

public could go in this House, in this American economy that we have. Just think how many more of these necessary programs that we are called upon to support could be engaged in and provided.

Now, I come from the great State of New Jersey, a State that oftentimes has to look to the core and to the Federal Government for various programs to provide for the health and safety of the citizens of not only my district but my State as well.

Think for a moment how much further we would be able to go in providing these services to the State in my district and my county, and through the State of New Jersey as well. Think of how much further we could go if we could be able to provide these services in a more economical and efficient basis.

The amendment before us does that. It will allow for the operation of the Federal Government to engage itself the same way as a small business does, the same way as a family budget does.

Closing then, bringing this all back to my opening comments with regard to what we have seen at the beginning of the process with the Democrat budget and what we have seen in the past several weeks with regard to the largest tax increase for the American family in U.S. history, what this amendment will do is drive down the pressure on this government to raise taxes on the backs of American families.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was not going to speak on this amendment. I was somewhat encouraged by the silence on the other side of the aisle when it originally came out.

But then when the majority party indicated that they are going to oppose this amendment, I have to stand up and say just, at least, one thing. We are going to have some amendment debates later today about how much money to spend on various programs and how much to spend on various things and how much to spend overall on this bill, whether we should be spending more of the taxpayers' money on things or less of the taxpayers' money on things.

We are going to have that debate today and tomorrow and the next day, and there are certainly disagreements between the majority side and the minority side on those issues as to whether we should tax people more and spend their money or tax people less and let them spend their own money.

But, interestingly, this amendment isn't about that. This amendment doesn't change the funding in the bill. It simply says we ought to have a mechanism to make the money that's there go farther.

I really don't understand why my Democratic colleagues would have some ideological objection to that. If we are going to spend a certain amount of money on a program, regardless of

what that program does, couldn't we all agree that we would like it to do as much as it can with that amount of money?

Certainly, if we allow private contractors, or contractors, the opportunity to say, hey, we can do this thing for less money, and we can do the same thing, and the agency determines that it's the same thing for less money, wouldn't we want them to do that?

This, actually, is not about spending less money. We will get to that later. But this is about having the money we spend go farther.

I mean, it's just like for people, Mr. Chairman, that are watching at home, imagining that, well, I am going to go out and, you know, get dry cleaning today, but I don't care how much it costs, and I don't care if the place next door does it cheaper, and they are every bit as good or better. I don't care, I am going to use the more expensive place because we are not going to make competition.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Would the gentleman yield? I have an inquiry of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. POMEROY). Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman?

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I will yield.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Is it correct to reference people watching House proceedings on television, or are we not supposed to do that?

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I believe that I clearly said, "Mr. Chairman, people who see this may wonder."

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I did, I believe. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, whether it's you, or anyone in this room or whoever, we have money that we spend on things, and we like to shop to see if we are getting the best price, getting the same product or as good a product or a better product for the best price. That's what this amendment says, is that we're going to allow people to shop or get the better product for the best price.

Mr. Chairman, it is beyond me why the majority party would object to something so sensible, so reasonable in being a steward of the taxpayers' dollars.

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

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

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

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

The Committee will rise informally. The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

For carrying out activities authorized by the Central Utah Project Completion Act (titles II through VI of Public Law 102-575), \$41,380,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$976,000 shall be deposited into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account for use by the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission.

In addition, for necessary expenses incurred in carrying out related responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior, \$1,620,000, to remain available until expended.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The following appropriations shall be expended to execute authorized functions of the Bureau of Reclamation:

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For management, development, and restoration of water and related natural resources and for related activities, including the operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of reclamation and other facilities, participation in fulfilling related Federal responsibilities to Native Americans, and related grants to, and cooperative and other agreements with, State and local governments, federally recognized Indian tribes, and others, \$871,197,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$57,615,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and \$26,825,000 shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund; of which such amounts as may be necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund; of which not more than \$500,000 is for high priority projects which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps, as authorized by section 106 of Public Law 91-378 (16 U.S.C. 1706): *Provided*, That such transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriation under this heading: *Provided further*, That of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities that can be financed by the Reclamation Fund or the Bureau of Reclamation special fee account established by section 4(i) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a(i)) shall be derived from that Fund or account: *Provided further*, That funds contributed under the Act of March 4, 1921 (43 U.S.C. 395) are available until expended for the purposes for which contributed: *Provided further*, That funds advanced under the Act of January 12, 1927 (43

U.S.C. 397a) shall be credited to this account and are available until expended for the same purposes as the sums appropriated under this heading.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 22 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

Page 11, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$55,000,000)”.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, again, this amendment, as some previous amendments have, attempts to make a very, very modest step towards saving the family budget from the single largest tax increase in American history.

Specifically, over the requested level or the level in the bill, this would reduce funding for Interior’s Water and Related Resources account to the President’s request from roughly \$871 million to \$816 million, representing a \$55 million savings to the American taxpayer. This account has been a traditionally earmarked account for certain water restoration activities in 17 Western States.

The bill’s current funding level represents a 6.7 percent increase over the President’s request. Again, I am sure this account funds many worthy projects.

But we need, I believe, a number of us believe we need a road map to try to bring fiscal sanity to the House in an appropriations bill that is already increasing spending twice the rate of inflation. So now we are having a debate over \$816 million, as proposed by the administration, which I am sure many in this body might think is an overly large number when we recognize that money is coming from hardworking American taxpayers, but a difference of \$816 million versus \$871 million.

Again, as the majority in their budget resolution enacts the single largest tax increase in American history, they are asking American families to somehow do more with less. Don’t we believe that the Federal Government ought to try to do more with less, and, in this case, we still have an increase, 6.7 percent increase over the President’s request.

As I have taken to the floor on other occasions during this debate, we should never, ever forget that although something good can be done with the taxpayers’ dollars in this account, I have no doubt, we have to remember the hardworking American families back home and how the single largest tax increase in history, which is funding this third appropriation bill, still twice the rate of inflation, we have to remember, we have to remember how this bill impacts them.

I sent out a letter to my constituents asking them how this tax increase of the Democrat majority would impact them.

□ 1430

I heard from Bruce in Garland. Garland’s a city in my district. He said, “In my particular case, an additional \$2,200 in taxes would cut into the finances I used to pay for my son’s college education. A control and reduction of spending is what is needed.”

Again, Mr. Chairman, what we realize is as we plus-up some Federal account, we are downsizing some family account. In this case, we’re affecting a family’s education account.

I heard from Joy in the city of Dallas. I represent the eastern part of the city of Dallas. She writes, “I could not pay for a semester of college for my daughter if I had to send more money to the government.”

So as this account’s getting plussed up by twice the rate of inflation, here are two individual families, just two out of millions across America, who are having their education accounts gutted by the plus-up in this particular bill.

I heard from Linda, also from the city of Garland. “If we had to pay an additional \$2,200 each year, it would make us have to decide between food or medicine.”

I’ve got a whole host of these letters, Mr. Chairman, to remind every Member in this body that as we talk about all the noble purposes we have for the American taxpayers’ money, they too have noble purposes. They have health care programs in their family, they have education programs in their family, they have energy bills and programs in their family, paying their heating bills, their cooling bills, filling up their automobile. So certainly we could take one modest step in saving the taxpayer \$55 million and plus-up the water and related resources account, a traditionally earmarked account. And we had a very vigorous debate over earmarks here recently, their transparency, their accountability.

But surely we could agree to hold to the President’s level and try to save the family budget from the onslaught of the Federal budget.

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

I rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment. Mr. Chairman, the water and related resources account funds Reclamation’s core missions of delivering water to citizens of this country, to those who till the soil in our country, and for generating hydro-power.

Given the growing need for water supplies in the 17 Western States of this country, I certainly believe it is critical that the Nation invest now in water reclamation and reuse projects for the future.

This account also provides very important funds for rural water supply projects for tribal and rural communities, contributing to meeting the United States’ trust responsibilities to Indian reservations through the delivery of safe drinking water.

I share the gentleman’s concern about health programs in the United

States, and I can’t think of anything more important than ensuring that people in 17 different States of this country have clean water to drink. And how shortsighted it would be to cut programs that provide clean drinking water for human health, so that we can spend untold sums of money on their health care after they get sick. If you want to talk about something that is penny-wise and pound-foolish, we have found it this afternoon.

This is a health amendment. If we take these moneys away, we will do a disservice to the health of the people who live in these regions. As with the Corps of Engineers, Reclamation’s infrastructure is aging, and it has increasing requirements for proper and adequate maintenance of its infrastructure.

But 17 States cover a large area and swath of the continent. But I’m just wondering which citizens in which communities are we going to tell we just can’t help you this year because we might have accepted the gentleman’s amendment. Are we going to tell people in Wichita, Kansas, the Wichita Cheney program that maybe they’re not going to get all of their money?

Are we going to tell people at Lakehead, Nevada that well, we had to make a cut of \$55 million, and you’re just not going to have the resources you need?

Or people in Oregon for the Crooked River project, are we going to tell them well, there’s just not enough money now?

Are we going to, in the State of Colorado, tell people in Pine River that we had to make a cut?

In Texas, are we going to tell people for the Canadian River project that there just wasn’t enough money to go around, or at Moon Lake in the State of Utah that we’re sorry, Congress dropped the ball? Or for the Colombia River Basin project, that somehow there was a shortfall in us meeting our responsibilities?

The gentleman’s correct. This is a health amendment. This is clean drinking water for people who live in 17 States in the United States of America provided through infrastructure that is aging. We have a responsibility to invest in that, and that is why I’m strongly opposed to the gentleman’s amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from Texas for this amendment. And let me begin where the gentleman from the other side of the aisle concluded when he asked the question? What if there is not enough money to go around?

That is a question that we ask here in Congress in the House all the time. What if there’s not enough money for my pet project to go around?

What if there’s not enough money for this earmark to go around?

What if there’s not enough money for this brand-new program to go around?

