



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 19, 2007

No. 116

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIREs).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 19, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ALBIO SIREs to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Lord our God, who breathes forth Your Spirit upon this world for another day, grant us true faith—a faith vision which will hold Congress and the people of this Nation together in troublesome times and through fashionable change.

Strengthen us in optimistic hope, as once again we place our trust in You.

Renew us in steadfast love as we would be loved; for lasting values and lasting virtue rest on these three: faith, hope, and love. The greatest of these is love. For this is Your Holy Name, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS)

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 966) "An Act to enable the Department of State to respond to a critical shortage of passport processing personnel, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 96-114, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Republican Leader, appoints the following individual to the Congressional Award Board:

Adam Ruiz of Kentucky.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ESTIMATE

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, one of President Bush's most used justification for the war in Iraq has been that it is central to winning the war on terror, but the National Intelligence Estimate tells a completely different story.

Al Qaeda has only gained strength since the United States invasion of Iraq in March of 2003, and al Qaeda has regenerated in Pakistan along its bor-

der with Afghanistan, a reality that may have something to do with the fact that the great majority of our troops and resources are fighting an ill-conceived war in Iraq instead of finishing the job we started in Afghanistan.

The sad truth is that when our Nation undertook Operation Enduring Freedom after the horrific attacks of 9/11, we had al Qaeda on the run. We had them on the verge of being dismantled.

President Bush decided to alter our mission at a critical time and send our brave men and women to Iraq that had nothing to do with 9/11, to fight a war that has been a detriment to the war on terror.

President Bush had al Qaeda on the ropes. He threw them a life preserver. They were weak, and today they're stronger, according to the report.

So to President Bush, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who want to stay the course, I simply ask why? Why would we want to continue a war that the American people want to end?

THE TERRORISTS DO NOT WANT PEACE

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the terrorists we face today are the same enemies that bombed our Marines in Beirut, Lebanon, bombed the World Trade Centers in 1993, attacked Khobar Towers in 1996, bombed our embassy in Africa in 1997. This enemy values death over life and seeks not to negotiate but to war against us.

These fanatics, in the name of religion, with a doctrine of hate, preach death to the United States.

On September 11, the terrorists brought the fight to us. Now Iraq is the centerpiece of the war on terror, and so is Afghanistan. We cannot give ground to this homicidal enemy because this

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H8123

will only encourage more attacks. The resulting consequences are disaster, destruction and defeat.

Today we find ourselves in a global struggle. We have been attacked over and over again by these radicals.

War, no one wants war. But war will not end just because we quit, nor because we are weary of war, nor because we desire peace. The enemy will continue this war against us, whether we are in the fight or not. They do not want peace. There can be no peace until we stop them.

And that's just the way it is.

TRI-CAUCUS HEALTH DISPARITIES SUMMIT

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss the Fifth Annual Congressional Tri-Caucus Minority Health Summit which will be held this week-end in San Diego.

Hosted by the Community Clinic Association of Los Angeles County, the event is an opportunity for Members of Congress to learn from health experts, grass roots advocates and innovative solutions and address health disparities in communities of color.

I'm proud that 11 Members from the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the Black Caucus and Asian Caucus will join me and health advocates in San Diego. We're prepared to discuss issues such as expanding the SCHIP program, HIV and AIDS, homelessness, foster care, border health and veterans care, along with that discussing chronic illnesses that face many communities of color that are low income and disadvantaged.

That's why my Tri-Caucus colleagues and I recently introduced H.R. 3014, the Health Equity and Accountability Act, a comprehensive bipartisan legislation which addresses health care disparities.

As Chair of the Hispanic Caucus Task Force on Health and the Environment, I look forward to this event and bringing a new direction to this Congress.

HOSPITAL INFECTION RATES

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

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, here are some grim statistics.

As of today, 1,095,890 cases, 49,320 deaths, and a cost of \$27,397,260,282. This is not a war. These are infections that people pick up in hospitals, and these are based upon CDC estimates of 90,000 deaths per year. But a more recent study came from the Association for Professionals in Infection Control, say the numbers can be as high as 119,000 deaths and 12 million cases per year.

When will we start acting to make sure that we have all hospitals act, as

so many have done, to eliminate infections from hospitals?

I ask my colleagues to cosponsor and to help pass H.R. 1174, the Healthy Hospitals Act. It is time we stop wasting health care dollars, health insurance dollars and wasting lives and start saving lives in hospitals the way so many hospitals have been able to do. Please, let's get moving to make our hospitals healthier.

CARBON MONOXIDE IN MEAT

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, carbon monoxide added to meat packaging is deceptive for consumers. Blasting meat with carbon monoxide makes spoiled meat appear to be red, wholesome, healthy when its really dangerous to eat.

Although it is well known that consumers rely heavily on color to evaluate the freshness of meat, the FDA has not required the use of carbon monoxide in the packaging of meat to be labeled.

Consumers, therefore, have no way of knowing whether the meat has been treated, and they can no longer rely on color to judge the freshness and safety of treated meat.

Here's meat we left out for 27 hours. The top's been treated with carbon monoxide, the bottom has not. The bottom is brown and nasty. The top looks fresh and wholesome. Eat either one of these packages of meat and you'll become very ill.

For this reason, I will today introduce the Carbon Monoxide Treated Foods Safe Handling, Labeling and Consumer Protection Act. This legislation is needed to help prevent consumer deception and serious risk to our public health.

Given the recent events that have highlighted food safety risks to public health, the Carbon Monoxide Treated Meat Safe Handling, Labeling and Consumer Protection Act takes the important step in helping inform and empower consumers to ensure their food is safe and wholesome.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY AND WASTE

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, we hear and read about so many examples of waste by the Federal bureaucracy that almost nothing shocks or surprises us anymore. However, the Washington Post reported yesterday on a really ridiculous waste of money.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency paid \$24 million for 112,000 tons of ice after Hurricane Katrina. 42,000 tons were stored for future use, and FEMA paid \$12.5 million in storage

fees. Now, all this unused ice is going to be thrown away. But here is the really ridiculous part.

