that this hole remains and that the point is made in a telling way.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this point of order is raised appropriately, and I concur with the gentleman from West Virginia in that it is legislation on an appropriations bill. It is actually a taxation. It is a revenue generator. It levies a tax on explosives and on firearms ammunition, and it is a way to generate revenue, perhaps as much as $130 million in this appropriations bill, in order to protect the interests of the firearms industry, the explosives industry, the people that are very closely regulated today and do not need to have additional regulation.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that the section be struck out, but it is also important that we maintain our standard here and avoid legislating on an appropriation bill.

So, with that, I again suggest that this point of order is one that is very solid on the policy of not legislating on appropriation bills, and I urge the Chair to sustain that point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If no further Member wishes to be heard on the point of order, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this provision includes language conferring authority. The provision, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained, and the provision is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary of the Federal Prison System for the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutions, including purchase (not to exceed 670, of which 635 are for replacement only) and hire of law enforcement and passenger motor vehicles, and for the provision of technical assistance and advice on corrections related issues to foreign governments, $4,987,059,000: *Provided*, That the Attorney General may transfer to the Health Resources and Services Administration such amounts as may be necessary for direct expenditures by that Administration for medical relief for inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Federal Prison System, where necessary, may enter into contracts with a fiscal agent/fiscal intermediary claims processor to determine the amounts payable to persons who, on behalf of the Federal Prison System, furnish health services to individuals committed to the custody of the Federal Prison System: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $50,000,000 shall remain available for necessary operations until September 30, 2008: *Provided further*, That, of the amounts provided for Contract Confinement, not to exceed $20,000,000 shall remain available until expended to make payments in advance for grants, contracts and reimbursable agreements, and other expenses authorized by section 501(c) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, for the care and security in the United States of Cuban and Haitian entrants: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Federal Prison System may accept donated property and services relating to the operation of the prison card program from a not-for-profit entity which has operated such program in the past notwithstanding the fact that such not-for-profit entity furnishes services under contracts to the Federal Prison System relating to the operation of pre-release services, halfway houses or other custodial facilities.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 22 offered by Mr. STEARNS:

Page 16, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Page 67, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

I have an amendment that Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. KING of Iowa have indicated they support this idea. So it is similar to H.R. 5476, legislation which I introduced to withhold the U.S. share of the U.N. Human Rights Council's budget from our regular U.N. dues. It transfers funding from the Council to hire more prison guards in the Federal Prison System.

Let me just speak briefly I think before I get into the meat of it, to just talk to you about the U.N. Human Rights Council.

Forty-one years ago this past Monday, 50 nations signed the United Nations Charter. A year later, former First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt became the first chairwoman of the U.N. Human Rights Commission, to monitor and prevent the abuse of human rights throughout the world.

Her chairmanship was the last for the U.S. on the Human Rights Commission, which has failed to uphold even the most basic ideals iterated in the U.N. Charter and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. It quickly lost any credibility and allowed tyrannies like Cuba, Sudan, Libya, Belarus, China and Zimbabwe to shield themselves from criticism for their human rights violations.

Over the life of the Commission, it failed to act or speak out against egregious human rights abuses like the atrocities committed in many of the Communist blocs and the genocides in Rwanda and Darfur. It also failed to condemn countries that sponsor terrorism, including Iran, Syria and North Korea. Instead, the Human Rights Commission repeatedly castigated Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East, while overlooking horrific human rights abuses throughout that same Middle East. At least 30 percent of all country-specific resolutions of the Commission critical of human rights were directed at that very small country, Israel. None targeted persistent violators like former Burma, which is now Myanmar, Syria and Zimbabwe and, of course, early on, China.

The U.N. recently replaced the discredited Commission with a Human Rights Council. For all the superficial changes, it will fail just as miserably as its predecessor. The reforms advocated by democratic nations were rejected, and that is why the United States declined to seek membership this year.

The Council cannot even prevent human rights violators from being elected to the Council itself. The only supposed protection, that a country can be suspended if two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly agree, is useless since less than half of the General Assembly could agree that Sudan was guilty of human rights violations. The new Council only reduced the number of seats on the Council from 53 to 47, not enough to make the Council more efficient or effective. It also retained geographic quotas that will allow countries like Iran, Venezuela, Sudan and Zimbabwe repeated chances to run for membership.

This new U.N. Human Rights Council is littered with abysmal human rights abusers. The newly elected membership includes nine countries that the democracy watchdog Freedom House designates as not free: China, Cuba, Saudi Arabia, Russia, Pakistan, Tunisia, Algeria, Cameroon and Azerbaijan. According to the Geneva-based human rights monitor U.N. Watch, almost half of the new members fail to meet accepted democratic standards.

The U.S. cannot fund such a human rights sham while our own Federal Prison System needs the money. The Federal Prison System requested a $500 million increase in fiscal year 2007. The

committee report falls $400 million short of that request. This unmet increase is vital to grapple with a growing prison population.

More than 188,000 inmates are confined in the correctional institutions of the Federal Prison System today. As a result, the Federal Prison System is operating 41 percent over capacity, up from 32 percent as of January, 2000. The number of Federal correctional officers cannot keep pace. In the 1990s, when inmate populations were approximately half as large, the prisons were at 95 percent staffing levels. Today, it has less than that. This has resulted in a significant increase in inmate assaults on correctional staff.

According to the Federal Prison System data, assaults against correctional staff increased by 75 percent, and assaults against correctional staff with weapons increased by 61 percent. These are alarming statistics.

This particular statistic concerns me because we have in my district the largest prison system, Coleman Correctional Facility.

So my amendment is significant. I ask support of it. It is symbolic. It is important to pass it.

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

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

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

The gentleman stated that this bill was below the Administration's request. We are above the Administration's request for prisons. We are not below.

Secondly, our Subcommittee last year put together what they called a Gingrich-Mitchell Commission, former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich and former Minority Leader Mitchell, to look at the U.N. reform, and they have come up with a good package, and they are working on this issue.

The State Department opposes this amendment. John Bolten up at the State Department says, and I quote, ''We must determine whether the U.N. Human Rights Council will be a body that the world will respect and take seriously.'' Its status is no longer characteristic of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights.

That said, the United States will work cooperatively with other member states to make the Council as strong and effective as it can be. We will be supportive of efforts to strengthen the Council and look forward to a serious review of the Council structure and work.

I have been as critical as anybody else, and I will stipulate perhaps more than anybody else, on the whole issue of the Human Rights Commission with regard to China, with regard to Sudan and with regard to these others, but this would complicate the Administration's efforts.