But let me suggest to you that there's another variation of that question that we would be mindful of, and that is the families back at home that we represent. When the mom and dad sits at their dining room table at the end of each week with their checkbook out, paying their bills, be it for the electric bill, some other utility or heating bill, their rent or their mortgage, their food bill, their health or education bill for their children, or any other vital bill that that family has, and the husband looks over to the wife, and they realize that they have all these stacks of bills in front of them, and they have more bills than they have money in their checking account, and the wife asks the husband, what now, because there's not enough money to go around, what does that family do?

Who does that family turn to when there's not enough money to go around?

I can tell you where this Congress turns to when we say there's not enough money to go around. When we say there's not enough money to go around, what this House has done, or at least in the new budget that was presented in the Budget Committee which I serve on, by the other side of the aisle, what the Democrats propose to do is to simply raise taxes. And as we have seen in the proposed budget from the other side of the aisle, it is now the largest tax increase in U.S. history, on the backs of America's families, on the backs of that very same husband and wife who is sitting there saying to themselves, there's not enough money to go around to pay our bills, to pay our mortgage, to pay our health care bills, to send our kids to go to school.

They can't raise taxes on anybody else. They can't go out to their neighbors and say, we can't afford food this week, we can't afford our rent this week. We can't afford to send our kids to the colleges we want to, so we're going to raise taxes on you. They can't do that. But somehow or other, Members of Congress think when they get elected around here, that we can do that by raising taxes, the largest tax increase in U.S. history, that somehow or other that we're entrusted to do such things and create slush funds and the like.

Well, I stand before you and say that no, that the American public has sent a message to us, to both sides of the aisle, to Republicans and Democrats alike. Yes, the Democrats are now in charge, Mr. Chairman, of this House. And they are so because the American public spoke this last November, quite candidly, because perhaps the Republicans weren't listening well enough during that period of time.

But I can tell you this, and those who listen to us on this floor today, the Republicans are listening very well right now, and the Democrats are not listening very well. The voters sent us a message in November and said enough is enough. We have to be concerned about

the family budget sometimes instead of the Federal budget. We have to put the focus on the moms and dads out there being able to pay their bills for their kids' health care and the like, instead of always worrying about ever-increasing budgets on the Federal level.

Now the proposal that is before us to look at would simply look to save a few million dollars out of a several trillion dollar budget, something that most Americans, myself included, can't really get our arms around when you think about how large this budget is. In a way, it's just a drop in the bucket when it comes to the budgets back here. But to the budget of the family at home, that's still a lot of money.

The proposal that the good gentleman from Texas proposes here right now would simply try to rein in spending in such the smallest of ways, but it would be a good step in the right direction. It would be saying to the voters from last November, we heard you; we have to put the focus on the family budget, we're going to try to live within our means.

And even when we are dealing with important issues, such as the gentleman from the other side of the aisle raised, whether it's water resources or the like, we're going to fund those programs. We're going to take care of those programs, but we're going to do it in an efficient and a manageable manner, and we're going to do so in a way that is not a burden on the American family budget any longer because we have heard you, and we realize that there will never be enough dollars for every single program that every single Member of Congress and the Senate come up with. But we are going to prioritize them, put them in order of importance, put them in an order that are most significant to the American family, fund those programs to the levels that are necessary. And the rest, we are going to do just as every family in America has to do, set limits on what we are going to spend on, set limits on how much we are going to spend, and live within our means.

So to the good gentleman, Mr. HENSARLING from Texas, I commend you for your work in trying to have this House live within its means.

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

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to yield to our distinguished chairman.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman from New York yielding, and would simply reference the last speaker's assertion about pet projects and referencing those to the projects that I enumerated in my remarks.

The fact is, I was enumerating projects on page 42 of the committee report, and 43 on the committee report, and page 44 on the committee report, and page 45 on the committee report that were submitted by the President of the United States.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I find the most recent comment of our good friend on the

other side rather amusing, as the President is charged with executing the policies that this Congress puts in place; and heaven forbid, that he or whoever might occupy that office, might have certain priorities that they would want to bring about to, in fact, execute the policies that have been passed by this Congress.

But be that as it may, I want to commend my good friend from Texas for bringing this amendment forward. I think that the amendment itself highlights truly the fallacy of the process that we're under. And that is, as my good friend from New Jersey just mentioned, that we fail in this Congress, at least the majority party fails in this Congress to prioritize spending in a way that passes a test that I believe the American people would be proud of or be pleased with.

The point isn't, as my good friend from Indiana has stated, the specifics of the project that he identified. That is not the point of the debate that we would rise to engage in. The point is that when is enough enough? When is it that we, as a Federal Government, take hard-earned tax money out of the pocketbooks and the back pockets of Americans and say, okay, that's all we need.

Clearly, this new majority has said that we can't get enough. We can't get enough. And consequently, they have adopted, in this past 6 months, a budget that includes the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation, the largest tax increase in the history of America.

And I have friends at home who say, well, that wouldn't be so bad if, in fact, they were solving real problems. But, Mr. Chairman, as you well know, the challenge of the Federal spending, the challenge of the budgetary process is the automatic programs, the entitlement programs, the mandatory programs, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, which comprise 54, 55 percent of our Federal budget.

And the budget that this new majority passed that included the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation did nothing, said nothing about how to reform those programs; how to make certain that Social Security, which is a program that is challenged to be charitable, challenged from a process standpoint, to be able to provide a safety net for those young citizens across our Nation who are in their 20s and 30s.

□ 1445

It is a program that will not have those kinds of resources without structural change, and so the majority party passes a budget with the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation and says nothing, it is mute, as it relates to Social Security reform. Mr. Chairman, I don't think that is what the American people sent us to Washington to do. I think they sent us to Washington to solve real problems.

As a physician prior to coming to Congress, one of the huge challenges

that we face is the provision of health care and health insurance for our citizens. And, consequently, the other two limbs of the budgetary challenge that we have, Medicare and Medicaid, huge problems, huge challenges from a financial standpoint. They require structural change. However, this majority passed in their budget, again the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation, nearly \$400 billion, and said nothing, nothing about structural reform to those programs that are imperative for the healthiness of our Nation.

So when we talk about our concern regarding spending, it is not necessarily the specifics of a given paragraph within a spending bill. The specifics are the overall amount of money that we are spending as a Federal Government and the fact that we are ignoring, this Congress is ignoring, the true financial challenges that face us as a Nation.

So I rise to commend my friend from Texas for offering an amendment that I think brings focus to where the debate ought to be, and that is to challenge each and every Member of this body and each and every Member of the Senate to make certain that before we end our time here this fiscal year, to make certain that the budget for fiscal year 2008 is as responsible as it can be, that we address appropriately those huge financial challenges that we have as a Nation and be much more responsible with taxpayer money and make certain that we allow Americans to keep their hard-earned taxpayer money in their back pocket and in their pocketbooks.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

For carrying out the programs, projects, plans, and habitat restoration, improvement, and acquisition provisions of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (title XXXIV of Public Law 102-575), \$59,122,000, to be derived from such sums as may be collected in the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund pursuant to sections 3404(c)(3), 3405(f), and 3407(d) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (Public Law 102-575), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to assess and collect the full amount of the additional mitigation and restoration payments authorized by section 3407(d) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used for the acquisition or leasing of water for in-stream purposes if the water is already committed to in-stream purposes by a court adopted decree or order.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out activities authorized by the Water Supply, Reliability, and Environmental Improvement Act (Public Law 108-361), consistent with plans to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, \$40,750,000, to remain available until expended, of which such amounts as may be necessary to carry out such activities may be transferred to appropriate accounts of other participating Federal agencies to carry out authorized purposes: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for the Federal share of the costs of CALFED Program management: *Provided further*, That the use of any funds provided to the California Bay-Delta Authority for program-wide management and oversight activities shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That CALFED implementation shall be carried out in a balanced manner with clear performance measures demonstrating concurrent progress in achieving the goals and objectives of the Program: *Provided further*, That \$5,000,000 shall be transferred to the Army Corps of Engineers to carry out further study and implementation of projects that contribute to the stability of the levee projects authorized under section 103(f)(3) of the Water Supply, Reliability, Environmental Improvement Act (Public Law 108-361).

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of policy, administration, and related functions in the office of the Commissioner, the Denver office, and offices in the five regions of the Bureau of Reclamation, to remain available until expended, \$58,811,000, to be derived from the Reclamation Fund and be nonreimbursable as provided in 43 U.S.C. 377: *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted as policy and administration expenses: *Provided further*, That, of the funds provided under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall be transferred to "Water and Related Resources" upon the expiration of the 60-day period following the date of enactment of this Act if, during such period, the Secretary of the Interior has not submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate the Bureau of Reclamation's five-year budget plan.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAMBORN:

Page 14, line 18, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,236,000)".

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, as we continue to wade through these massive and costly spending bills, my commitment to the American taxpayer remains strong. I signed a pledge to uphold a Presidential veto of any spending bill that exceeds the President's requested level of funding. Hopefully, we can contain some of this out-of-control spending and pass fiscally responsible legislation; but if not, I intend to honor that pledge.

This appropriations bill would increase spending for energy and water projects by \$1.1 billion more than the President's budget request and seeks to increase spending by more than \$1.3 billion over last year's fiscal 2007 Energy and Water appropriations bill.

We have an opportunity to demonstrate restraint by reducing the

amount that the government spends, not increasing it. At a time when the Federal Government faces an \$8.8 trillion national debt, we have a real opportunity to show the American people that we can be fiscally disciplined and that we will reduce this deficit. Increasing the size of government or bureaucracy will not help this reduction effort.

My commonsense amendment would simply maintain the Policy and Administration account under the Bureau of Reclamation at fiscal year 2007 levels, representing a \$1.2 million reduction from \$58.8 million to \$57.6 million. That is the same as last year's budget. Given that this funding level was appropriate for last year's budget and our Nation needs to reduce Federal spending, this commonsense restraint should be acceptable.

This amendment is not critical of the Bureau of Reclamation or its employees, who actually help deliver water to parts of my district and are important to the State of Colorado and to the entire West. It would simply require the Federal Government to operate the way any deficit-laden business would. A private sector company experiencing the same deficits the Federal Government is facing would not increase its deficit. It would simply cut spending or go out of business. A family on a tight budget finds ways to go without, and we should explore every opportunity to be fiscally responsible as well.