FEMA is going to pay \$3.4 million, \$3,400,000 to melt the ice. It's over 90 degrees outside. The Department of Homeland Security, of which FEMA is a part, has 171,000 employees. A first-grader could melt ice. But the Federal Government is going to pay \$3,400,000 to have it done.

No wonder the Federal Government is almost \$9 trillion in debt. If we ever created a Hall of Fame of government waste, FEMA should be the first admission.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today in full support of H.R. 3043, the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2008. By bringing this bill to the House floor, we demonstrate again the hard work of the Democratic majority to reverse the trend of critical cuts to programs that improve the lives of all Americans.

The bill includes an additional \$750 million for the National Institutes of Health, another \$400 million for the Social Security Administration to address the backlog of disability cases and reviews and, most dramatically, \$2 billion additionally to improve the requirements of No Child Left Behind.

Additionally, Head Start will get \$75 million in additional funding under this bill. But when you look at it, in real dollar terms, that's actually a decrease. Head Start is widely recognized as one of our most productive education programs. For every dollar that we spend on Head Start we bring in \$9 in future benefits in taxes. So the benefits of Head Start do not end just with the preparation for school.

And I understand there are budgetary constraints but, Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the conference committee we can actually put real money into Head Start.

THE CAPTURE OF MASHHADANI

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to our troops for capturing the highest ranking Iraqi in al Qaeda's leadership. Mashhadani, known to be the most senior Iraqi in al Qaeda leadership, operated as chief communicator between his terrorists and senior al Qaeda leaders, including bin Laden and Zawahiri.

This arrest further confirms the connection between al Qaeda and Iraq and

the global terrorism network. I believe this news is significant in proving that the al Qaeda our troops are fighting in Iraq is inseparable in the front on the global war on terrorism.

Our troops are fighting to protect American families. Stopping the terrorists in Iraq, which Zawahiri and bin Laden have identified as the central front in the global war on terrorism, is vital to this effort. Our troops' courageous efforts in Iraq are working, and we must support our brave men and women in uniform to defeat this enemy who promotes mass murder.

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

COMMEMORATING CJ MARTIN'S BIRTHDAY AND IN SUPPORT OF CJ'S HOME PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the birthday of CJ Martin. I say commemorate because he would celebrate his fourth birthday tomorrow. Instead, CJ was taken from his family and our community by a killer F-3 tornado that struck his great grandmother's home in Eastbrook manufactured housing community.

CJ and the other 24 victims might have been saved had they only had a warning that they needed to protect themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I was the sheriff of Vanderburgh County when this tornado hit. I saw firsthand the devastation that it caused and what severe weather can bring to the families and the communities that they touch. That experience resulted in my introduction of CJ's Home Protection Act, H.R. 2787.

The bill simply requires manufactured homes to come equipped with life-saving NOAA weather radios. Like a smoke detector, these inexpensive devices can provide families with the warning they need to take action and protect themselves.

Today, as we remember CJ's birthday, I encourage my colleagues to honor his life by cosponsoring this important public safety measure.

□ 1015

BOYD AND OLDHAM COUNTY NAMED SCHOOLS TO WATCH

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the academic achievements of two schools in Kentucky's Fourth District. Boyd County Middle School in Ashland and North Oldham Middle School in Goshen were recently recognized by the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform as "Schools to Watch."

The National Forum selected 59 schools nationwide to receive this prestigious honor. Schools were chosen based on three criteria: academic excellence, responsiveness to the needs and interests of young adolescents, and commitment to helping all students achieve at a high level.

Recently, I had the opportunity to meet with educators from these schools during their visit to Washington, DC. I was impressed by the commitment of these educators. And though they face innumerable challenges in their classrooms, they are dedicated to providing each student with the highest quality education possible. I am proud to know that these exceptional teachers are educating future generations of Kentuckians. I applaud their hard work and thank them for their leadership, enthusiasm, and dedication.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1145

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COHEN) at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON H.R. 3093, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND JUSTICE, AND SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2008

Mr. MOLLOHAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-240) on the bill (H.R. 3093) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

RECOGNIZING THE MARINES OF COMPANY M ON THEIR 25TH ANNUAL REUNION

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 541) recognizing the Marines of Company M (or "Mike Company") of the 3rd Battalion, 7th Regiment, 1st Marine Division on the occasion of their 25th Annual Reunion, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 541

Whereas the Marines of Company M (or "Mike Company") of the 3rd Battalion, 7th Regiment, 1st Marine Division served honorably and heroically in the Republic of Vietnam from July 1965 to October 1970 in defense of freedom, liberty, and political self-determination for the South Vietnamese people;

Whereas, during this period of more than five years, 137 Marines of Mike Company were killed in action and more than 1,000 were wounded in action;

Whereas, in recognition of its outstanding service, numerous unit awards were bestowed upon Mike Company, including—

- (1) Presidential Unit Citation Streamer with two Bronze Stars;
- (2) Navy Unit Commendation Streamer;
- (3) Meritorious Unit Commendation Streamer with two Bronze Stars;
- (4) National Defense Service Streamer;
- (5) Vietnam Service Streamer with two Silver Stars and three Bronze Stars;
- (6) Vietnam Cross of Gallantry with Palm Streamer; and
- (7) Vietnam Meritorious Unit Citation Civil Actions Streamer;

Whereas the Marines of Mike Company have formed the Mike 3/7 Vietnam Association to honor the memories of their fallen comrades, celebrate the lives of their surviving comrades, express profound appreciation to their families and loved ones, recognize their monumental sacrifices and achievements, and immortalize their contribution to the Marine Corps legacy of courage, patriotism, and military excellence for the edification of, and emulation by, future generations;