The Secretary of State, Secretary Rice, is opposed to this. The State Department is opposed to this. The Administration is opposed to this.

Change it by dealing with it through the Gingrich-Mitchell Task Force and put pressure on them, but do not complicate the life of John Bolten and Secretary Rice up there.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

□ 2045

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am not sure exactly what the gentleman is attempting to achieve here, but I really find myself in disagreement at both ends.

I find myself in disagreement with the offset, certainly. However imperfect the U.S. Human Rights Council and its memberships may or may not be, I am not sure that taking this money from that organization for that purpose, even if it were to come from that account, would address the problem.

I might point out that Chairman WOLF is extremely sensitive to human rights, and has been for a long time; and when he addresses human rights issues in this bill, he is very conscious about them. I really feel confident in the way that he has treated the overall State Department accounts, particularly as any of that account might be contributing to the U.N. Human Rights Council budget, if that is the focus of this offset, even though it comes from the international organizations, account which is a much broader account.

On the other side of it, to increase funding for the Bureau of Prisons by $500,000, I am really pleased that the gentleman recognizes that we do need additional dollars within the Bureau of Prisons, and I agree that to a large extent the Bureau of Prisons is underfunded. It is underfunded in a lot of areas. If we are concerned about assaults on guards, if we are concerned about those kinds of issues, then maybe we ought to be looking for those types of programs that could be funded, but it would cost a lot more than $500,000 in the Bureau of Prisons, to would address education, training, and those kinds of programs that would be remedial with regard to prisoners; and we could reduce the concerns that he is trying to address with this offset.

So on both ends, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I close by saying let us do what we did in the Gingrich-Mitchell thing. The U.N. has made a lot of mistakes. John Bolten is no wallflower. I support what John Bolten is trying to do up there, and I don't think we should complicate the administration's life by doing this.

I yield to the gentleman if he would like to say something.

Mr. STEARNS. Well, Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that I realize you are doing a wonderful job in your position here, and this, in a larger sense, is symbolic to show to the United Nations where our priorities are and to give an opportunity for some Members, like myself, to voice their concerns about this Human Rights Commission, and I thank you for your courtesy.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For planning, acquisition of sites and construction of new facilities; purchase and acquisition of facilities and remodeling, and equipping of such facilities for penal and correctional use, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account; and constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account, $88,961,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $14,000,000 shall be available to construct areas for inmate work programs: *Provided*, That labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed under this appropriation.

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

The Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available, and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments, without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the program set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, including purchase (not to exceed five for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

Not to exceed $2,477,000 of the funds of the corporation shall be available for its administrative expenses, and for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, to be computed on an accrual basis to be determined in accordance with the corporation's current prescribed accounting system, and such amounts shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, and expenditures which such accounting system requires to be capitalized or charged to cost of commodities acquired or produced, including selling and shipping expenses, and expenses in connection with acquisition, construction, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of facilities and other property belonging to the corporation or in which it has an interest.

OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN PREVENTION AND PROSECUTION PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance for the prevention and prosecution of violence against women, as authorized by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) (''the 1968 Act''); the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement

Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322) (''the 1994 Act''); the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (''the 1990 Act''); the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–21); the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–386) (''the 2000 Act''); and the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (''the 2005 Act''); $390,296,000, including amounts for administrative costs, to remain available until expended as follows—

(1) $11,897,000 for the court-appointed special advocate program, as authorized by section 217 of the 1990 Act;

(2) $2,287,000 for child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners, as authorized by section 222 of the 1990 Act;

(3) $174,500,000 for grants to combat violence against women, as authorized by part T of the 1968 Act, as amended by section 101 of the 2005 Act, of which $2,477,000 shall be for the National Institute of Justice for research and evaluation of violence against women;

(4) $14,808,000 for transitional housing assistance grants for victims of domestic violence, stalking or sexual assault as authorized by section 40299 of the 1994 Act, as amended by section 602 of the 2005 Act;

(5) $63,075,000 for grants to encourage arrest policies as authorized by part U of the 1968 Act, as amended by section 102 of the 2005 Act;

(6) $39,166,000 for rural domestic violence and child abuse enforcement assistance grants, as authorized by section 40295 of the 1994 Act, as amended by section 203 of the 2005 Act;

(7) $4,958,000 for training programs as authorized by section 40152 of the 1994 Act, as amended by section 108 of the 2005 Act, and for related local demonstration projects;

(8) $2,962,000 for grants to improve the stalking and domestic violence databases, as authorized by section 40602 of the 1994 Act, as amended by section 109 of the 2005 Act;

(9) $9,054,000 for grants to reduce violent crimes against women on campus, as authorized by section 304 of the 2005 Act;

(10) $42,000,000 for legal assistance for victims, as authorized by section 1201 of the 2000 Act, as amended by section 103 of the 2005 Act;

(11) $4,540,000 for enhancing protection for older and disabled women from domestic violence and sexual assault, as authorized by section 40802 of the 1994 Act, as amended by section 205 of the 2005 Act;

(12) $13,894,000 for the safe havens for children program, as authorized by section 1301 of the 2000 Act, as amended by section 306 of the 2005 Act; and

(13) $7,155,000 for education and training to end violence against and abuse of women with disabilities, as authorized by section 1402 of the 2000 Act, as amended by section 204 of the 2005 Act.

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, the Missing Children's Assistance Act, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith, the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–21), the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–405), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162), and the Victims of Crime Act of 1984, $215,575,000, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322) (''the 1994 Act''); the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (''the 1968 Act''); the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–164); the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162); and the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–386); and other programs; $1,103,492,000 (including amounts for administrative costs, which shall be transferred to and merged with the ''Justice Assistance'' account): *Provided*, That funding provided under this heading shall remain available until expended as follows—

(1) $558,077,000 for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program as authorized by subpart 1 of part E of title I of the 1968 Act, as amended by section 1111 of Public Law 109–162 (except that the special rules for Puerto Rico under section 505(g) of the 1968 Act, as amended by section 1111 of Public Law 109–162, shall not apply for purposes of this Act), of which—

(A) $115,225,000 is for discretionary grants, notwithstanding the provisions of section 505 of the 1968 Act; and

(B) $75,000,000 is for Boys and Girls Clubs in public housing facilities and other areas in cooperation with State and local law enforcement, as authorized by section 401 of Public Law 104–294 (42 U.S.C. 13751 note);