This amendment is the first step of many necessary steps enforcing fiscal discipline and sanity upon the Federal Government and out-of-control Federal deficit spending. We must restore fiscal discipline and assure the American people that we are doing whatever is necessary to reduce our national debt. To do this, we must find commonsense and innovative new ways to do more with less.

The American people have asked Congress to rein in Federal spending and tighten its belt. This reasonable amendment does just that, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor in support of yet another good and commonsense amendment. Good and common sense because it asks of this Congress to do the very same thing that any family in America and any small business in America would do under similar circumstances.

The American public right now is looking at, as we have already seen, the largest tax increase in U.S. history. And let me just take a moment, though, before I go into the particulars on this amendment to explain how that impacts upon the average American family.

There was an article in the New York Times several months ago after the Democrats proposed their budget, which is inclusive of what we have here before us, to say how would this, the

largest tax increase in American history, impact a family of four, the average American family of four maybe in the Fifth Congressional District, maybe in Bergen County, which is one of the great counties of New Jersey that I represent, an average family of four, four individuals, making around \$70,000, which I should point out by no means in the great State of New Jersey would be considered by most people an affluent family. That family would see their taxes, because of this underlying legislation combined with the overall budget, go up by upwards of \$1,500, \$1,600 year. That would mean \$1,500 or \$1,600 more coming to the Federal Treasury into the Federal checkbook as opposed to being able to stay in the family checkbook. That means \$1,500 or \$1,600 more coming down to the Washington bureaucrats as opposed to being able to remain in the family checkbook on the kitchen table where Mom and Dad are able to decide should those dollars be spent on their son's college education, on their daughter's health care expenses, on their in-laws' necessary expenses that they must share with, whatever else, to Washington as opposed to the family budget.

Now, the good gentleman from Colorado comes up with an amendment to try to address that. If we are able to hold the line on overall spending just as an average family would have to do, we would not see the need for this, the largest tax increase in American history. And what does the good gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) do? Well, he simply says hold the line on spending for, let us say, the bureaucrats, if you will, all good men and women, I am sure, the people in the policy and administration account under this bill, under the Bureau of Reclamation, hold the spending at 2007 levels. By doing so, we will be saving some money. That will represent a \$1.236 billion reduction, from \$58.8 billion to \$57.57 billion.

Some of you may say in this grand scheme of things when we are looking at our Federal budget upwards of almost \$3 trillion, saving \$1.2 billion is not that much. But the flip side of that argument is if it really isn't that much of a cut, then it really shouldn't be that much to bear for the Federal Government. If we are not really not cutting that much, then the bureaucrats and the rest who have such a huge budget as it is should not feel the squeeze that much. But all we are asking them to do, like any other family does, is to live on their budget for this year.

I ask how many Americans saw their income rise last year by one, two, two-½ times the rate of inflation? I can tell you quite candidly most of the people that I talk to in my district, unfortunately, did not see their incomes rise that much, but yet that is what we are asking them to do in the sense of higher taxes to pay for the increase in spending for the overall budget that we have here.

Let me just conclude in the same way that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) does in his letter. He says, and I think these are the most poignant words: "We must restore fiscal discipline and assure the American people that we are doing whatever is necessary to reduce our national debt. To do this, we must find both common-sense and innovative ways to do more with less. The American people have asked Congress to rein in Federal spending and to tighten its belt. This reasonable amendment does just that." And he asks us all from both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democrat alike, to join with the gentleman from Colorado to work to make sure that we do not have the largest tax increase in American history, to work to make sure that we have a system that is common sense, efficient, and appropriate on the Federal level, just as we have asked for the American family at home.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is amazing. If folks on the other side keep saying tax increase, they are actually going to believe that there is a tax increase.

What I notice is that they very rarely mention deficit because when they do, they leave themselves open for discussion on the deficit. Yes, there is a deficit and the American people are quickly finding that out. The deficit was not created in the last less than 6 months that Democrats have had control of this House. The deficit was created by taking us into a war that we shouldn't have been involved in where close to \$600 billion has been spent, not to mention the loss of life, not to mention the fact that when our troops come home over the next 10, 15, 20 years, we will be paying in deficit spending to make up for medical care and all the needs that I certainly will be supporting for them.

□ 1500

Now, it's interesting, Mr. Chairman, how the other side mentions that this bill spends money. Well, in a way that's redundant because that's what the Constitution says the Appropriations Committee is supposed to do. It is supposed to come to the Congress every year and spend dollars. How much we spend, that's a discussion.

But if there was ever a place where you can justify a modest increase, it would be when you deal with the energy issues in our country. There are dollars here, no one is mentioning, for research. There are dollars here to deal with the energy issue.

Now, every American knows that probably at the center of issues in this country is the high cost of fuel in this country, whether for driving or heating our homes. So when you take some of those tax dollars and you spend them, a very modest amount, on research to see if there is a way that in the future we can cut out our dependency on foreign oil, that is a great investment.

That is no different than investing in a college or education for the children. It is the same kind. But again, we are not going to hear that. What we are going to hear is this repetition about how money is being spent, and that there is a tax increase.

I don't remember a tax increase in the 6 months that we have been here as Democrats. What I do remember that caused a deficit was, one, the war; and two, that we did have a tax decrease in this country, a tax cut, we did. But it wasn't for anybody that we know, certainly no one I know. It was for millionaires and zillionaires, including some of them who told us that they didn't even want a tax cut. Those are the people.

So if indeed those tax cuts reach their sunset and die, I guess you could play with words and say that taxes will go up. Yeah, for somebody who has \$100 million, he or she might pay more taxes later on. But the working class, the people who are getting help for their education, the folks that are getting a better deal on energy propositions in the future, those are the facts, the people that we are looking for. Now, you want to cut the deficit down? You want to create a situation where we will spend less money in this country? Stop the war now. Stop spending another dollar on the war in Iraq.

But it has been forgotten. It's all about tax-and-spend Democrats. My God, when you hear this, Mr. Chairman, you would think we were in control for the last 14 years. No, it's 12, 14 years against less than 6 months. And in those 6 months we have spoken to parents about their kids' education. In those 6 months we've made attempts to bring down the cost of gasoline. In those 6 months, yes, we gave a minimum wage increase to the lowest earners in this country. That's what we've done. And we will be proud of that. You want to cut the deficit that you created over 12 years? Stop the war now. That's the best way to do it.

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

There were so many inaccuracies in that last speech, but there are at least a couple that I would like to correct relative to taxes, one of them being that in the last 6 years, the tax reductions that have been put in place actually reduce taxes for every single American who pays income taxes, and actually took some people that were paying income taxes and took them off the tax rolls. And that the Democrats' budget, which has in fact been passed, unlike the minimum wage increase which is not actually in the law at this point, but the Democrats' budget which has in fact been passed has proposed potentially to roll back all of those tax increases and thereby increase taxes on every single taxpayer in America.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman from California.

To put things in perspective for my colleague from New York, it's true that the war in Iraq has cost \$600 billion. That is 7 percent of the \$8.8 trillion total national debt that we have. So we have to also address the remaining 93 percent of the debt, because the war is 7 percent out of that \$8.8 trillion.

So, getting back to this amendment that is before us, I would differ with my colleague from New York. We are not cutting any research into energy development. We are cutting the bureaucracy expense. We are cutting the policy and administration portion of the Bureau of Reclamation. We are just keeping it to last year's dollar amount. So the bureaucracy, the administration of the Bureau of Reclamation is what is being kept to last year's figures. There is no cut going on for any research development program whatsoever. So I just wanted to make that correction.

Apparently I haven't won over my colleague from New York yet, but I would urge everyone else here to adopt this amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I thank the gentleman, and I would just like to amplify what he said, that if in fact what this amendment does is take spending to last year, then it's not a cut at all. It's not even a cut of the bureaucracy that you're talking about, it is in fact making this line or this area of expenditure the same as last year.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was compelled to come down to just comment about some of the information that we've heard from the other side regarding issues not necessarily related to this amendment, because they broadened the debate significantly to talk about the deficit. And Mr. Chairman, as you well know, the deficit has been decreasing significantly for reasons that I would like to touch on a little bit.

They also talked about the issue of the work that they had accomplished, that this majority had accomplished. And they talk about decreasing gas prices. Well, in fact, what their gas bill did, Mr. Chairman, as you recall is to increase taxes on United States oil companies. Sounds good maybe in some districts, I don't know; mine is not terribly interested in anybody paying more taxes. But they increased taxes on United States oil companies. Now that bill sits in the Senate, thank goodness, because hopefully the Senate will be able to resolve it and correct it so that the actual policy of this Congress on gas prices will indeed be to bring them down. It takes greater responsibility to do that.

If in fact that were to become law, then what we would do under the direction of this majority party is to decrease the ability for American oil companies to produce American oil, and we would increase our reliance and our dependency on foreign oil; not the

greatest energy plan, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest.

They also talked about assisting kids' education, college education. We have that as a goal, certainly. We think it's appropriate to provide for greater resources for American citizens to attend higher education. What does their bill do, though, Mr. Chairman? Again, it sits in the Senate, so hopefully we will have the Senate correct that.

But what their bill does is to ratchet down very gradually the interest rate that students pay on loans to go to college and keeps them at half their current rate for 6 months, Mr. Chairman, and then, boom, right back up to where they were. Well, Mr. Chairman, that isn't leadership either.

Now, this chart right here, Mr. Chairman, talks about the increasing Federal revenue. But this red line here could be jobs, it could be increasing Federal revenue, it could be economic development. And there was a remarkable thing that occurred in 2003 that made it so that that line goes up appropriately. Thank goodness, the American people say. Appropriately, Federal revenues increase, economic development increases, jobs increase. And what happened in 2003 was the culmination of appropriate tax reductions for the American people. And what does this majority want to do? It wants to take that line back down. Because what they've done is passed a budget that reverses every single tax reduction, appropriate tax reduction, for the American people. Mr. Chairman, that is not the kind of leadership, I don't think, the American people deserve, nor is it the type of leadership that they desire.