Whereas, in pursuit of this goal, the Marines of Mike Company, along with their families, friends, and loved ones, decided to hold an annual reunion, with the first reunion having taken place on November 10, 1983, the 208th birthday of the Marine Corps; and

Whereas Americans owe a debt of gratitude to the Marines of Mike Company for their selfless dedication to duty and their admirable display of courage under fire: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives, on behalf of a grateful nation, recognizes and commends the Marines of Company M (or "Mike Company") of the 3rd Battalion, 7th Regiment, 1st Marine Division on the occasion of their 25th Annual Reunion, which is being held this year in the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 955(b)NOTE), and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the National Council on the Arts:

Ms. MCCOLLUM, Minnesota

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE DANA ROHRABACHER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Alberto Sandoval, Deputy District Director, Office of the Honorable DANA ROHRABACHER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 6, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Superior Court of Orange County, California, for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

ALBERTO SANDOVAL,
Deputy District Director.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE DANA ROHRABACHER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Kathleen Hollingsworth, District Director, Office of the Honorable DANA ROHRABACHER, Member of Congress:

JULY 6, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Superior Court of Orange County, California, for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN HOLLINGSWORTH,
District Director.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 547 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3043.

□ 1148

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3043) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related

agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mrs. TAUSCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on the legislative day of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, amendment No. 31 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 125, line 2.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, as we begin this debate today, I think I ought to take just a moment to explain to the Members of the House where we stand. We have, I believe, 19 amendments still pending to this bill. Four of those amendments will take at least one-half hour and perhaps significantly longer. When you add the slippage time to those debate minutes, if every Member exercises his or her right to offer the amendments that are filed, we could be here for another 8 hours on this bill.

I know Members are trying to catch their planes. I will try to keep my remarks as brief as possible; I would appreciate it if everyone else would do the same. And if there are those Members who could be persuaded to forgo offering an amendment or two, that would be helpful also in terms of my Members who are trying to catch their planes. I think that by now we are well aware of what people's philosophical ideas are about this bill, and I would appreciate it if Members could extend enough courtesy to their colleagues so that our colleagues, especially those on the west coast, will be able to make their planes without staying in town overnight.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WALSH of New York. I certainly would like to echo his sentiments regarding the time available to us to complete the bill and the ability of Members to get home.

Let me just offer a modest proposal. There is a unanimous consent request, but I just ask that the authors consider the possibility that there are four across-the-board cuts proposed for the bill different percentage amounts and there is 2 hours allocated for that debate.

Seemingly, 1 hour's worth of debate to determine whether or not there was a majority of votes in the Chamber to cut this bill across the board by 0.25 percent or 4.6 percent, seemingly 1 hour would be enough time to debate as opposed to 2. So that decision has been made, but as the chairman suggested, people may think differently as we move on through the debate about the possibility of spending less time debating those same issues.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WESTMORELAND
Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment, and I will ask the Clerk to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WESTMORELAND:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available under this Act may be used by the Department of Education to publish or process the Free Application for Federal Student Aid in a language other than English.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Chairman, when a student decides to go to college, many families gather all their financial records and sit down to fill out the free application for Federal Student Aid, or the FISA, form.

To be eligible to receive Federal student aid, a student must meet certain eligibility requirements. Importantly, one of those requirements is that the student be a U.S. citizen or eligible noncitizen, basically, a legal permanent resident. They also have to have a high school diploma or a GED and be enrolled or accepted at a school that participates in the Federal Student Loan Aid program.

Given these requirements, it would be expected that a citizen or legal permanent resident that is a high school graduate or GED holder and has been accepted as a student at an institution of higher education would be able to complete the FISA in English; however, the U.S. Department of Education clearly does not think so. I have a higher opinion of our education system than that, and I believe a student that meets these eligibility requirements will be proficient enough in English to complete this form in English.

When I learned that this free Federal student application form is available for completion in either English or Spanish, I became concerned that others don't share my opinion of the capabilities of our education system. Even more disturbing is the presumption that the Federal Government would be subsidizing the college education of an individual that does not have the proficiency in English to fill out the form to get free Federal assistance.

So, colleagues, my amendment is simple. It would prevent the Department of Education from providing or

processing the free application for student loan assistance form in any language other than English. With the requirements for obtaining student assistance, it is not an imposition to ensure that our tax dollars go to students that are clearly ready to receive and achieve a college education. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I wonder how any of us would like to have our future decided by people we have never met or never even seen on the basis of those people having a 10-minute conversation without our being present. I don't think any of us would like that very much, and yet that is what the gentleman is asking us to do.

The gentleman, in effect, is asking us to pass sentence on 150,000 students who applied for student financial assistance last year using the Spanish version of the application form. Those students would automatically be denied financial aid, with no demonstrable proof that they were illegal aliens, only because they felt more comfortable applying in Spanish.

Now, I want every American—I want every person who comes to this country to learn English. I hope our values are the cement that holds this country together, but I think that English is a great tool to strengthen that cement. But I really would simply suggest that, first of all, this is the wrong venue.

The Appropriations Committee has held no hearings on this matter. So far as I know, the gentleman has held no hearings on this matter. He may have very strong opinions; I do, too. But both of our opinions may be irrelevant when we discover what the facts are. The fact is, if something like this is going to happen, if we are going to make decisions that affect people's career possibilities just for the heck of it, it would be nice if we had thought about it rather than jumped onto the nearest slogan masquerading as an amendment.

So I would strongly urge that this House show a sense of fairness and a sense of restraint and decline to support the gentleman's amendment, at least until we have had hearings in the proper committee. That is the way we would do things if we are concerned with due process, if we are concerned with maximizing fairness rather than scoring political points.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin withdraw his reservation?