(2) $405,000,000 for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, as authorized by section 241(i)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(i)(5)), as amended by section 1196 of Public Law 109–162;

(3) $30,000,000 for the Southwest Border Prosecutor Initiative to reimburse State, county, parish, tribal, or municipal governments only for costs associated with the prosecution of criminal cases declined by local offices of the United States Attorneys;

(4) $21,488,000 for activities authorized under sections 201 and 204 of Public Law 109–164;

(5) $40,000,000 for Drug Courts, as authorized by section 1001(25)(A) of title I of the 1968 Act, as amended by section 1142 of Public Law 109–162;

(6) $10,000,000 for a prescription drug monitoring program;

(7) $22,943,000 for prison rape prevention and prosecution programs, as authorized by the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–79), of which $2,175,000 shall be transferred to the National Prison Rape Elimination Commission for authorized activities;

(8) $5,000,000 for grants for residential substance abuse treatment for State prisoners, as authorized by part S of the 1968 Act;

(9) $2,000,000 for a program to improve State and local law enforcement intelligence capabilities including antiterrorism training and training to ensure that constitutional rights, civil liberties, civil rights, and privacy interests are protected;

(10) $2,000,000 for a capital litigation improvement grant program;

(11) $5,000,000 for mental health courts and adult and juvenile collaboration program grants, as authorized by parts V and HH of title I of the 1968 Act; and

(12) $1,984,000 for the National Sex Offender Public Registry:

Provided, That, if a unit of local government uses any of the funds made available under this title to increase the number of law enforcement officers, the unit of local government will achieve a net gain in the number of law enforcement officers who perform nonadministrative public safety service.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOLLOHAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOLLOHAN:

Page 23, lines 4 and 9, after each of the dollar amounts, insert ''(increased by $341,923,000)''.

Page 38, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $67,077,000)''.

Page 55, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $100,000,000)''.

Page 55, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $75,000,000)''.

Page 55, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

Page 86, line 17, after each of the dollar amounts, insert ''(increased by $81,000,000)''.

Page 89, line 17, after each of the dollar amounts, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 107, after line 23, insert the following new section:

SEC. 629. In the case of taxpayers with income in excess of $1,000,000, for calendar year 2007 the amount of tax reduction resulting from the enactment of Public Laws 107–16, 108–27, and 108–311 shall be reduced by 1.45 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of my amendment. But before I describe the amendment, let me first note that Chairman WOLF has done a tremendous job with the narrow allocation he had.

However, the reductions and the eliminations proposed by the administration are really undermining our ability to protect our communities, to assist the neediest in our country, and to invest in cutting-edge innovations. All of those programs, addressing those concerns and those community needs are under the jurisdiction of this bill. This amendment takes a step to correcting those underfundings and those deficiencies.

First, Mr. Chairman, my amendment would provide an increase of $341 million to State and local law enforcement grants, restoring these grants to the full authorization level of $900 million. Federal assistance to State and local law enforcement has been cut by about $2 billion since 2001, and violent crime rates are up 2.5 percent, the largest percentage increase since 1992.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize this. This is State and local law enforcement. This is the program the Federal Government has that assists State and local law enforcement in performing the protective function that

they have on a daily basis, dangerous job; and they don't have the resources. The Federal Government has recognized that State and local law enforcement does not have the resources to do its job. We have recognized that for a number of years, and we have programs to supplement their resources to ensure that they are able to do that.

But this bill, and the President's request over the last number of years, has by attrition cut by nearly $2 billion since 2001 Federal assistance to State and local law enforcement. Those are real cuts, and they have had real impacts. And the impact is best measured by the increase in violent crime by 2.5 percent since 1992.

Mr. Chairman, second, this amendment would provide an increase of $67 million to the Economic Development Administration, bringing the funding level up to the $327 million request. This would provide EDA with a $44 million increase above last year's enacted level to better provide for economically distressed regions with high unemployment and low incomes.

Third, this amendment provides an increase of $81 million to the Legal Services Corporation, bringing the amount near the fiscal year 1995 high water mark of $415 million. The bill currently provides $313 million to Legal Services Corporation, an increase of $3 million above the President's request, but a dramatic $12.7 million reduction from last year's enacted level.

Legal Services Corporation's budget has suffered cuts in each of the last three fiscal years, despite a steadily rising poverty rate. Need going up, funding going down for this program.

Fourth, this amendment provides $10 million to the Small Business Administration for microloans, which were zeroed out in the President's budget. However, during full committee, the chairman accepted an amendment to partially restore the funding. An additional $10 million is needed to fully fund the microloan program, which is the single largest source of funding for microenterprise development in the Nation, and helps high-risk business owners who seek grants of $35,000 or less, helping the neediest of our small business entrepreneurs.

Fifth, Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides an increase of $100 million for NASA science and education. Of this amount, $25 million would be for NASA education to reverse the trend of damaging cuts that we have seen in the past few years, restoring the funding to the fiscal year 2005 funding level of $178.9 million. The remaining $75 million is available to increase important science programs that have been cut seriously or eliminated.

In the NASA budget, as the President emphasizes space exploration, deemphasizes science and research, this amendment would change that, providing that additional funding, the amount cut, from science programs.

All this would be accomplished by an offset that would nick the average tax break for those with incomes of more than $1 million by 1.45 percent, or $1,657. Now, to a lot of taxpayers, and to the average American, $1,657 is a lot of money. But the average tax break before this amendment, for those with incomes more than $1 million, is $114,172. Voting for this amendment, if the amendment were made in order, would have invested $600 million back into law enforcement, low income, and millionaires would still receive a $112,000 tax break, just suffering $1,600 to do all that good, Mr. Chairman.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WOLF. 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.''

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The 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 changes the application of existing law, and 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. KENNEDY OF MINNESOTA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $532,148,000)''.

Page 23, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $532,148,000)''.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

(Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in the last 5 years, funding for the grants under the consolidated Byrne-JAG formula have been cut by almost two-thirds. At the same time, we have had two consecutive attempts by the administration to eliminate this program entirely. I don't know about my colleagues, but my police officers in my district don't understand this.

The minimum this program should be funded at is $900 million, which is what 162 Members of this House requested in a letter to the Budget Committee earlier this year and that was recommended by the Budget Committee in the report accompanying the fiscal year 2007 budget resolution.

I realize how tight this bill is and how much the chairman and the committee have worked to give as much as they can, and I realize tough choices have been made; but we must do better for our law enforcement officers, and our Members will have a chance to do that here today.