So, when we broaden this debate, it's appropriate, because the American people, Mr. Chairman, the American people are watching, and what they see is a majority party that is terribly interested in making certain that the American people are taxed to a greater degree so that they ostensibly have more money to be able to spend on their pet programs.

My good friend says that it's only folks who make hundreds of millions of dollars who will have their taxes go up. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is not the case, as you well know. Taxes will increase for virtually every single American. Anybody who pays taxes now, under this new majority if they get their way, will have increased taxes. That's not the kind of leadership I believe the American people voted for in November, it is not the kind of leadership that we would provide, it is not the kind of leadership that the American people deserve.

So, I am pleased that my good friends on the other side have broadened the debate because it results in the opportunity to bring into focus greater clarity to these budget bills, greater clarity to these appropriations bills, and makes certain that the American people are paying attention to the kind of

leadership that this new majority is offering, or the lack of leadership they're offering.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I am pleased to yield to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I think it is a significant point that you raise with regard to what level of American taxpayers will be subjected to these taxes.

I come from the great State of New Jersey, where we had similar rhetoric, if you will, from the other side of the aisle on the State level. And we actually heard the exact same arguments being made: Don't worry, they're going to come up with what they call the millionaires' tax; and if you're not a millionaire, don't worry about it. Well, truth be told, after all the dust was scattered away from the bills, after all the hearings were held, after all the press conferences and everything else was done by the Democrats in the State of New Jersey, we found that that level went from \$1 million to \$900,000 to \$800,000 to \$700,000 to \$600,000 to \$500,000, \$400,000, \$300,000, 250-some-odd thousand dollars at the end of the day. Now, you still say they may be a large income? Well, in the State of New Jersey, if you're a two-income family making a hundred-some-odd thousand dollars, you found that you would still be subject to tax on that.

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

I would like to actually talk about the bill, and I would like to talk about the underlying merits of what Mr. HOBSON and I and the members of the subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee have tried to do.

In this particular title, we are talking about the Bureau of Reclamation, and we are talking about people's health and well-being. Part of that does include the wise stewardship of the moneys that are provided. From the debate that has taken place today, you would think that the only thing we are worried about is spending money and worried about the quantity of the money that we are spending as opposed to the quality of the underlying act and the work that the agencies do. And I would draw, Mr. Chairman, my colleague's attention to page 48 of the report that goes into great detail, and I am going to read it.

The gentleman has an amendment before us to cut \$1.236 million from the bill. And the fact is, over the last several years our subcommittee, under the leadership of then-Chairman HOBSON, as well as myself, have done everything possible to make sure that the moneys being spent by the Bureau of Reclamation are being spent wisely.

And I read from the report. "In fiscal year 2006, the Committee directed the Department of Interior to submit, with its fiscal year 2007 budget request, a detailed 5-year budget plan for each of the major budget components, including water and related resources, California Bay Delta Restoration program,

Central Valley Project Restoration Fund, and Central Utah Project Completion.”

Because the concern of the subcommittee then, and as it is as of this moment, is that the public's moneys are being spent with quality as well.

“The Department subsequently informed the Committee that it would be unable to provide a 5-year plan for fiscal year 2007 and intended to make the initial submission with the fiscal year 2008 request. The Bureau failed to make that submission either, and now informs the Committee that the 5-year plan will be submitted at some undefined time in the future.”

The patience of the subcommittee, the patience of the Appropriations Committee is not without limit. And as a result, in the report language we note the Committee's extreme frustration with the Bureau's inability to provide a 5-year budget plan, the act contains a provision that transfers \$10 million, not \$1.236 million, but \$10 million from policy and administration to water and related resources if the 5-year plan is not submitted within 60 days of date of enactment. We are certainly not afraid to move moneys around, and in this case, to the tune of \$10 million, if the good judgment of this committee is not abided by.

So I would emphasize that this is not just a matter of quantity of money, it is quality of money. And that is what we are about. That is why I am adamantly opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

□ 1515

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 14 passenger motor vehicles, which are for replacement only.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 201. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to determine the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit until development by the Secretary of the Interior and the State of California of a plan, which shall conform to the water quality standards of the State of California as approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to minimize any detrimental effect of the San Luis drainage waters.

(b) The costs of the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and the costs of the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program shall be

classified by the Secretary of the Interior as reimbursable or nonreimbursable and collected until fully repaid pursuant to the “Cleanup Program-Alternative Repayment Plan” and the “SJVDP-Alternative Repayment Plan” described in the report entitled “Repayment Report, Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program, February 1995”, prepared by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. Any future obligations of funds by the United States relating to, or providing for, drainage service or drainage studies for the San Luis Unit shall be fully reimbursable by San Luis Unit beneficiaries of such service or studies pursuant to Federal reclamation law.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ENERGY PROGRAMS

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for energy efficiency and renewable energy activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$1,873,844,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 21 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

Page 16, line 19, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$101,550,000)”.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, one of the last speakers on the other side of the aisle mentioned that he wasn't quite sure why we kept talking about taxes and tax increases, because inevitably if you head toward the balanced budget, that is what all spending turns into: it turns into taxes.

In fact, the Democratic budget, which, to the majority party's credit, is heading toward a balanced budget in 5 years, as were I believe virtually all of the budgets that were presented this year, but it does so by saying, in its own terms, that they will raise taxes as much as they need to at the end of that 5 years in order to achieve a balanced budget.

So when we are talking today about things that are increasing in spending, this isn't something that is abstract. This isn't \$20 million here, \$40 million here, \$100 billion there of just sort of faceless, nameless money. That is money in figures that are so large that most people, Mr. Chairman, have a hard time even comprehending how much that is and how it can relate to the things that we are doing.

But it makes it a little more down-to-earth, brings it a little more home, when you look at each one of these, which is the way we should look at them, Mr. Chairman, each one of these spending increases on each program, on each bill, on each thing here, and realize that every dollar of increase there

is a dollar that the majority party wants to go get out of the pockets of taxpayers at home. That is what we are really talking about. That is why, Mr. Chairman, I propose this amendment.

Now, this amendment refers to just one of the many, many projects and many, many programs in this appropriations bill. This one is something that deals with weatherization assistance, and the bill that is before us proposes to increase weatherization assistance spending by 20 percent over last year.

Now, what is interesting is that in the President's budget, which this amendment proposes to reduce the spending to, the President has actually proposed to reduce this to almost half. Why is that? Because in something that is called energy efficiency and renewable energy, this program is actually not at all efficient.

I actually had some personal experience with this program, not personal in the sense that I was dealing with the program from a recipient standpoint, but when I was in the State legislature with this program in California. By the time that you deal with the Federal bureaucracy and then you get the money to the State and there is the State bureaucracy, and then you put this money out, very little of this money was actually going to anything toward the goal that was accomplished. And what is interesting is it is also creating a subsidy for something that already pays for itself.

The reason people weatherize their homes or seal leaks and so forth or cracks in windows and doors is because it saves you money on your energy bill over time.

So this is a program that has been shown to be inefficient, has been shown to not be effective, that subsidizes something that doesn't need subsidization, and which in this bill is proposed to increase by 20 percent.

Now, the President's budget proposed to reduce this. It is one of those things on that list of programs that a number of people have that are saying these are some of the most inefficient programs in the Federal Government today, and this is one of them that certainly should be reduced or perhaps eliminated.

But instead, this bill proposes to increase it by nearly \$40 million. And, again, \$40 million, I guess sometimes this is the difference between government and not government. When things don't work in government, it seems that there is always a group of people saying the reason they are not working is because they don't have enough money, and we need to spend more money on them. Whereas, normally in the real world, Mr. Chairman, when something isn't working, that is when people take money from it, make it become more efficient, or not fund it anymore if it is not working.

So, Mr. Chairman, this amendment, just this one area of this one Department, proposes to reduce this to the President's proposed budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, of all the work Congress does, few things could be more important than to protect our Nation from the threat of nuclear terrorism. It is hard to imagine that in one instant a nuclear bomb detonating in a major American city could kill more of our citizens than we have lost in combat in every war in our Nation's history. Osama bin Laden has told his followers that it is their religious duty to secure loose nuclear materials for a bomb to be set off in the United States. It is our sacrosanct duty to ensure that that never happens.

That is why I want to salute Chairman VISCOSKY for making homeland security against nuclear terrorism the highest of priorities in this bill. He is right to do so.

This bill provides \$2.1 billion to protect the American family from a nuclear holocaust, a level that is nearly \$400 million above the administration's budget request. Specifically, it provides \$832 million for international nuclear materials protection and cooperation activities, a \$359 million increase to the budget request. With these funds, we will expand cooperative programs with Russia and other nations with vast inventories of nuclear material.

In this bill, the Global Threat Reduction Initiative is increased by \$132 million to a total of \$251 million. This will assist us in identifying, securing, removing, and disposing of nuclear material throughout the world.

The Megaports Initiative is funded at \$25.8 million. This program installs radiation detectors at major seaports around the world so nuclear weapons and materials can be intercepted before they are smuggled into a major American city. This additional funding will allow the Department of Energy to install sensors at several key seaports this year, rather than waiting for several years to do so.

I wanted to take a moment of my time to also compliment the hard-working, dedicated citizens who work at the Department of Energy on these nuclear nonproliferation programs. They work extraordinarily long hours, many spending long periods of time away from their families in the harsh Russian climate working to secure these materials and to protect us and our families from the threat of nuclear terrorism.

Let me point out some of DOE's successes because of that hard work and because of the work of this subcommittee, chaired formerly by Chairman HOBSON, who also made homeland security against nuclear terrorism a top priority:

DOE in recent years has completed work securing nuclear materials at 91 of 125 Russian nuclear weapons material and warhead sites, with the remainder in progress.

We have secured more than 520 vulnerable radiological sites overseas,

containing enough nuclear material to build approximately 7,700 dirty bombs.

We have recovered over 14,000 radiological sources domestically, containing enough material for approximately 1,400 dirty bombs.