Mr. OBEY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I seek the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I would hope that all of our colleagues would oppose this amendment.

The student loan application that is in question here, the criticism of it and the concern with it is not because it is printed in Spanish or English. The real criticism is that it is so complicated that families have an incredibly difficult time in filling out this form. Our committee has been working, Mr. EMANUEL and others have been working, to try to simplify this form to make it useful.

□ 1200

This form has more questions than if you went to the World Bank to get a loan. But to now suggest that a student may be denied access to a loan and the family may be denied access to financial support for that education solely on the basis of whether or not the parents speak English, they fill out the form right and whether or not the form is printed in Spanish, you know the old saying, I'm here from the Federal Government; I'm here to help you. This has nothing to do with the parents' status. Nothing to do with the status. It is a question of whether or not we make some effort to reach out to these individuals to make it easier for them to fill out the forms that are necessary for their young people, their children to go on to college and have the financial resources to do that. The question of whether it's printed in Spanish or not is simply now arbitrary. And as would they, if they don't fill out the form correctly, if they have to do it with their child or somebody else trying to interpret the questions, interpret the answers to them, I think that's incredibly unfair to people who are here in this country. They're here legally, and they don't happen to speak English and they made need this assistance.

What we know about people trying to learn English is that in every city, in every part of this country, where there are classes to teach English, they're oversubscribed, they have waiting lists because these people understand that English is the language of this country. It's the currency of the country, it's the means by which you get ahead in this country, and that's why they want their children to learn English. To now come along and say that we're going to make it more difficult, based upon this characteristic that has nothing to do with your qualifications for the financial assistance, with the qualifications of your child to go to school, what they've accomplished with their lives, I think is outrageous and arbitrary.

I'd like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. As an educator and a classroom teacher and as a principal of a public school, working with youngsters who come from different language background, I find the amendment quite counterproductive and a barrier. Many parents feel embarrassed that they can't help their youngsters, and

this would only enhance that. If in our system that we're looking to encourage children to go to school and pursue higher education, this would be but a barrier. And I'm sure that you don't want youngsters to be not going to public education system and applying for these kinds of assistance.

I have a thought though. And we have Fortune 500 companies in this country. And I just bought a phone. And in the instruction manuals, the instructions are not only in English but it's also in Spanish, French and German. There must be a reason why Fortune 500s do this. It's about customer satisfaction. And if this government is about satisfying those who are here in this country, who are citizens, who are taxpayers then we should be also looking at this kind of mentality.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I think the gentleman makes a point. This is about American citizens who are here who are paying taxes, whose children have done well enough to go on to college. They're seeking the financial resources to do that. They may not speak English. And this is a service that we provide to those individuals so that they can accurately fill out a form. They can understand the form, they can understand the liabilities that they're taking on. They can understand the qualifications.

To arbitrarily come along and tell one group of citizens, based upon this question of whether or not they speak English, they will be able to have the same access to these resources as others or not seems to me to be very unfair, very un-American. It promotes a set of values that really aren't consistent with the values in this country. And it really is about whether or not the Federal Government is in the business of looking at the people they're trying to serve as customers, people who should be served.

I would hope that we would oppose this amendment. We continue to struggle to try to make this form comprehensible to those who speak English and understand English. And I think to make it more difficult now for those who don't is a very poor service to that part of American society. And I would urge opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Reclaiming my time, I wondered how the other side would answer to this, and quite interesting answers. First of all, this doesn't have anything to do with K-12. And as far as you buying your phone, Mr. Chairman, as far as somebody buying a phone that's got instructions in three or four different languages, they may be sold in different countries. I don't have any idea. But the Federal Government didn't buy that phone for you to use.

Now, here's the thing. We're talking about student aid, free aid going to someone who is fixing to go to college that is a legal resident here, either a citizen or a legal resident. All we're

saying is if you're going to ask the American taxpayers to pay for your financial assistance, that you should be proficient enough in the language of this country to fill out the application. Now, you don't have to be a rocket scientist to figure that out. And we can throw all these other little things in there about the people that won't get to apply and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. It doesn't matter.

All this amendment says is if you're going to ask the Federal Government to help with financial aid for your college education that we hope you succeed in, and that we want you to excel in, that you can at least speak the language of this country. That's all we're saying.

This is a very simple amendment. There's been so much rhetoric over there. I guess, you know, evidently, they're taking this for something that it's not. Very simple, Mr. Chairman. Very, very simple. Do we want to make sure that our taxpayers' dollars go to students who are legal citizens of this country, who have a GED or a high school education, that are applying for financial aid to go to a college in this country to be proficient enough in English to fill the application out in English? It's very simple.

I won't belabor this. And I know the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is trying to get as many of these amendments out of the way as you can. But I certainly hope that my colleagues, and especially all the colleagues who are interested in protecting the hard taxpayers' dollars of this country, and who are interested in getting as many students financial aid that need it, that have the best opportunity to go forward and succeed in their college education and spend the money wisely, that they would support this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WELCH of Vermont) 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.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF
GEORGIA

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

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

TITLE VI

ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to take any action to finalize (or otherwise implement) provisions contained in the proposed rule published on May 3, 2007, on pages 24680 through 25135 of volume 72, Federal Register, insofar as such provisions propose—

(1) to alter payments for services under the hospital inpatient prospective payment system under section 1886(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C 1395ww(d)) based on use of a Medicare severity diagnosis related group (MS-DRG) system; or

(2) to implement a prospective behavioral offset in response to the implementation of such a Medicare Severity Diagnosis Related Group (MS-DRG) system for purposes of such hospital inpatient prospective payment system.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleagues and friends, PETER WELCH of Vermont and JERRY WELLER from Illinois, for joining me in offering this important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, hospitals need more than just 2 months to change their coding system. It's too much too soon. CMS needs to give them the time they need. In addition, we must not allow CMS to implement this behavior offset.