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this bipartisan amendment. For years, the Bush administration has been talking tough on drugs and law enforcement while slashing the funding that makes law enforcement possible. The big drops in crime during the Clinton years were made possible by programs like Byrne that put dollars where they are needed: in the hands of local police departments and task forces.

Since 2001, however, funding has been cut again and again, from over $1 billion to less than $367 million in this year's bill. These cuts go against everything we know to be true about drug policy. Ninety percent of drug arrests are made by State and local law enforcement, and local drug task forces are our first and best line of defense against the growing problem of meth in our communities. Now more than ever, we need to support the work that our local law enforcement officers are doing.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, later today, some of our colleagues plan to offer amendments to this bill that would divert money from the 2010 Census. Many of them have good intentions and would send the money to other worthwhile programs. However, I would like to strongly urge those colleagues to consider the damage that would be done—not just to this Nation, but perhaps even to the very district they represent—should the Census be depleted. It a program with an enormous impact and should never be carved up and handed out like a Thanksgiving turkey.

Five years from now, if Members begin complaining about problems with Census and the count in their States, we will only have ourselves to blame. If members want to take money from Census, perhaps they should volunteer their States for inaccurate counts.

Just because the actual survey takes place in 2010 doesn't mean that cutting the Census in 2006 is irrelevant. Initial planning is ongoing and the Census Bureau is gearing up for the largest peace-time mobilization in American history. The Census doesn't just appear in an instant and then disappear every ten years, it is a constant, massive effort that never stops.

Some might try to divert money from the Census to other programs in this bill in the name of law enforcement. But they should keep in mind that the Census is a critical tool for fighting crime. Crime mapping, after all, relies on accurate demographic and housing data to help police determine where to deploy manpower, equipment and other resources.

Furthermore, imagine the impact of an inaccurate Census on the Byrne Memorial Justice

Assistance Grant Program. The distribution of this money is based on population and crime statistics, both of which are based on Census statistics.

Mr. Chairman, I hope our colleagues understand that the Census affects much of what we do, from billions upon billions in federal dollars that could assist our districts to our States' representation in Congress. It is especially important for areas that are undercounted and underserved. It is not a throwaway program—in many ways it is the lifeblood of this government.

□ 2100

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia reserves a point of order?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I do. I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes a point of order. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, that it is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The Committee on Appropriations filed a suballocation of the budget for fiscal year 2007 on June 6, 2006, House Report 109–488. The adoption of this amendment would cause the subcommittee's suballocation for budget authority made under section 302(b) to be exceeded and is not permitted under section 302(f) of the act.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

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

The Chair is authoritatively guided under section 312 of the Budget Act by an estimate of the Committee on the Budget that an amendment providing any net increase in new discretionary budget authority would cause a breach of the pertinent allocation of such authority.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota would increase the level of new discretionary budget authority in the bill. As such, the amendment violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARROW

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARROW:

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

Page 24, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 67, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to thank Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for their work on this important bill.

Mr. Chairman, since I joined Congress last year, illegal immigration has been debated, discussed and voted on a lot in this House, and it is the number one concern with a lot of folks that I represent back home in Georgia.

We all know that the explosion of illegal immigrants is imposing a huge cost on local schools and local hospitals, but it is also imposing a huge new cost on local law enforcement as well. Local police departments are already stretched to the limit financially in dealing with home-grown crime. Despite that, most do an outstanding job of serving the public without all the resources they already need.

But because we still haven't secured our borders, we have caused local law enforcement to have to do more. We have asked them to do more, and yet the Federal Government is not helping them to deal with that part of the crime problem that the Federal Government has actually created.

Since 9/11, Congress hasn't helped. We have given local law enforcement more to do, but less to do it with. We have expanded State and local law enforcement's authority to investigate, arrest and jail undocumented criminal aliens.

When we expand the responsibilities of State and local police, when we ask them to do more, we have an obligation to give them the resources that they need in order to do more.

In 1994, Congress created the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, the SCAAP program, and since then it has provided over $4.1 billion in financial assistance to States, reimbursing State and local police for the cost of jailing undocumented criminal aliens.

In the last fiscal year alone, my home State of Georgia received $1.8 million in SCAAP funding for our State and local police. This year, funding for SCAAP was zeroed out in the President's budget. Fortunately, this bill will reinstate some funding for this program, but the amount is still far short of the amount that is authorized of the amount that is needed.

My amendment would provide an additional $10 million to the SCAAP program.

Frankly, we have enough homegrown crime to deal with already without having to deal with the crime that we are literally importing from other countries. As a result, my amendment pays for an increase in SCAAP funding through an 8/10 of 1 percent decrease in funding from the account that pays membership fees to international organizations.

Earlier this year, the President addressed the Nation and announced he would be sending National Guard troops to our southern border to help stem the flood of illegal immigrants flowing into the United States. National Guard troops on the border may help stem the flow of new illegal immigrants, but they do nothing to deal with the criminal element that has already gotten through.

With an estimated is 11 million illegal immigrants already living in the United States, our local law enforcement agencies continue to serve as our first line of defense in dealing with the criminal element that has already entered the country. That is why we need to provide State and local police with the resources that they need to do the job that we impose upon them.

I therefore urge my colleagues to help State and local law enforcement deal with undocumented criminals and support the amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment on this side.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MINNESOTA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 23, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 39, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 50 seconds to my friend from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, a methamphetamine epidemic is plaguing America, as we know. It has become the leading drug problem in my home State of Kansas. The Byrne-JAG program is a critical tool for Kansas drug and law enforcement as they fight this methamphetamine abuse production and trafficking. It is especially true of rural communities who have fewer resources and live and die by these Federal grants.

Today, I spoke to Cristi Cain, a meth prevention organization leader. Here is her quote: Reduced funding means reduced enforcement, which means increased addiction, increased trafficking, increased manufacturing, which means more injured and killed children, more fires and more explosions, more crime to support the addiction. In short, an endangered Kansan.

I urge adoption of the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 50 seconds to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate being offered the time.

In my three decades of public service, I have never seen a problem as pervasive or as damaging as the meth epidemic faced by my home State of Oregon. Talking to law enforcement leaders about the meth problem, I have heard one message loud and clear. Local law enforcement lacks the money needed to extinguish this wildfire.

The Byrne-JAG program is an effective partnership between Federal authorities and State and local law enforcement. It enables State and local leaders to leverage resources in key areas and facilitates collaboration among law enforcement, treatment and prevention programs. Last year, the Byrne task forces nationwide seized 5,600 meth labs, 55,000 weapons, and massive quantities of narcotics, including 2.7 million grams of methamphetamine.