We have equipped 88 land border crossings in Russia with radiation detection equipment, with work complete or under way in eight other countries.

We have installed Megaports radiation detection equipment at eight ports, with operational testing and evaluation under way at one additional port.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago, President Bush said that protecting our Nation from nuclear terrorism should be our Nation's number one national security priority. I agree. With the strong leadership of Chairman VISCOSKY and now Ranking Member HOBSON, this bill takes a significant step forward in protecting our communities, our families and our Nation from the threat of nuclear terrorism.

That is why I urge bipartisan support for this important legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. I note that this amendment is offered to the section of the bill on energy efficiency and renewable energy, and I would note first that the President's request for this year is more than 10 percent below on every one of the renewable energy accounts in the budget. Those are cuts below the 2007 enacted amount, and it covers biomass, which leads to the biomass accounts, which include biodiesel, corn ethanol and cellulosic ethanol, which, of course, is the area that so many people believe is going to be a major saver in the future.

It includes solar energy, wind energy, geothermal technology, hydropower, vehicle technologies, where 30 percent of all of our energy is used, building technologies, where 40 percent of all of our energy is used, industrial technologies, where 20 percent of all of our energy is used. And the President proposes in those areas 10 percent reductions below the enacted, whereas the subcommittee, in its wisdom, and apparently agreed to certainly by me and certainly apparently agreed by the gentleman from California, the committee has added moneys over the enacted number for 2007. So we apparently agree on that.

But then, oddly enough, the gentleman from California chooses to attack the one program that gives direct help to low-income households in this country. It is the one program, the weatherization program, where low-income households can get assistance to install energy-saving technologies and measures in their homes.

Well, it turns out there are something like 14 million households in this country that have incomes of less than 50 percent of the median income in various areas around the country. Half of

them live in homes. Most of those homes are very inefficient users of energy. So the Low Income Weatherization Program is a program that would help those homes be more efficient in the use of energy.

The President's request for this year is in fact below the enacted 2007 number actually by more than 30 percent below what the enacted 2007 number was. Enacted 2006 number was even higher than the 2007 number. So the committee, in its wisdom, has instead recommended raising the number to the 2006 level, to the levels expended in fiscal year 2006, and the gentleman from California wants to take it back from the committee's number by this time 45 percent or something like that, the exact number I haven't quite calculated.

□ 1530

Those moneys are well invested in those homes which low-income households are using, where energy is so inefficiently used, where we can save a substantial amount of energy every year, thereby reducing greenhouse gases that are produced in the production of the energy that would otherwise be wasted in those homes. And where one would say far beyond the cost of the energy-saving measures that would be part of the weatherization program, far beyond the cost. In such situations, you are saving the amount of the cost within a 3 or 4 or 5-year period when the savings go on long into the future, year after year after year, saving energy and reducing greenhouse gases and saving dollars. Perhaps most important for those people, it is the savings of the dollars that they otherwise would spend in those low-income households where the amount of money spent on housing per se in low-income households tends to be up in the two-thirds to three-quarters of the total household income.

So I think the weatherization program is a very useful program, a very effective program for saving money for people at the lowest levels of income. I hope we will soundly defeat this amendment by the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first of all before I begin, let me commend a prior speaker, the gentleman from Texas, with his references to homeland security and the efforts that need to be made. I completely concur with the majority of the points that he makes.

This House, as you know, just dealt with those issues the other day on homeland security and how it relates to my congressional district is one of the forefront issues that I deal with. I commend the points he is making there.

Tied to homeland security is energy security as well. We will not be a secure country if we are not secure with regard to our energy needs. Much in

this underlying legislation and what the administration is calling for is working towards that laudable goal, energy efficiency and renewable energies as well. And I concur with the previous speaker with his remarks as well, that we must move in that direction.

I guess the rub is how you get to some of these things. When you talk to your local constituents back at home. When we have the opportunity to go back to our districts and talk to them and they see just how Washington spends their very hard-earned dollars, they must think we are literally burning their dollars down here and wasting them on inefficient programs. Some of them of course are important. Others need to be prioritized down the line to put them in the proper perspective.

The legislation we have before us, more specifically the amendment, goes to that ultimate goal, setting priorities. Now the gentleman who is proposing this amendment is from the great State of California, a very warm State. I have come from the great Northeast where weatherization is a critical matter, especially for the low-income individuals who need to do something in order to make sure that their limited dollars go as far as they possibly can.

They are called upon in their daily lives to be as efficient as they can with their limited dollars, whether it is spending on food or rent costs, or in this case, their energy costs.

But they are asking us the very same thing in Washington. They are asking us to be efficient and effective with their dollars because they want to tell us these dollars are limited as well. Because it comes out of the American taxpayers' pocketbook.

What we are looking at here is the largest tax increase in U.S. history, and this is going to be a negative impact on the average American family of \$1,500 or \$2,000 more that comes out of their wallets and is sent to Washington. They are asking to make sure that the dollars spent are done effectively.

I am a Member of the 108th Congress. I came in with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and a few others, I believe, that started a group called WWW, Washington Waste Watchers. They would come to the floor each week and talk about areas of concern to them and this entire Congress to make sure that Washington moves in the right direction, to be stopping this wasteful spending of dollars.

So before we take a program that is already in existence, that we know as the testimony here earlier from the gentleman from California may be a laudable program in some sense in terms of providing assistance to those who need it, but it is wasting the dollars in another sense because it is not really getting to those individuals who desperately need it, and it is going elsewhere and being done in an inefficient manner.

Before we simply up the dollars and not make sure that those dollars get to those low- and moderate-income people to get the job done, as the gentleman from California pointed out, let's make sure that we have something, something to make sure that we do so in an efficient and effective manner. That is what the WWW, Washington Waste Watchers, is trying to do. That is what the Republican side of the aisle is trying to do.

Let's implement programs to say we will operate this House of Representatives the same as a family's budget would; that we will operate just as stringently with our dollars here as if they were our very own. We will make sure that there are systems in place, accountability in place to make sure that the dollars really get to the places they need to get to. And before we get those mechanisms set up and established, we are not going to waste any more taxpayer dollars by going to them and saying we are going to raise tax dollars or raise tax rates, and simply up the spending on a program until we can certify that program is being run effectively and efficiently.

I commend the gentleman from California for trying to move in the right direction to make sure that we don't have the largest tax increase in history, and to make sure that programs like this are run efficiently and effectively.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

I want to make a last couple of comments relative to the comments made by the gentleman from Massachusetts. A lot of what the gentleman from Massachusetts said I agree with. I think we differ in three basic areas.

One is that the gentleman from Massachusetts believes this program has been effective. My involvement with it in California and things that I have seen statistically here say otherwise. Certainly the administration agrees this program has not been a cost-effective program.

Second is talking about how this thing might save money here. But where does this money come from? It is \$245 million. This money does not come from the sky. It does not come from the air. It comes from taxpayers. And the question is not does it save anybody any money or anybody anything; is it cost effective in what it does? And I think the answer is "no."

The third comment I would like to make is that the gentleman pointed out a number of programs in this bill which have all been increased in this proposed bill. That is fine, but I guess I would ask this: Are there no programs here which are not effective? Are there no programs that deserve some reduction in spending or perhaps even elimination?

Ronald Reagan said that the closest thing to eternal life is a government program, and I believe we are seeing with programs like this that those words Ronald Reagan made some time ago ring true.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just want to share, when asked what programs have been cut or not cut, I want to share with you, 37 cuts to Department of Energy weapons programs; 57 programs have been cut overall; 20 cuts to other programs, 2 in the Corps of Engineers, 2 in the Bureau of Reclamation, 3 independent agencies, and 13 in the Department of Energy. There have been 16 of 37 weapons cuts that were requested by the administration.

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

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY
RELIABILITY

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for electricity delivery and energy reliability activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$134,161,000, to remain available until expended.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for nuclear energy activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of not to exceed 20 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including one ambulance, \$759,227,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS:

Page 17, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000)(increased by \$20,000,000)".

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, this is a very simple amendment and perhaps the majority might want to just accept it, so let me just explain.

The generation IV nuclear energy systems program is the next far, far generation program. We have been waiting and working for the generation III program. This is about the generation IV after that, which is 2030. There is a lot of money in this that is going to be used to develop energy far into the future, and yet we have in the present nuclear power program of 2010, we have need for this money here and today.

I point this out to my colleagues, particularly on that side of the aisle, that if we don't get enough money to the nuclear power 2010 program, power plants across this country will be forced to build gas and coal-burning power plants to meet the ever-growing energy demands of this Nation.

So if you really want to reduce greenhouse gases, I think you should support my amendment because you are basically taking this money, \$20 million, from the generation IV nuclear systems energy account which has been funded at almost \$80 million above the President's budget request, and you are simply transferring it to the nuclear power 2010 account which is funded almost \$34 million below the President's budget request.

If the other side is willing to accept my amendment, I am willing to stop talking and we can proceed. If you are concerned about global warming and coal- and gas-burning, this will help our Nation move forward by helping the nuclear power plants in the near, near future instead of the far, far future.

Let me talk about the nuclear power 2010 program. It is intended simply to encourage near-term orders for advanced versions of existing commercial nuclear plants. Frankly, it is an integral part of the goal of constructing new plants in the next decade.

Approximately two-thirds of the new reactors use a reactor technology that depends on nuclear power 2010. Nuclear power plants generate electricity without producing or emitting any greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide. Nuclear power plants generate 73 percent of all carbon-free electricity in America and are an essential mitigation tool for reducing greenhouse gases.

If we are serious about addressing the issue of global climate change, then nuclear power must be a critical component of any future energy and environmental strategy we have in this country.

With the additional funds in this amendment, the program for 2010, we could focus more on reducing the technical, regulatory and institutional barriers to the deployment of new nuclear power plants in the near term while still allowing a generous increase in funds for the generation IV program. So the money is already there for generation IV. So I am just asking a very modicum amount, taking from the generation IV and moving it to the near term, so that we can build these nuclear power plants.