I've talked to hospitals in my district. They're doing everything right when it comes to coding and charging Medicare. This cut will punish the hospital before they've done anything wrong. 269 Members of the House feel the same way.

Mr. WELLER and I sent a letter to CMS on June 12, along with 267 of our colleagues and 63 Senators urging CMS not to make this \$24 billion cut. Hospitals do not deserve a \$24 billion cut. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment and help our hospitals.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. And first let me thank my colleagues, JOHN LEWIS, PETER WELCH, for

the opportunity to join in bipartisan sponsorship of this amendment.

This amendment prevents the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services from cutting \$24 billion in funding for our local hospitals, funding that's used to provide care to seniors disabled under Medicare. In my district alone this would mean a loss of \$60 million in reimbursement for my local hospitals, having a devastating effect on the quality of care.

A key misstep in the proposed rule is the 2.4 percent so-called behavior offset payment cut. CMS proposed this cut to eliminate what the agency has inaccurately claimed will be the effect of greater use of coding as hospitals move to a new system. These extreme cuts in reimbursements, based on speculation rather than fact, will impose an added burden on all hospitals.

Earlier this year my friend and colleague JOHN LEWIS and I circulated a letter in opposition to these Draconian cuts. The response was overwhelming, with 269 Members of this House going on the record against this devastating cut to our local hospitals. This is overwhelming bipartisan opposition to this bad policy proposed by CMS.

Mr. Chairman, I will include this letter in the RECORD in support of this amendment.

The amendment also prohibits CMS from prospectively applying any behavioral offset in fiscal year 2008, ensuring that any adjustments made for coding changes will be based on the actual experiences of the hospital, not mere conjecture.

I ask my colleagues to join us in bipartisan support of this effort to prohibit the use of any funds to implement these Draconian provisions of the IPPS rule that will place hospitals under undue financial burden, compromising the quality of care our constituents deserve.

In order to prevent these local hospitals and protect our constituents, I ask my colleagues to vote in a bipartisan "yes."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, June 12, 2007.

Re CMS Proposed Inpatient Prospective Payment Rule

Ms. LESLIE V. NORWALK, Esquire,
Acting Administrator, Centers for Medicare and
Medicaid Services (CMS), Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. NORWALK: We write to express our strong opposition to two provisions in the proposed Inpatient Prospective Payment System (IPPS) regulation. We respectfully request that these provisions be excluded from the final regulation.

The first provision would impose a 2.4 percent cut to all operating and capital payments for inpatient hospital services for Medicare patients based on the misguided premise of a so-called "behavioral offset." This unwarranted proposal would result in payment reductions for hospital services in both FY08 and FY09, cutting \$24 billion dollars in operating and capital payments over the next five years.

The second proposal would reduce payments to hospitals in urban areas for capital-related costs for inpatient hospital services, cutting payments by nearly \$1 billion over the next five years. We urge you to eliminate

both provisions when the final regulation is published.

Please allow us to further explain our strong objection to these changes:

1. Cuts due to a "Behavioral Offset." The suggestion to cut hospital operating and capital payments is based on the suggested adoption of a classification system called Medicare Severity Diagnosis-Related Groups (MS-DRGs). This change is grounded on the belief that with the implementation of the MS-DRGs, hospitals would change coding practices, resulting in higher payments. Not even in the initial years of the IPPS was coding change found to be of the magnitude of CMS's proposed FY08 and FY09 cuts. MS-DRGs are simply a refinement of a classification system that hospitals have been using for 23 years. Hospitals are already experts in coding for payment; they have little ability to change their classification and coding practices.

The rationale for the reduction is also based on the transition of hospitals in Maryland to a completely new type coding system called All Patient Refined DRGs (APR-DRGs). We have concerns with the methodology of reaching this conclusion. Maryland's hospitals are paid under a state rate-setting system where an incentive to code accurately did not significantly affect what a hospital was paid. The classification system recently adopted by Maryland is much more complicated than what CMS is proposing and changed the coding incentives for Maryland hospitals. Generalizing the Maryland experience to the rest of the nation's hospitals is an "apples-to-oranges" comparison.

CMS is not mandated by law to impose a behavioral offset in the IPPS regulation, yet has chosen to do so. There is no precedent in other payment systems for making a prospective adjustment of this magnitude—without any empirical evidence of actual and measurable changes in coding. While CMS has, on occasion, made adjustments for coding in implementing new payment systems, these changes generally have been made based on actual experience. When implementing a new physician fee schedule payment system in 1992, CMS (then the Health Care Financing Administration) imposed a behavioral offset on physician services, primarily to offset predicted increases in the volume of services. We later learned that the offset was much higher than was necessary, and the reduction was never returned to the physicians adversely affected by those cuts.

2. Cuts to Capital-Related Payments. For years, the Medicare program has paid for its share of the capital-related costs of inpatient hospital services. The proposed rule would freeze capital payments for all hospitals in urban areas and would eliminate additional capital payments made to large hospitals in urban areas. Taken together, these cuts would amount to nearly \$1 billion over the next five years.

These changes in capital payments would make it much more difficult for hospitals to purchase advanced technology and equipment and could have the effect of slowing clinical innovation in the hospitals most likely to conduct cutting edge research. Additionally, such a reduction could slow the adoption of much needed health information technology. Hospitals make long-term commitments to capital acquisitions. This proposal amounts to pulling the rug out from under their financial obligations to maintain and improve their physical facilities for patients.

Congress recently opposed a component of the administration's fiscal year 2008 budget proposal that would have significantly reduced hospital payments. As you know, both the FY08 House and Senate budget resolu-

tions reinforced this sentiment by rejecting those cuts. The administration's attempt to achieve payment reductions of this magnitude through the regulatory process is equally unacceptable. We believe this action circumvents Congress' intent that hospital services for Medicare patients not be reduced.