Many States have already been forced to cut or completely eliminate their gang and drug task forces. If we don't increase funding for the Byrne-JAG program, those cuts will only be deeper. I urge my colleagues to support the Kennedy amendment.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, if you were to listen to this debate, you would assume that this bill has zero in it for meth. I urge Members to turn to page 11. I know nobody reads the reports here, and it is pretty obvious, but in order to help Federal, State and local law enforcement address the meth epidemic, the recommendation provides $367 million for the Justice Assistance Grants which the administration proposed to eliminate, $99 million for meth specific grants, which is the authorized level, and $58 million above the budget request, $40,000 for drug core programs, an increase of $30 million with regard to that.

You act as if we haven't done anything on meth. This amendment will devastate the census. I mean, no good deed goes unpunished in this institution sometimes. The administration zeros all this out. We met with every Member. Every Member that approached the committee, we tried to sit down and work it out with them to the best of it, to no avail.

Then we just accepted the Reichert amendment. God bless Mr. REICHERT for his efforts. He has probably forgotten more about this than most other Members, $25 million more that has just been accepted. Now we come out with another 50, 50, 50.

Then, where does he get the money from? I think in the Constitution they talk about the census. It is my sense that that is in the census in the Constitution. At this stage, a reduction of this magnitude to the 2010 decennial census programs will impact fundamental missions of the Census Bureau, reapportionment, the funding that goes out to different localities. A complete and accurate count in 2010 will not be able to be achieved, particularly when they look for the dress rehearsal.

The immediate ramifications are a disproportionate impact on vulnerable populations, irretrievable loss of testing opportunities to identify the problems. What can you say? Forget the census, blow it off, and put this in, even though the committee has increased it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I join Chairman WOLF in opposing this amendment.

The amendment would increase Byrne grants by $50 million. That is the good news. No question about it. We would like to have more money for law enforcement. The offset would be a corresponding reduction to the 2010 decennial census by $50 million.

It is totally unacceptable, Mr. Chairman. I go back to my original statement where I say that we are going to oppose a lot of amendments today that are good amendments except for the offset.

This is really the wrong place for this offset, which I might add is still totally inadequate to Census Bureau funding to meet the needs of our communities, not to mention that the law enforcement uses census data to determine how to allocate manpower and equipment.

An article by the Brookings Institute fellow Andrew Reamer speaks to this point, and I quote, crime mapping has emerged as a critical tool in ensuring that these scarce resources are used to the best effect. Crime mapping applications at the State and local level rely heavily on the Census Bureau's demographic and housing data.

For State and local crime mappers, the Census Bureau has the single most important population and housing data at the neighborhood level. This bill has been carefully crafted. Fifty million dollars out of the Census Bureau is a lot of money, which we cannot afford.

Remember, folks, we are moving to 2010 when we are going to do a new decennial census. Taking money out of the census today means that we are not able to do a good job with that tomorrow. I can remember when we had to do an emergency funding for the Census Bureau in the last census. I oppose this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. First, I want to thank the chairman for upping up the administration's attempt to zero out the Byrne grants, but, in fact, they have gone down from $600 million to $400 million and some, this year to $371 million. It will gut so many of our drug task forces around the United States.

But I also spent many years in my life here in Congress on the Census Subcommittee. Sometimes you have to prioritize. Right now, we need more help on the streets with crime than we do in the Census Bureau. The mandate for every 10 years is every 10 years.

The Census Bureau has taken on all kinds of other tasks, which some of the private sector can, quite frankly, pay for if they need it, rather than shut down our drug task forces. Because this is roughly almost a 67 percent cut over the last 6 years, not based on inflation, a 60 percent cut.

I know this chairman has fought to put this back in. This administration's drug enforcement budget is an abomination and embarrassment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I don't know how often we have to watch Members pose for political holy pictures on these issues before we start to gag. Well, I am at that point.

You have Members coming to this floor creating a great commotion, trying to create the impression that they are oh so much a champion of this program or that program.

On this amendment, it is the Byrne grant. On some other amendments, it is another program. My question to you, sir, is how did you vote on the budget resolution? Because if you voted for that budget resolution, you put this committee and this House into a position in which they have no choice but to cut one of these programs or the other.

Now you can parade around as a wonderful conservative, but the fact is, don't come to this floor with crocodile tears crying about what is happening to the Byrne grants or any other program if you voted for that budget resolution.

At least half the amendments being offered in this House, tonight and tomorrow, are cover-your-tail amendments, Mr. Chairman. They are here because Members who voted for the budget resolution are now trying to escape their responsibility because they want to have a roll call in their pocket that they can go to their constituents saying I didn't mean to cut that program.

But when you cut programs, there is not a line item in the budget for waste, fraud and abuse. When you cut the money, as you did in the budget, you are willing to sacrifice everything in order to provide $50 billion this year in tax cuts to people who make $1 million a year.

□ 2115

That is the real action. And half this other stuff is phony as a $3 bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 50 seconds to the gentleman from Nebraska, Congressman FORTENBERRY.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of this amendment as well offered by my colleague, Mr. KENNEDY.

In every congressional district throughout the country, narcotics does take on a sinister but very unique face. In rural communities that span the First District of Nebraska, that ugly face is methamphetamine abuse, production, and trafficking.

Throughout my district, local law enforcement agencies are using as much as 85 percent of their resources to battle meth. Broken families, child abuse, gang violence, and environmental decay are other consequences that this poison imposes on our communities. In other districts maybe the problem isn't meth, but perhaps something just as sinister like cocaine or heroin.

But no matter what face narcotics takes in any particular district, I would like to remind my colleagues that we must, in good conscience, support the men and women of local law enforcement. These are the courageous men and woman who risk their lives daily to better the communities, and they deserve our gratitude, but also our efforts to assist them in the difficult and dangerous work they do.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 50 seconds to the gentleman from Utah, Congressman MATHESON.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kennedy amendment. Every time I meet with anyone in law enforcement in my State, county sheriff, police chief, I hear about the effectiveness of the Byrne grant program, and I also hear the concern about potential cuts in funding the Byrne grants. I don't think that that experience is unique to my congressional district. I suspect that that would be the case throughout this country.

This is a situation where we are making difficult choices, but when it comes to the impact of drug use in our society and the effectiveness of the Byrne grant program, I think that we need to pay attention to the fact that this is a program that works. So many people question programs in the government that may not work so well. This is one that has a track record. It works.