I conclude by saying failure to meet the goals of the nuclear 2010 program could result in delays 1 year, 2 years, possibly 3 years, and create the possibility of an indefinite delay as companies attempt to meet the demand with other types of generation, including coal and natural gases.

I conclude and thank my colleagues for listening, but I think when you realize it is not very complicated, we are just taking \$20 million from a generation IV nuclear research program that we have no results from and don't know anything about and moving them to a current program in 2010 and saying let's let the nuclear industry have this special advantage so we can combat global warming and we can make sure that we move forward with nuclear power generation in this country as soon as possible.

□ 1545

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

I appreciate what the gentleman wants to do. We certainly share a concern about global warming. We also share a desire to ensure that we have a viable nuclear industry in the near term as well as the long term. Where there would be a difference of opinion is the balance that needs to be struck in this legislation to accomplish both of those goals.

I would point out that the legislation that has been reported to the House has done everything possible to ensure that the nuclear industry can move forward. For example, we have fully funded the President's request for \$494 million for Yucca Mountain to make sure that they can meet their deadline for the submission of a license for the waste repository in June of 2008. The industry clearly needs the repository.

The House bill includes \$167.8 million for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, something that I think the gentleman would agree is critically necessary as far as the licensing procedures in the shorter term. This is a \$17.1 million increase over the administration's request, more than 10 percent more. And I would point out that in the continuing resolution for fiscal year 2007, this was one of the few accounts that this subcommittee specifically also increased. We also include \$15 million within the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for nuclear engineering scholarships that were proposed for termination by the administration, because if we do not have new, bright talent in those educational facilities under scholarship, we are not going to have a future.

And we did include moneys for Nuclear Power 2010. It is the same level as the current fiscal year. I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that this is a direct payment to utilities undergoing the NRC license process and no other sector of the energy portion of this country receives this type of Federal assistance.

The gentleman would take the money from Generation IV nuclear energy systems by having the moneys reduced. I would point out that the subcommittee went to great lengths to increase moneys for Generation IV. We are supportive of the light water reactors that are going to be coming online in the near term. We want to make sure we have that next generation of reactors online as well for the future, one that can not only provide electrical industry to our Nation that is needed but also potentially produce the hydrogen for the new economy we are looking for. We have provided those moneys and would not want to see them cut.

Additionally, we had a debate and conversation earlier today about the mixed oxide program that previously had been designated a nonproliferation item. We have correctly moved it into the Energy Department as far as their accounts and would point out that \$689 million between unobligated balances, between the spending for '07 and between what is included in this bill, is included for MOX.

So we have been more than generous, and I also think we have struck the right balance to ensure that we do have an industry starting up in the near term and one that has a long-term, safe future for the generation of energy in this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The bill includes a \$33 million cut to Nuclear Power 2010. While that level may be difficult for some to accept, I fully support it.

Nuclear Power 2010 was designed to facilitate industry decisions to build and operate new nuclear power plants in the U.S. And that would be great for America. We need a dramatic increase in reliable, safe baseload energy; and I would much rather see it come from nuclear energy than from coal plants.

Unfortunately, most of the funding that we have provided for Nuclear Power 2010 doesn't go to help industry figure out our untested regulatory process or to identify new sites for plants. Most of the funding in this account has been provided to support the work of reactor designers. There is little uncertainty about reactor design. It doesn't need our support through this program. And there's really no such thing as struggling mom-and-pop reactor design teams. But I do know that we must continue to support design for the next generation of reactors. This bill does just that. It increases our support to the Gen IV nuclear design program by \$79 million. That's where nuclear R&D should be funded, not from Nuclear Power 2010.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting against this amendment.

I yield additional time to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio gave me?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 4 minutes on the gentleman from Ohio's time.

Mr. STEARNS. If I might address the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, I have here the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill. On page 68, it indicates that the Nuclear Power 2010, you provide about \$80 million, a decrease of \$34 million. So the question I have for you, if you support this program so much, why would you cut it \$34 million, which is basically a huge percentage?

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to respond to the question raised. First of all I would point out that the funds that are provided are at this year's fiscal level. It is not a cut. It is a cut from the President's request.

The other observation I would make is I believe that the Department should be in the business of science research and development and not exclusively be paying for companies to license new reactors, so that would certainly do justification.

Mr. STEARNS. Then the other question is, in Generation IV, the nuclear energy system by which you increased it \$80 million, it seems to me, and you might want to answer this question, here you have a program that is a fourth generation of nuclear research. We don't even have the results from the second and third generation nuclear research, yet you're increasing a huge amount of money for something well into the future when you have a system, the 2010 energy system, which could use this money today and would go towards improving global warming and put less demand on all these nuclear energy companies because they certainly can't meet the demand in the next 2 years without burning coal and gas.

So I ask the gentleman, why would he want to increase something that's a fourth generation when the second and third generation have not even been successful in providing anything for us?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. And if the gentleman from Ohio would yield, I would be happy to respond.

Mr. HOBSON. I yield.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would point out that there was a \$70 million increase, and I would not want to engage in quibbling as to whether it is a second, third or fourth generation, but do believe there is a strong public purpose for demonstrating the commercial viability of the thermal-neutron gas reactor for the very purposes that the gentleman is concerned about and that I share his concern, that is, climate change and global warming and energy sources, where we can generate the electricity in this country as well as potentially produce hydrogen. We ought to start down that road sooner

rather than later, and again in a balanced fashion along with 2010.

Mr. HOBSON. Taking back my time, I would point out to the gentleman from Florida that we do have the capability, and we do understand Generation 3, 3½. Where we need to go is beyond that and look at Gen IV. That's what we're trying to do in the bill now, and that's why we oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SCHMIDT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SCHMIDT:

Page 17, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$80,000,000)".

Page 21, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$80,000,000)".

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I have tremendous respect for our chairman and ranking member and realize the very difficult undertaking they have had in putting this bill together and balancing the number of important priorities within it. Unfortunately, the bill before us would drastically cut the President's request to \$405 million for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, GNEP, initiative to \$120 million. This amounts to a \$285 million reduction from the President's request for GNEP.

At the same time, this bill goes well above the President's request for the Department of Energy science account. The President's request for the science account was already a 15.8 percent increase above the fiscal 2007 level. On top of this, the House bill provides another \$116 million above the administration's request. My amendment would provide an additional \$80 million for the GNEP initiative, offset by an \$80 million decrease in the science account.

If we are going to be serious about reducing greenhouse gas emissions, addressing climate change and reducing our dependence on foreign oil, we need to allow GNEP to proceed in a meaningful capacity. To accomplish these objectives, we need to diversify our energy supply and increase energy efficiency and conservation. Nuclear energy is a vital component to diversifying our energy supply and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. And in order for the nuclear renaissance to become a reality, we must address the spent fuel issue, which is what GNEP is all about.

Recycling spent nuclear fuel is a way to reduce by about 95 percent the vol-

ume of waste that would have to be disposed of at the Yucca Mountain repository. Recycling would also enable us to reduce the radioactive life of this material from millions of years to thousands. Whether you support nuclear energy or not, these two points should be very positive if we are going to take better care of our environment.

Since the 1970s, the United States has been falling behind the world in nuclear technology. It is vital that we fund this program at a sufficient level that allows the United States to reestablish itself as a leader in the field.

I appreciate the chairman and ranking member's work on this important issue. I would hope for some favorable comments from them. But I am going to at the end of this discussion ask for unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment in hopes that we can work it out at a later date.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlelady's concern about research for nuclear energy in the future. I also appreciate the courtesy as far as her willingness to withdraw the amendment.

The concern that the committee had is that the administration came in originally with a \$405 million request. During hearings, the administration also suggested that all \$405 million was for just research. The concern we have, and I mentioned it in my opening remarks during general debate, is contract management at the Department of Energy. And certainly it's not the fault of the gentlelady's, and I know she shares our concern, but there is a very bad track record at the Department of Energy; and the fact is they have been on a high-risk watch list for the General Accountability Office since the year 1990.

□ 1600

I would point out that the committee learned that the Department of Energy's use of technology readiness levels in the global nuclear energy partnership technology development plan does not apply readiness in the manner consistent with the recommendations in the General Accountability Office report of March of this year.

So, looking ahead as far as potentially incurring huge long-term costs on behalf of the taxpayers, we have suggested that the administration take a step back, continue to do very necessary and very vital research, but let us take all deliberate speed as opposed to a rush to judgment and oppose her amendment, and I appreciate her consideration in withdrawing it.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment, and I thank the chairman for his time and consideration of this and hope that we can work together to make GNEP a reality in a meaningful, bipartisan way so that the United States can continue to be a world leader, not just in nuclear energy but in energy independence from foreign oil.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Of the funds made available under this heading for obligation in prior years, \$149,000,000 are rescinded.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out fossil energy research and development activities, under the authority of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91), including the acquisition of interest, including defeasible and equitable interests in any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition or expansion, and for the hire of passenger motor vehicles, the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, the purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms, the reimbursement to the General Services Administration for security guard services, and for conducting inquiries, technological investigations and research concerning the extraction, processing, use, and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs (30 U.S.C. 3, 1602, and 1603), \$708,801,000 to remain available until expended of which \$166,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Clean Coal Technology", and of which transferred amounts \$108,000,000 is available to continue a multi-year project coordinated with the private sector for FutureGen, without regard to the terms and conditions applicable to clean coal technological projects, and of which the remaining \$58,000,000 is available for carbon sequestration research and development: *Provided further*, That no part of the sums herein made available shall be used for the field testing of nuclear explosives in the recovery of oil and gas: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Energy is authorized to accept fees and contributions from public and private sources, to be deposited in a contributed funds account, and prosecute projects using such fees and contributions in cooperation with other Federal, State, or private agencies or concerns: *Provided further*, That revenues and other moneys received by or for the account of the Department of Energy or otherwise generated by sale of products in connection with projects of the Department appropriated under the Fossil Energy Research and Development account may be retained by the Secretary of Energy, to be available until expended, and used only for plant construction, operation, costs, and payments to cost-sharing entities as provided in appropriate cost-sharing contracts or agreements.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. KLINE OF MINNESOTA

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 19 offered by Mr. KLINE of Minnesota:

Page 18, line 10, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$142,000,000)".