In closing, we would like to reiterate our belief that CMS's decision could serve to jeopardize hospitals' ability to continue to care for patients. CMS's behavioral offset is unnecessary, and will result in devastating cuts to hospital services for our constituents.

CMS's proposal to cut capital-related payments would create significant financial difficulties for many of our most innovative hospitals. We strongly support the elimination of these provisions from your final regulation.

Both CMS and Members of Congress share the goal of serving the American public and helping those most in need. We hope that you will give strong consideration to the bipartisan concerns outlined in this letter.

Sincerely,
Signed by 269 Members of the House of Representatives.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COSIGNERS OF THE CMS PROPOSED INPATIENT PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT RULE LETTER

Member	State
1. John Lewis	(GA)
2. Jerry Weller	(IL)
3. Neil Abercrombie	(HI)
4. Gary L. Ackerman	(NY)
5. Robert Aderholt	(AL)
6. Rodney Alexander	(LA)
7. Tom Allen	(ME)
8. Jason Altmire	(PA)
9. Robert E. Andrews	(NJ)
10. Michael Arcuri	(NY)
11. Joe Baca	(CA)
12. Spencer Bachus	(AL)
13. Tammy Baldwin	(WI)
14. John Barrow	(GA)
15. Shelley Berkley	(NV)
16. Marion Berry	(AR)
17. Judy Biggert	(IL)
18. Brian P. Bilbray	(CA)
19. Sanford Bishop	(GA)
20. Timothy H. Bishop	(NY)
21. Rob Bishop	(UT)
22. Marsha Blackburn	(TN)
23. Earl Blumenuer	(OR)
24. Jo Bonner	(AL)
25. Mary Bono	(CA)
26. John Boozman	(AR)
27. Leonard Boswell	(IA)
28. Rick Boucher	(VA)
29. Charles Boustany, Jr.	(LA)
30. Nancy Bayda	(KS)
31. Robert A. Brady	(PA)
32. Kevin Brady	(TX)
33. Bruce Braley	(IA)
34. G.K. Butterfield	(NC)
35. Steve Buyer	(IN)
36. Michael Capuano	(MA)
37. Dennis Cardoza	(CA)
38. Russ Carnahan	(MO)
39. Christopher Carney	(PA)
40. Julia Carson	(IN)
41. John Carter	(TX)
42. Mike Castle	(DE)
43. Ben Chandler	(KY)
44. Carolyn Cheeks Kilpatrick	(MI)
45. Yvette Clarke	(NY)
46. Howard Coble	(NC)
47. Steve Cohen	(TN)
48. John Conyers	(MI)
49. Jerry F. Costello	(IL)
50. Joe Courtney	(CT)
51. Joe Crowley	(NY)
52. Henry Cuellar	(TX)
53. Elijah Cummings	(MD)
54. Susan Davis	(CA)
55. Geoff Davis	(KY)
56. Lincoln Davis	(TN)
57. Danny Davis	(IL)
58. David Davis	(TN)
59. William D. Delahunt	(MA)
60. Rosa DeLauro	(CT)
61. Charles W. Dent	(PA)
62. Norman D. Dicks	(WA)
63. Lloyd Doggett	(TX)
64. Joe Donnelly	(IN)
65. Michael Doyle	(PA)
66. John J. Duncan, Jr.	(TN)
67. Chet Edwards	(TX)
68. Vernon J. Ehlers	(MI)
69. Keith Ellison	(MN)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COSIGNERS OF THE CMS PROPOSED INPATIENT PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT RULE LETTER—Continued

Member	State
70. Jo Ann Emerson	(MO)
71. Eliot Engel	(NY)
72. Phil English	(PA)
73. Bob Etheridge	(NC)
74. Terry Everett	(AL)
75. Mary Fallin	(OK)
76. Sam Farr	(CA)
77. Chaka Fattah	(PA)
78. Mike Ferguson	(NJ)
79. Bob Filner	(CA)
80. Randy Forbes	(VA)
81. Luis Fortuno	(PR)
82. Vito Fossella	(NY)
83. Barney Frank	(MA)
84. Rodney Frelinghuysen	(NJ)
85. Scott Garrett	(NJ)
86. Jim Gerlach	(PA)
87. Gabrielle Giffords	(AZ)
88. Kristen Gillibrand	(NY)
89. Paul E. Gillmor	(OH)
90. Phil Gingrey	(GA)
91. Charles Gonzalez	(TX)
92. Virgil Goode	(VA)
93. Bart Gordon	(TN)
94. Sam Graves	(MO)
95. Gene Green	(TX)
96. Al Green	(TX)
97. Raul Grijalva	(AZ)
98. John Hall	(NY)
99. Phil Hare	(IL)
100. Robin Hayes	(NC)
101. Dean Heller	(NV)
102. Stephanie Herseth Sandlin	(SD)
103. Brian Higgins	(NY)
104. Baron Hill	(IN)
105. Maurice Hinchey	(NY)
106. Mazie Hirono	(HI)
107. David Hobson	(OH)
108. Paul Hodes	(NH)
109. Tim Holden	(PA)
110. Eleanor Holmes Norton	(DC)
111. Rush Holt	(NJ)
112. Michael M. Honda	(CA)
113. Darlene Hooley	(OR)
114. Jay Inslee	(WA)
115. Steve Israel	(NY)
116. Darrell Issa	(CA)
117. Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.	(IL)
118. Sheila Jackson-Lee	(TX)
119. William Jefferson	(LA)
120. Bobby Jindal	(LA)
121. Henry C. "Hank" Johnson	(GA)
122. Timothy V. Johnson	(IL)
123. Eddie Bernice Johnson	(TX)
124. Walter Jones	(NC)
125. Steve Kagen	(WI)
126. Paul E. Kanjorski	(PA)
127. Marcy Kaptur	(OH)
128. Dale E. Kildee	(MI)
129. Peter King	(NY)
130. Ron Klein	(FL)
131. John Kline	(MN)
132. Dennis Kucinich	(OH)
133. John R. Kuhl	(NY)
134. Ray LaHood	(IL)
135. James R. Langevin	(RI)
136. Rick Larsen	(WA)
137. John Larson	(CT)
138. Tom Latham	(IA)
139. Barbara Lee	(CA)
140. Sander Levin	(MI)
141. Ron Lewis	(KY)
142. Frank LoBiondo	(NJ)
143. Dave Lofgren	(IA)
144. Zoe Lofgren	(CA)
145. Nita Lowey	(NY)
146. Frank Lucas	(OK)
147. Stephen Lynch	(MA)
148. Tim Mahoney	(FL)
149. Carolyn B. Maloney	(NY)
150. Donald A. Manzullo	(IL)
151. Edward J. Markey	(MA)
152. Jim Marshall	(GA)
153. Jim Matheson	(UT)
154. Doris Matsui	(CA)
155. Carolyn McCarthy	(NY)
156. Michael McCaul	(TX)
157. Betty McCollum	(MN)
158. Thaddeus McCotter	(MI)
159. Jim McDermott	(WA)
160. Jim McGovern	(MA)
161. John M. McHugh	(NY)
162. Mike McIntyre	(NC)
163. Cathy McMorris Rodgers	(WA)
164. Jerry F. McMorris	(CA)
165. Michael McNulty	(NY)
166. Gregory W. Meeks	(NY)
167. Charlie Melancon	(LA)
168. Michael Michaud	(ME)
169. Brad Miller	(NC)
170. Harry Mitchell	(AZ)
171. Alan Mollohan	(WV)
172. Dennis Moore	(KS)
173. Gwen Moore	(WI)
174. Shelley Moore Capito	(WV)
175. James Moran	(VA)
176. Christopher Murphy	(CT)
177. Patrick Murphy	(PA)
178. Tim Murphy	(PA)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COSIGNERS OF THE CMS
PROPOSED INPATIENT PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT RULE
LETTER—Continued