I encourage people to vote for this amendment, and I thank Mr. KENNEDY for his leadership on the issue.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 50 seconds to the gentleman from the great State of Minnesota, Congressman RAMSTAD.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, as co-chair of the Law Enforcement Caucus, I believe it is short-sighted and counterproductive to underfund Byrne grants for law enforcement.

I have seen in my home State of Minnesota firsthand the importance of Byrne grants to local police in reducing crime and improving public safety. They have funded overtime pay, task forces to fight the war on drugs, equipment, and buy money to enforce our drug laws.

We must never forget our cops are on the front lines in the war on crime and fighting drug dealers and protecting our homeland. And before we bleed too much for our Census Bureau, I think we should remember, this agency in this bill already receives a $72 million increase. We are talking about funding cops, the war on drugs, homeland security, or $72 million more for the Bureau of Census. To me that is a no-brainer: we fund Byrne grants, which every law enforcement official in America is pleading for.

I urge adoption of the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Edmund Burke once said the most important reason we have government is to keep people safe.

The Edward Byrne Memorial Grant program is a key component of the federal efforts to make our communities safe.

Named for a fallen New York City police officer, the Byrne Grant program has been a vital tool since 1988 in helping state and local law enforcement fight violent and drug-related crime.

Although I respect the difficult job our Appropriations Committee is faced with when setting spending priorities, we cannot afford to shortchange public safety.

As co-chair of the Law Enforcement Caucus, Mr. Chairman, I believe it's short-sighted and counter productive to underfund Byrne Grants for law enforcement.

This amendment would increase funding for the Byrne-JAG program by $50 million and is offset by a reduction to the Bureau of the Census—an agency that already receives a $72 million increase in this bill!

Byrne Grants have been essential to better coordination between local and federal law enforcement in protecting our homeland. They have been key to providing personnel, equipment, training and technical assistance in the war on drugs.

They have bolstered prosecution efforts. And they have been used to administer critical programs—multi-jurisdictional drug enforcement teams, anti-drug education, treatment and alternative sentencing, such as drug courts.

In my home state of Minnesota, I've seen, firsthand, the importance of Byrne Grants to local police in reducing crime and improving public safety. They have funded overtime pay, task forces, equipment and "buy" money to enforce our drug laws.

We must never forget our cops are on the front lines—in the war on crime, fighting drug dealers and protecting our homeland.

As Chris Matthews of MSNBC said after the attacks of September 11: "Before the attacks on our homeland, America's heroes were the rich and famous. Since Sept. 11, America's heroes are the cops and firefighters. And that's good for America."

Today, America's heroes are counting on us. Congress owes it to these brave men and women who put their lives on the line every day they put on the badge. Our Nation's law enforcement officers need all the tools Congress can provide.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment to increase the maximum funding levels for Byrne Grants. It's time to honor the sacrifices made each and every day by our Nation's law enforcement community and give our Nation's finest the support they need.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. In my last 10 seconds, I would just compliment and applaud the committee and the chairman for the great work that they have done in trying to offset the cut by the administration, but say with a two-thirds cuts in Byrne grants funding, this amendment is absolutely necessary. And I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

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

Mr. Chairman, I tried, the committee tried. Every Member who spoke to me on either side, we really made a really sincere effort to address it.

I went to Nebraska. I went out to Nebraska. The gentleman from Nebraska is right: they have a real, real problem.

But if you would just kind of listen to this debate, you would automatically, if you were just tuning in in Dubuque or Des Moines, you would assume that there was nothing in here, that we had just been stone deaf, that we had not even listened. We added also, to keep in mind, we just added, under the Reichert amendment, $25 million.

But in the committee report, on page 11, after really searching, I was very moved when I went out to Nebraska. I thought we want to do everything. And I have talked to Mr. SOUDER. And every time, I thought I have tried to do everything I could.

Now, as Mr. OBEY said, the budget resolutions come down, and the deficits are important and we talk. But here is what the conference report says:

"In order to help the Federal, State and local law enforcement address the meth epidemic, the recommendation provides $367 million for the Justice Assistance Grants program," they were wiped out, "which the administration proposed to eliminate; $99 million for meth-specific grants, which is the authorized level, and $58 million plus above the budget request; $40,000 for Drug Court programs, which is $30 million above the current year, $5 million for State Prison Drug Treatment programs, which the administration proposed to eliminate, and also $15 million above the request for DEA."

But if I had just listened to this debate, I would assume that this guy, WOLF, he was AWOL. He had no interest in meth. He was insensitive.

Of course, my father was a policeman. I have five kids. I have 11 grandkids. I think the deficit is a problem. I sit in Republican conferences, and I even hear people talk about it.

The Constitution requires that we do the census. It requires it. It isn't optional. We will use it to reapportion. And so I think what is taken here, you go to the weakest and the most vulnerable. There is not a lobby downtown for the Census Bureau. It just is not.

It is an easy vote. I am going to call for a roll call vote. We will have a roll call vote. But there is no support for the census, except in the Constitution. This guy named Jefferson and Washington and Madison and Monroe, they thought it was important.

But now we are going to take $50 million. I am sort of baffled. I guess it would have been almost easier to sometimes just not kind of go up anytime and try to listen, and then come down and take amendments on the floor that you were almost going to take.

I think I am going to lose this amendment. But I believe that I am right. And I believe for us to take this money out of the Census Bureau, I think they could have probably found another spot. But one spot has a strong lobby downtown; probably a lot of registered lobbyists are working on that area. Another, are there any registered lobbyists for the Census Bureau? Zero. Zip.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for all he has done in the area of providing more drug treatment, more work in terms of interdiction of drugs. This chairman has done more than anyone else in his position could ever do on the meth epidemic or anything else.

All of us care about the census because we are not going to get back in our districts the entitlements for veterans, for those who are children, for education, if we don't have an accurate census. It is the process by which all substance goes through.

If we don't have money for our districts that comes through a proper accounting, we are losing money in our districts. If you can't understand that the census is the key to making sure our districts' needs get met, then I don't think you have actually been looking at why we have a census. That is the reason we have it, so a portion in government, the money can go to where it ought to go to those who need it most.