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce funding for the fossil energy research and development account in this bill by \$142 million. These funds appropriated in this account go toward research of oil, gasoline, coal and natural gas.

Funding this account at \$709 million, as in this bill, would be a 19½ percent increase over last year's appropriation amount and 20 percent higher than what was requested by the administration.

This massive increase in spending is aimed at research of oil, coal and natural gas. With energy prices rising, our research dollars are better spent by going toward alternative and diversified energy sources like nuclear, wind, solar, geothermal, hydropower and others.

You may be interested to know that some of the research projects funded by this account include: a submersible-deployed micro-drill for sampling of shallow gas deposits, ultra-lightweight cement, and an oil and gas resource assessment of the Russian Arctic.

Given the record profits being made by oil, gas and coal companies, the research of oil and gas resources of the Russian Arctic should be done and paid for by those oil companies, not by American taxpayers who have already paid for it at the pump.

A half a billion dollars in Federal funds appropriated to this account, as was the case last year, should be more than enough for the government's share of this research.

Any additional funding, and I'm talking about funding over the half a billion dollar plus what's already in last year's bill, any additional funding should be borne by the private sector.

My amendment would save the taxpayers \$142 million and remove that 20 percent increase in spending on fossil fuel research.

Solutions to our rising energy prices are not found in a massive increase in deficit spending, and we've been talking a lot about deficit spending today.

Not only does this bill have a 20 percent increase in spending for fossil fuel research, it contains a \$1.3 billion increase over last year's Energy and Water appropriation.

It seems that this appropriation bill is another example of ballooning Federal spending and increasing Federal deficits to be paid for by ever-higher taxes.

We know it's been discussed today that the Federal budget that was passed by House Democrats earlier this year does indeed include the largest tax increase in American history. It would raise taxes by at least \$217 billion. We're looking for ways to reduce spending, modest ways. That's all that these appropriation bills allow us. We can't address the massive spending that comes from entitlement spending, but we can get at sensible ways to control the spending in these discretionary funds.

My amendment is a step in the right direction. Let's save the taxpayers \$142 million and remove this huge 20 percent increase in spending for fossil fuel research.

There have been proposals to put price controls on oil companies. I vehemently oppose those, but I don't think

it's unreasonable to ask them to put some of those profits back into this essential research and development, take the burden off the taxpayers. Let's in a bipartisan way support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, and would observe for the House that, again, I am not in total disagreement with some of the assertions and points that he has made.

The fact is, there is no silver bullet as far as solving the energy problems we face today and in the future. He is absolutely correct. That is why the subcommittee has significantly increased funding for biofuels. That's why the subcommittee significantly increased funding for vehicle technology. That's why the subcommittee increased funding for other types of renewables. The gentleman references solar and wind, for example. That's why there's an increase in the hydrogen account. That's why there's an increase as far as maximization of power produced with hydroelectric facilities.

And so what we're trying to do is to strike a balance, and again getting back to my earlier comments about quantity and quality, we are concerned and spoke about it in the bill language, as well as the report language, about the fossil fuel program. I certainly, for one, absolutely believe that we need to do more on the issue of capturing CO₂, and we have done that in this bill. We need to do more as far as in sequestration of that particular gas, but we have to do it intelligently.

The fact is, a FutureGen program that has been initiated under the Department of Energy, from my perspective, took a very bad turn in the road as people continue to look at adding bells and whistles, and we had a colloquy on that particular issue earlier in the day as well.

I would point out that FutureGen, according to the committee report, needs to be refocused as an integrated gasification combined cycle plant with carbon capture and sequestration and drop the ambiguity of other, less critical research components. The committee believes that by streamlining the design to demonstrate these factors, critical goals can be reached in a more timely and fiscally prudent fashion.

So what we're trying to do in the bill is to have a broad range of new energy sources accelerated through increased funding. We have done that with fossil but have not done so blindly. We want to make sure that that money is spent wisely, given the fact that nearly 50 percent of this country's electricity is generated today by coal-powered plants. I absolutely believe that we should pursue this research and would reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TIM MURPHY).

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I rise in opposition to this amendment, although I believe it is of value in making sure we question how we spend our money.

I'm concerned that coal provides over 50 percent of our energy source in America. In this bill, there's \$108 million for FutureGen which is creating energy from coal without emissions; \$73 million for the other clean coal power initiative; and some \$376 million has been recommended for the core research and development program, much of that done at the National Energy Technology Research labs, some of which are in my district, and others in West Virginia and Oregon and around the country.

We have a 250-year supply of coal under our Nation's soil. Conversely, other parts of the world that have oil will run out long before we are out of coal.

We have to crack the code in understanding how to create electrical energy out of coal without emissions. It is a monumental and perhaps one of the greatest scientific challenges of our time.

If we're able to do this, we'll be able to create the electrical energy and the power we need to power our factories, to light our homes and run our office buildings. Without this, we will continue to be subject to the whims of countries involved with OPEC who manipulate the price of our energy every day.

A report done this year through MIT called the Future of Coal stated that we need perhaps billions to deal with this issue of finding out how to create energy out of clean coal. It is an important investment and one that we cannot lag on, one that we have to continue to work on.

I certainly encourage all of us to look at ways we can watch for any waste involved with how this money is spent on every level in appropriations; however, I ask that this be one area, where America has abundant supplies of coal, we make sure that we continue to mine our coal because it's one of the few ways that we can do so and create energy without having to worry about the whims of terrorists and OPEC states.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, most of the \$142 million proposed as an increase in the account would support research and development of carbon capture and sequestration technology. No matter what energy future one believes in, fossil fuels will play a significant role. This increase would fund the R&D that we've simply got to do to isolate the carbon and store it to reduce emissions.

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

One of the things that we have to understand that we're talking about today on this floor, we're talking about

a lot of different kinds of security. We're talking about energy security. We're also talking about economic security. But really the bottom line we're talking about is jobs in America.

No doubt that energy is a major issue in our country. Our energy dependence becomes a problem, is continuing to be a problem, but what we have to do is go about this in a way that makes sense.

And when we look at, yes, we need to look at additional research in certain areas and additional expenditures in other areas and nuclear, and the gentleman from Florida brought that point forward, the gentleman brings forward the fact that we're increasing things like that by 20 percent. That would be really good if we were spending surpluses, but in fact we're not spending from surpluses, and what we're talking about is deficit spending and what we're talking about is an economic future for our young men and women.

Because you see what we're on the floor here today trying to do. My colleagues and I are trying to save the American taxpayers some money, because we have a leadership on the other side of the aisle that's on a spending spree. They think they have surpluses that they're spending, and in fact we're not.

In fact, we've got a \$23 billion increase. We have got these "funny money" accounts where we're going to come up with the money from someplace. We all know where that money is coming from. That money is going to come from the American taxpayers because they've already gone on record to say that we're going to pass the largest tax increase in American history. And the way they're going to do that is they're going to tax the rich people.

Well, let's talk about the tax structure in this country today. For example, who are the rich people? We've got 1 percent of the top wage earners in this country already paying 33 percent of the taxes. Now, the next level up, the top 5 percent, they get to pay 54 percent of the taxes, and the top 10 percent get to pay 68 percent of the taxes.

Recently, the Tax Foundation brought forth a point that I think most of us knew, and that is, that three out of every five, that's 60 percent, of America's highest income-bracket payers are small business people. Let me repeat that. Three out of every five of the people who are in the upper bracket, which is the bracket that they want to tax, are small business people.

And what do small business people do? Well, they just do something that's extraordinarily great for America. They create jobs. In fact, they're the largest creator of jobs in this country. And what we did is back in 2003 we said, you know what, we want small businesses to create more jobs, make more economic security for our young people, and so we lowered the taxes.

And what happened? Well, something wonderful. We created 7.8 million new jobs in America. And you know what

creating 7.8 million new jobs in America did for us? Well, number one, we have the highest home ownership rate in the history of this country.

□ 1615

More people own a home today than any other time in the history of this Nation. Guess what, more people are employed than any other time in the history of our Nation.

What we have to do, the Speaker of this House stood up on the day that she was sworn in and said, we listened to the people. I don't think they were listening. If they thought the American people were saying we want more spending and more taxes, I think they misunderstood.

If the American people said anything, it is they want a government that's less, that takes less of their money, spends less of their money, lives, spends their money like government spends their money like the American people have to, they have to spend within their limits.

Yes, I will like a 2 percent increase in this and a 2 percent increase in that, but the truth of the matter is, we can't afford it. If we continue on this trend of higher taxes, bigger spending, we are going to see these job numbers begin to talk.

So when you talk about we want more energy-efficient cars, let me tell you, if we don't have anybody that can afford cars in America because they don't have jobs, then what do we need energy-efficient cars for?

Let's be sensible about our policy here. We are making a sufficient amount of commitments to many of these initiatives, but we have to do it in a commonsense way. We have to do it in a way that says, you know what, a 2 percent increase or 3 percent, maybe this program should be eliminated, because this program is not providing any dividends for the American taxpayers.

We measure, around here, what we are doing about our problem by how much money we spend on it. Quite honestly, that's how we got in the situation of these large deficits is because we keep throwing money at problems instead of standing up here on the floor of this House and debating these issues and talking about what is in the best interest of the taxpayers.

I commend the gentleman from Minnesota on his amendment and urge passage.

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

Mr. Chairman, I read a sign almost every day, they are out in hallways all over, from the Blue Dog Coalition, and as of today, it says today's U.S. national debt, \$8.807 trillion; your share, \$29,000. There's some of us all the time we have been in the House been trying to do something about that. We have been trying to bring down the deficit. We have been trying to with our own party, the Republicans, with the Democrats now in the majority, get spending reined in.

Also, in our Natural Resources Committee, as well as other committees around, we have been trying to find answers to our energy problem, because, let's face it, we're funding our enemies, people that want to see us, have damage done to our way of life, if not destroyed.