Member	State
179. John P. Murtha	(PA)
180. Jerrold Nadler	(NY)
181. Grace Napolitano	(CA)
182. Richard Neal	(MA)
183. James Oberstar	(MN)
184. John W. Oliver	(MA)
185. Solomon P. Ortiz	(TX)
186. Bill Pascrell	(NJ)
187. Ed Pastor	(AZ)
188. Ron Paul	(TX)
189. Donald Payne	(NJ)
190. Steve Pearce	(NM)
191. Ed Perlmutter	(CO)
192. Collin Peterson	(MN)
193. John Peterson	(WI)
194. Thomas Petri	(VA)
195. Joseph Pitts	(PA)
196. Todd Russell Platts	(PA)
197. Ted Poe	(TX)
198. Jon Porter	(NV)
199. Tom Price	(GA)
200. David Price	(NC)
201. Deborah Pryce	(OH)
202. George Radanovich	(CA)
203. Nick J. Rahall, III	(WV)
204. Jim Ramstad	(MN)
205. Denny Rehberg	(MT)
206. Dave Reichert	(WA)
207. Rick Renzi	(AZ)
208. Silvestre Reyes	(TX)
209. Tom Reynolds	(NV)
210. Ciro Rodriguez	(TX)
211. Mike Rogers	(AL)
212. Harold Rogers	(KY)
213. Dana Rohrabacher	(CA)
214. Peter Roskam	(IL)
215. Mike Ross	(AR)
216. Steve Rothman	(NJ)
217. Lucille Roybal-Allard	(CA)
218. Bobby Rush	(IL)
219. Tim Ryan	(OH)
220. John T. Salazar	(CO)
221. Bill Sali	(ID)
222. Loretta Sanchez	(CA)
223. Jim Saxton	(NJ)
224. Adam Schiff	(CA)
225. Allyson Schwartz	(PA)
226. David Scott	(VA)
227. Robert C. Scott	(VA)
228. Jose Serrano	(NY)
229. Pete Sessions	(TX)
230. Joe Sestak	(PA)
231. Christopher Shays	(CT)
232. Carol Shea-Porter	(NH)
233. Bill Shuster	(PA)
234. Mike Simpson	(ID)
235. Albio Sires	(NJ)
236. Louise M. Slaughter	(NY)
237. Chris Smith	(NJ)
238. Vic Snyder	(AR)
239. Mark Souder	(IN)
240. Zachary Space	(OH)
241. Cliff Stearns	(FL)
242. Bart Stupak	(MI)
243. Betty Sutton	(OH)
244. John Tanner	(TN)
245. Ellen Tauscher	(CA)
246. Gene Taylor	(MS)
247. Lee Terry	(NE)
248. John F. Tierney	(MA)
249. Edolphus Towns	(NY)
250. Stephanie Tubbs Jones	(OH)
251. Michael R. Turner	(OH)
252. Mark Udall	(CO)
253. Tom Udall	(NM)
254. Fred Upton	(MI)
255. Chris Van Hollen	(MD)
256. Nydia Velazquez	(NY)
257. James T. Walsh	(NY)
258. Tim Walz	(MN)
259. Zach Wamp	(TN)
260. Debbie Wasserman Schultz	(FL)
261. Maxine Waters	(CA)
262. Diane E. Watson	(CA)
263. Anthony Weiner	(NY)
264. Peter Welch	(VT)
265. Ed Whitfield	(KY)
266. Heather Wilson	(NM)
267. Lynn Woolsey	(CA)
268. David Wu	(OR)
269. John Yarmuth	(KY)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I speak to paragraph 1 of the amendment. This is another proposed CMS rule. Bottom line is this: Our American hospitals and health care delivery system has to provide health care to our citizens. CMS plays a major role in helping us to do that and to contain costs.