And, again, the chairman has done more than anyone else to try to make sure this meth epidemic has been tackled, and I support him wholeheartedly in opposing this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, constitutional requirement, article I, section 2, we are required to take the decennial census. We ramp up to it. There has been controversy on this legislation. I say, God bless the Members that offered this. If you really feel so strong, vote for it. And I hope the money goes for the good. But I think when I look at this, I kind of feel, looking at this, as we work this bill through, I just don't understand. And I don't see how we can just take it from there. Patton, Boggs and Blow doesn't represent the census. Aiken Gump doesn't represent the census. They represent the Chinese, but not the census.

So we are going to go to the weakest, most vulnerable. Article I, section 2 of the Constitution.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would rise to strike the last word and I don't intend to take 5 minutes. But I do want to make this point. You know, this is chickens coming home to roost.

If you voted for these budget resolutions that increasingly cut the allocation to the Appropriations Committee, and in turn the full appropriations committee gives smaller and smaller allocations to the subcommittees, this is where we get. We get to this point. I mean, there is a real relationship between voting for a budget resolution. The whole budget process, the hearings and making a budget, coming forth with a budget resolution, the whole process, in my opinion, is not real except that it does set the cap on domestic discretionary and defense spending. And that has gone down and down and down.

So now we are at the point that we have 100-about amendments offered here today, a lot of them from the majority side, a lot of them from the minority side, looking at the consequences of budget resolutions that don't provide adequate allocation. Everybody's looking at programs saying, oh, my goodness, you mean we are cutting law enforcement programs like this? You mean the President comes forward and zeroes out State and local law enforcement; the chairman comes back and tries to restore it but, boy, it is not enough. And Byrne grant programs. Golly, the allocation is not enough. Well, surprise. Budget resolutions mean something at the allocation level. The whole process gets down to how much money do we have for domestic discretionary.

Some folks are very concerned about NASA. Some folks are very concerned about science spending. Some folks are very concerned about law enforcement. Some people are concerned about the Bureau of Prisons.

Well, if you voted for the budget resolution, this is what you get, chickens coming home to roost. There is not enough money for these programs.

And I just want to make the point that when you get down to a really small pie, then you start cannibalizing good programs.

Are you suggesting that really that we don't need this $50 million for census programs? I mean, do we not need that?

The subcommittee went through a rigorous process of hearings. We went through a rigorous process with the majority staff, the chairman of the committee, coming forward with this bill. It is the best bill that can come forward given our allocation. We cut these census programs and the Justice Department isn't going to have the information it needs in order to spend its dollars wisely. You cut the census program, come 2010, we are not going to be able to conduct a proper census, decennial census. That is the consequences of it. You can cut it now. You can cut census program, you can try to cut some of these other programs, these unacceptable offsets. But there is a consequence for it. And what you are really acknowledging here tonight is that you shouldn't have voted for that budget resolution. You shouldn't have voted for a budget resolution that does not provide for an adequate allocation for us to do our job for law enforcement.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. SOUDER. Does our unanimous consent agreement give the majority subcommittee chairman the ability to speak for 5 minutes whenever he wants, plus the ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee, plus the subcommittee on any motion in front of the House, plus the 5 minutes to oppose an amendment?

□ 2130

The CHAIRMAN. When an amendment is pending, the order of the House of today allows the subcommittee chairman and ranking minority member and the committee chairman and ranking minority member the right to strike the last word.

Mr. SOUDER. So if I understand what the chairman said, the rest of the House only gets 5 minutes, even if it represents the majority position of the House, but the combined Appropriations Committee can take 25 minutes to oppose our amendment, and our only recourse is to object to unanimous consent agreements?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SOUDER. My parliamentary inquiry is, the only way to have stopped this was to have objected to the unanimous consent agreement?

The CHAIRMAN. The order of the House was propounded by unanimous consent and was accepted.

Mr. SOUDER. In the future, I will be objecting if that is going to be the order of the House.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman and his party have 5 additional minutes to make their case.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee may extend time on equal terms where both sides would have the equal time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that both sides give the opposition the same time so that the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Minnesota and others have equal time.

Mr. SOUDER. Will the chairman yield?

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, we were restricted to 50 seconds. Most people

have gone through the process, but many Members did not come over who could have spoken.

I have a general concern that the Appropriations Committee on all the amendments can gang up, as we saw here, on a 5-minute rule; and I have concern about these unanimous consent agreements. I do not think we need to hold the House further here. We already went through our different statements. I could debate for 30 minutes on the census and other things, but I think we should move to a vote at this point. But I have a real problem about this intimidation by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yielded back my time, but I would ask unanimous consent to claim any time I had remaining and to yield it to the gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you asking unanimous consent to reclaim your time, which is 2 minutes, and have the ability to yield that time?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SOUDER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I am only trying to yield it to the gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I found the last comment from the gentleman from Indiana to be very interesting.

The fact is that the unanimous consent agreement was agreed to as a courtesy by the minority to the majority. It is, very frankly, not in the political interest of the minority party in this House to assist the majority party in moving its appropriation bills through the House. We have done so on every occasion as a matter of legislative courtesy to the majority.

Now, if members of the majority do not like that, then I guarantee you there will never be another unanimous consent request provided from the minority side of the aisle. If that is the way you want it, you are going to be here a long time struggling with every appropriation bill from here on out.

The minority accepted the unanimous consent request with this provision because there are many times when the majority party and the minority party have a different view of amendments. This is not one of those times, but that happens most of the time on these amendments. And so the unanimous consent request is not any conspiracy between members of the Appropriations Committee. It is simply an effort to move the House's vote along.

We have 100 amendments. Without this unanimous consent request, we would still be on number 2 or number 3. You would not get halfway through this bill before you go home for the July 4 recess. Now, if that is what you want, I am perfectly happy to give it to you.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MILLENDER-MCDONALD

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 24, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 39, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 40, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, 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.

Today, I am offering an amendment to increase funding for the Department of Justice drug court programs. My amendment would raise allocated funding to drug court programs in the bill from $40 million to $45 million.

Mr. Chairman, we Members of Congress recognize that substance abuse not only has devastating effects on the abuser but also on the entire community. The total estimated cost of drug abuse to American communities in 2000 was $160.7 billion, mostly from health care costs and productivity losses.

Also troubling is the rise in drug-related crime. Between 1984 and 1999, the number of defendants charged with a drug offense in Federal court increased by 247 percent. In 2001, substance abusers accounted for more than half of all sentenced Federal inmates.

However, many drug-related offenses are nonviolent, and incarceration will not prevent repeated drug use. Treatment is the key.

Drug courts are a proven, unique tool in the war against substance abuse. These special courts were developed to curb dependency at the local level by reflecting the unique strengths of each community and using comprehensive supervision, drug testing, and treatment services.