So how do we get around this energy debacle where we keep using fossil fuels that keep funding our enemies? I heard a chairman say a moment ago, there is no silver bullet. I couldn't agree more. We need every single aspect of energy, all of the alternative energies, all of the energy sources we have, that includes drilling the Outer Continental Shelf and areas where it would be safe to do so. It includes drilling in ANWR, the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve in Alaska, and here we've got \$142 million that is in issue here.

As the saying goes, \$142 million here, \$142 million there, before long, we are talking about real money. People in our hometowns, they understand, this is a lot of money, may not be to some of us up here in Washington, but, as we have seen recently, as we have seen recently the last couple of weeks in Natural Resources, people keep wanting to study things, let's study this.

We were ready to go on a biomass program. In the energy bill marked up last week, we are going to back up 10 years and have another study on that. We have these programs ready to go, and we keep wanting to back up and have more studies done.

What we really need to do is just move forward. Some of these studies, when left to the private sector, they are going to recoup their money and their profits. Let them pay for these things. They are making all these profits. Why should we use taxpayer dollars to do that?

So we have coal that if the bill becomes law that was passed out of Resources, it's going to make it harder to utilize the coal we have. All these different alternative energy sources are available, and we keep wanting to use money to study them.

What occurs to me, when I hear there is no silver bullet, is not only do I agree that there is no silver bullet solution, but I keep feeling like, because we keep appointing studies and keep wanting to spend taxpayers' hard-earned money to study things, instead of just going ahead and producing, that the silver bullet may be in the Chamber that's pointed to our Nation's collective head here.

It's time to quit studying. It's time to move forward, it's time to use money for purposes that are not those that should be done by the private sector, and then we can get back to money.

Then, lo and behold, all those folks have been saying we really don't want to raise taxes even though it looks like it's going to be the largest tax increase in American history. All those who say we don't want to raise taxes, it's this

\$142 million here, \$142 million there. Before you know it, we may even be able to lower taxes even further.

So I will encourage my colleagues, let's quit studying, let's quit spending money that could be going back to taxpayers if we are not going to need it for something more pressing, quit studying, start producing and then that silver bullet won't be aimed at our head.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, thank you to the chairman and the ranking member of this committee as we debate a very important piece of legislation in the Energy and Water appropriations bill.

I would like to talk specifically about an issue that is vitally important to literally hundreds of thousands of people in Minnesota, South Dakota, and Iowa. The Lewis and Clark Rural Water System is a unique water project that I am hopeful will receive the appropriate funding as the Energy and Water appropriations bill moves forward.

This Lewis and Clark water project, when completed, will provide safe, reliable drinking water to over 300,000 people in roughly 5,000 square miles of South Dakota, Iowa, and Minnesota. The project will move water from the Missouri River into those areas to provide safe drinking water and the ability of those communities to grow economically.

Minnesota is called the Land of 10,000 lakes. Unfortunately, they are not equally distributed. For example, in Rock County there is not a single natural lake. The lack of water has a profound impact on economic development. Businesses are reluctant to locate or expand because of the lack of reliable water.

I literally have communities that I represent that cannot permit a single new home to be built until someone moves out because their water shortages are that severe. Seventeen of the 20 local municipalities that are participating in this project, and I repeat on this and say it very carefully, have prepaid \$87 million of their local share of the expenses in order to keep inflationary costs at a minimum. Additionally, all three States involved, Minnesota, South Dakota and Iowa, have committed to prepay on the project as well.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government is the partner that's lacking. My constituents, the people of South Dakota and Iowa, clearly understand expenditures of Federal dollars for investments are not necessarily wasteful. If the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System receives its full \$35 million in requests this year, this project will be completed by 2018. However, if we are funded at the level President Bush has requested in his 2008 budget, we will not see completion until past 2051.

The 300,000 people of Minnesota, South Dakota, and Iowa can't wait that long. Previous Congresses have created a significant budget crisis. I

hear my colleagues mentioning that, and they're absolutely right. We spent at deficit records. We created a national debt that is staggering, but we cannot be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The longer we take to provide appropriate Federal funds, the more this project is going to cost, and it is already being built. It is already being prepaid, and it will produce significant economic gains for us.

I look forward to working with the chairman and ranking member to make sure this project is appropriately funded.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Before I begin, let me just say I concur with the gentleman from Minnesota on his priorities that he is setting forth, and I cannot honestly say that I am familiar with each and every aspect of the provisions that he is raising there; but from his testimony before the House right now, they seem to at least rise to the level of significance, especially when you go to the concern of making sure that people need to have adequate drinking supply. So I appreciate him coming to the floor and making that point.

I think the gentleman's point coincides with the point that I wish to make right now in support of the gentleman's amendment that is on the floor before us right now, and that is that it's incumbent upon this House and this body to set priorities. The American public asks no less of us, inasmuch as we are spending their hard-earned tax dollars. The American public has seen the misapplication of setting of priorities of this House in past administrations and past Houses in the past.

The American public has been outspoken when they saw, with regard to what happened with Katrina, and the infamous case of buying of FEMA trailers, literally thousands of them, that were then set on land and never used for their rightful purposes. The American public was outraged when they said the priorities were not appropriately spent with their tax dollars in that instance.

Likewise we were outraged when they heard about the proverbial "bridge to nowhere." Again they asked were not priorities set as to where their tax dollars go when it comes to transportation purposes.

Again, finally in the area of earmarks, and the latter point raises the earmarks. When the American public hears about the litany of earmarks that come out of both this House and Senate as well, the Cowgirl Hall of Fame and other such things, again the American public asks are priorities not set on these matters, again, with their hard-earned tax dollars.

Well, the American public spoke this last November and at least this side of the aisle heard them loud and clear. We must set appropriate priorities when it comes to the American tax dollars.

Unfortunately, unfortunately, the priorities that seem to be coming from the other side of the aisle in the majority of cases are not the appropriate priorities that the American public would set for themselves. Priority number one from the other side of the aisle is a budget which raises taxes, the largest tax increase in U.S. history upon the American family.

Priority number two from the other side of the aisle appears to be an increase in spending with little or no regard to accountability or cutting spending in any areas. We see that in this case.

When I hear the arguments made, both pro and con in this bill, I am taken aback. All this amendment simply does is to say that the American taxpayer dollars should not be there and spent to subsidize Big Oil.

We had similar language in legislation last year. I know I supported it saying that the American taxpayer, in light of oil now being sold at over \$60 a barrel, should not be forced into a situation anymore to support Big Oil in coal industries when it comes to these things through tax credits and tax cuts. I supported those, saying the American public in that regard.

But, now, today, when we have a Member, Congressman KLINE, saying let's at least rein in, let's at least set some priorities as to where our energy dollars should go, let's go to those areas, as the gentleman here said, perhaps some who support carbon capture issues; let's have some of those dollars, as a Member from the other side of the aisle says, go to renewable energy resources, whether it be wind, water or geothermal or et cetera. Let those dollars go to those areas, but let's set the priorities of those dollars to go specifically to those areas and not on extraneous purposes, as we saw in this bill.

Congressman KLINE gave a couple of examples that really just threw me when I heard them once again. The American public must really scratch their head, as I did, when they say, should we be giving, as Congressman KLINE said, given the record profits being made by oil, gas and coal, the research of oil and gas resources of the Russian Arctic should be done and paid for by those oil companies and not by American taxpayers. This amendment simply goes to make sure that occurs.

Likewise, again in the Arctic area, submersible deployed microdrill sampling, ultralight cement and oil and gas resource assessments in that area. Who should be paying for that? The American public?

We already pay for that when we go to the pump each time. Shouldn't it be the oil companies who should make it a private investment and not the American tax borrowers? This amendment simply says let's set those priorities, let's reduce spending on those areas and make sure that we have the dollars from the American public to spend on those other areas, be they renewable energy or otherwise.

□ 1630

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

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

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. JONES of Ohio) having assumed the chair, Mr. POMEROY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2764, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-199) on the resolution (H. Res. 498) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2764) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2641, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2641 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 481, notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the bill may be offered except:

Pro forma amendments offered at any point in the reading by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

An amendment by Mr. FORBES regarding a study of certain river basins;

An amendment by Mr. WYNN regarding hydrogen research;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING regarding funding for DOE Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability;

An amendment by Mr. SHADEGG regarding funding for hydropower incentives;

An amendment by Mr. PORTER regarding Yucca Mountain;

An amendment by Mr. PRICE of Georgia regarding funding for the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative;

An amendment by Mr. BURGESS regarding funding for fossil energy;

An amendment by Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico regarding funding for medical imaging;

An amendment by Mr. UPTON or Mr. TOWNS regarding funding for nuclear energy loan guarantees;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING regarding funding for DOE Departmental Administration;

An amendment by Mr. MATHESON regarding funding for contract oversight;

An amendment by Mrs. TAUSCHER regarding weapons dismantlement activities;

An amendment by Mr. UDALL of New Mexico regarding funding for weapons activities;

An amendment by Mrs. SCHMIDT regarding a prohibition on Global Nuclear Energy Partnership funds for certain nuclear waste storage;

An amendment by Mr. SPACE regarding funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission;

An amendment by Mr. NEUGEBAUER regarding funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING regarding funding for the Denali Commission;

An amendment by Ms. BERKLEY limiting use of funds for the Yucca Mountain Youth Website educational campaign;

An amendment by Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, or Ms. DELAURO limiting use of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission funds to review a particular application;

An amendment by Mr. CONAWAY regarding use of reductions made through amendments for deficit reduction;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa regarding actions to mitigate global warming;

An amendment by Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut limiting use of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission funds for certain permit actions;

An amendment by Mrs. MUSGRAVE regarding an across-the-board reduction in funding;

An amendment by Mr. PRICE of Georgia regarding an across-the-board reduction in funding, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. UPTON or Ms. HARMAN regarding use of Energy Star certified light bulbs;

An amendment by Mr. SHADEGG limiting use of funds to breach or remove hydropower dams;

An amendment by Mr. HINCHEY or Mr. WOLF limiting use of funds for designation of transmission corridors, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;