To date, there are nearly 1,800 drug court programs that serve more than 70,000 participants with impressive recovery results. The program allows for the full weight of interveners to be brought to bear on the offender, compelling him or her to deal with the substance abuse problem.

The treatment represents a viable long-term solution with long-term results as opposed to incarceration, a short-term course of action that fails to treat the addiction problems.

I am proud that while he served as our Nation's Drug Czar, Asa Hutchinson came to my district and visited my drug court in Compton, California. He went away believing it was a model for others nationwide. It is clear that these courts make a difference, Mr. Chairman, and deserve sufficient funding levels.

I wish to recognize Chairman LEWIS, Chairman WOLF, and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for their dedication to drug courts and thank them for increasing this account by 300 percent from last year.

With the understanding that Chairman WOLF and Chairman LEWIS will fight in conference to increase drug court funding to $45 million, I have agreed to withdraw my amendment, and I defer to the chairman at this time.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I am not in opposition since the gentlewoman has withdrawn the amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I pledge to do everything we can in conference, and I know Mr. MOLLOHAN feels the same way and we have had the conversation with other members, to keep the figure at this number. It is a 300 percent increase. Drug courts are very, very important. So I will do everything I can, and I know Mr. MOLLOHAN will also agree, to keep this in. And I thank the gentlewoman.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I do recognize you will use all of your efforts to try to increase this. I appreciate your commitment to this successful program.

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

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

There was no objection.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

Amendment by Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin.

Amendment by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ of New York.

Amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 22 by Mr. STEARNS of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 185, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]

AYES—237

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
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)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—185

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
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
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Price (GA)
Putnam
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Brady (PA)
Cannon
Carson
Evans
Herger
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Ortiz
Radanovich
Strickland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2209

Messrs. PETRI, LATHAM, GREEN of Wisconsin, SHERWOOD and GOHMERT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no''.

Messrs. EDWARDS, OWENS, BOOZMAN, ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, MCCOTTER, SCHWARZ Of Michigan, LAHOOD, JOHNSON of Illinois and Ms. HART changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye''.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The CHAIRMAN. 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 CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 207, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

AYES—214

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
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 (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul

Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Renzi
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
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
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOES—207

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
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
Gutknecht
Hall
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
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 (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Brady (PA)
Cannon
Carson
Evans
Herger
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Ortiz
Radanovich
Strickland
Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 2214

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 243, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 328]

AYES—176

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Case
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gallegly
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Inslee
Israel
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOES—243

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Cleaver
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Brady (PA)
Cannon
Carson
Costa
Evans
Herger
Hyde

Johnson, Sam
Ortiz
Radanovich
Rush
Strickland
Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2218

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 257, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

AYES—163

Akin
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Beauprez
Berkley
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Cardoza
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Coble
Conaway
Costa
Cubin
Cuellar
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Duncan
Everett
Feeney
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hayworth
Hefley
Herseth
Holden
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinney
McMorris
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Nunes
Oberstar
Otter
Pascrell
Paul
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Rahall
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NJ)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Wamp
Weiner
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—257

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Bass
Becerra
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Manzullo
Marchant
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Pickering
Pitts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherwood
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—12

Brady (PA)
Cannon
Carson
Culberson
Evans
Herger
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Ortiz
Radanovich
Strickland
Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2222

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MINNESOTA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 291, noes 129, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

AYES—291

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berkley
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy

McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Watson
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wu
Young (FL)

NOES—129

Ackerman
Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Berman
Biggert
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonilla
Bono
Boyd
Burgess
Campbell (CA)
Capuano
Carter
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Conyers
Cramer
Crowley
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Emanuel
Eshoo
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Goode
Granger
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Lantos
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matsui
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Olver
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Petri
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sherwood
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Solis
Stark
Tancredo
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Tiahrt
Turner
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Boehner
Brady (PA)
Cannon
Carson
Evans
Herger
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Ortiz
Radanovich
Strickland
Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2229

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Messrs. RAHALL, MARKEY, MEEHAN and NEAL of Massachusetts changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 2230

Mr. WOLF. 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. MCCAUL of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, 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. 5672) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COLLOQUY RE CRAB PROCESSOR QUOTA SHARES

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Chairman YOUNG.

Is it the intent of the conference on H.R. 889, the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006, that when the National Marine Fisheries Service issues new processor quota shares under section 417, the regional designation for the shares for both the king and c. opilio crab fisheries shall reflect the processing history of the Blue Dutch during the years leading up to the North Pacific Council's adoption of the crab plan?

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Yes, it is the intent of the conferees that both the new king crab processor quota shares and the new c.opilio processor quota shares shall receive a designation based on the location in which crab was historically processed.

Mr. LOBIONDO. I thank the gentleman.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4157

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name from H.R. 4157, the Health Information Technology Act of 2005.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There as no objection.

OVERSIGHT GAP IN IRAQ

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, former State Department intelligence officials testified yesterday that they warned the administration 3 years ago that the occupation of Iraq would provoke insurgency ethnic strife and the targeting of U.S. forces. But their words then, 3 years ago, went unheeded.

The Post reported today that the hearing ''marked the first time intelligence assessments on postwar Iraq had been specifically discussed in a congressional session.'' No Republicans participated.

Three years after the war in Iraq began, Republicans are still refusing to investigate what went wrong. Ohio families are paying the price.

Many of us have repeatedly asked the President to present a plan for success in Iraq, a winning exit strategy to complete the mission and start to redeploy and bring our troops home. Republicans responded with theatrics and sound bites. More of the same is not a plan. More of the same doesn't bring us any closer to winning the global war on terror.

The troops and the American people deserve better. They deserve a Congress that doesn't look the other way when mistakes are made. They deserve a realistic and forward-thinking plan that brings our troops home.

SHUTTLE SAFETY

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just a few days from today, brave Americans will again enter into space, pressing forward the intellectual and, of course, scientific expertise that Americans possess. I support the space exploration program, but I stand today as a member of the House Science Committee who has continually asked the question about safety, safety, safety.

After the incident of *Columbia*, we implemented safety procedures. Unfortunately, today, we find that one of the engineers that had concerns about the space shuttle's launch on July 1 has now been removed as an engineer from this program.

Whistle-blower protection. Safety requirements. It is time, before they launch, that they tell Members of Congress the facts and that we can be assured that all manner of testing, all assessment has been made to ensure a safe launch, as safe as possible, so that lives can be protected.