But CMS, the government representative, has to be a partner of our deliverers, the hospitals, not an adversary. And that requires that they give more than 2 months notice, they give a heads up to the hospitals when they're going to change a rule that has the direct and immediate impact of changing revenue streams for our hospitals.

This amendment, paragraph 1, like paragraph 2, simply delays the implementation so that there will be a heads up, a time to respond, a time to study it and a time to implement it.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, 269 Members of this body are on record in their support of this bipartisan amendment. It is simply wrong to punish the hospital before they have done anything wrong. So I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, on this side of the aisle we'd be happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I agree. I am one of the signatories on the letter. I support it. It will help our hospitals.

□ 1215

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

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 26 offered by Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

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

SEC. _____. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out the Entertainment Education Program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(b) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Ombudsman Program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(c) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to provide additional rotating pastel lights, zero-gravity chairs, or dry-heat saunas for its fitness center.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I wonder if I could ask the gentleman a question. In the interest of saving time helping Members get to their planes, would the gentleman be willing to forgo extended comment if we accept the comment?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Yes. I will just explain the amendment and then I would be happy to yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) is recognized.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I appreciate the Chair's indulgence and I will just take a moment to explain what this amendment does, and then I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, there is a recent troubling report entitled "CDC Off Center," which was produced under the direction of Senator COBURN with a report in the Senate Government Affairs Committee. Instead of using its resources to fight life-threatening diseases like HIV/AIDS and cancer, the CDC has instead spent money on needless luxury items and nongovernment functions.

For example, the CDC's Office of Health and Safety recently provided its employees with a new, extravagant fitness center that includes such items as rotating pastel "mood" lights, zero-gravity chairs, and \$30,000 dry-heat saunas. The CDC has also spent over \$1.7 million on a "Hollywood liaison" to advise TV shows like "E.R." and "House" on medical information included in their programming, clearly an expense that should have been covered by the successful for-profit television shows, not by our hard-earned tax dollars. They also further squandered taxpayer dollars in an office intended to help improve employee morale. This program, which currently costs \$250,000 per year, has yielded just 98 complaints since it was created last year. At this rate it is costing taxpayers about \$3,000 per complaint. Despite the program's lack of use, the CDC is planning to spend at least \$1 million more to expand it.

In a time when we are facing increasing risk of bioterrorism and disease, these are hardly the best use of taxpayer dollars.

My amendment simply would ensure that the CDC would not be able to spend any more Federal funding on these three boondoggles described above. And it is my hope that we can get the CDC focused on doing its job, which is very important and they do a good job on that, and not on these kinds of boondoggles. This report shows dozen of examples of these abuses.

And I appreciate the Chair for his indulgence and the acceptance of the amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UPTON:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to purchase light bulbs unless the light bulbs have the "ENERGY STAR" designation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, because we are trying to get Members out of here for their planes, I would be happy to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. UPTON. No problem.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

Page 125, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 522. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 employees from a Federal department or agency at any single conference occurring outside the United States.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment. We are not sure which amendment this is.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order. And I would simply ask the gentleman, in the interest of time, would the gentleman be willing to shorten his remarks and we would be happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I appreciate that. I will shorten my remarks to approximately 30 seconds to say, I thank the chairman for accepting the amendment. I thank the previous subcommittee chairmen as well for accepting similar which we have done in the past, which simply says to

set priorities. When we have Federal agencies send Federal employees overseas for conferences, we should put a realistic limitation on it, and this one, I think, does, at 50 employees of any Federal Department or agency for any single conference occurring outside the United States.

Again, I appreciate the chairman's acceptance of the amendment.

While this is an amendment that I have proposed to other appropriations bills, I believe it is especially important that it be included on this bill.

Since 2000, HHS has spent over \$435 million on conferences and spent \$88 million just last year. Government-wide spending in those same years was over \$1.5 billion.

In 2002 HHS spent \$3.6 million to send 236 persons to the AIDS conference in Barcelona.

In 2004 HHS spent \$500,000 to send 140 persons to the AIDS conference in Bangkok.

In 2005 HHS sent 300 employees to a dioxin conference in Toronto.

Last year the agency sent delegations of 200 or more to 54 separate conferences.

Many of these conferences are now covered online, allowing interested parties to attend without expensive plane tickets, meals, and hotel rooms.

An identical amendment was included in the House-passed version of the FY05 appropriations bill but removed in conference. I cannot help but think of the possibly tens of millions of taxpayer money that could have been saved in the past few years had this language become standard.

I trust that the new chairman will work to include the amendment in the conference agreement—we must inject some sense into HHS. This amendment will only limit international conferences, just a small step in reigning in an agency that seems to think its job is to talk about problems instead of working to solve them.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

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

TITLE VI

ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for the "Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Services", by increasing the amount made available for the "National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute", and by increasing the amount made available for the "National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke" by \$49,000,000, \$10,000,000, and \$10,000,000, respectively.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I will yield.

Mr. OBEY. Again, the same deal, if we accept the amendment. We are trying to help get Members out of here.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I will. I will just extend that 30 seconds to approximately 1 minute, though, because I just want to make a point on this amendment.

I very much appreciate the chairman for accepting this amendment. What this amendment does, as we have said all along, is it sets priorities, and it does on two areas that are extremely important to the Fifth Congressional District and the State of New Jersey and the entire Nation as well. And that is that we set priorities by increasing funding in two very important areas.

One is to the National Cancer Institute for additional cancer research by \$10 million. And another area of extreme importance to the State of New Jersey for the rising number of children being born with autism, to direct an additional \$10 million for research in that area as well.

I will just give a couple of statistics: one in 150 children, and it used to be one in around 10,000, is now diagnosed with autism. Every day 67 children are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder, which translates into a new case almost every 20 minutes. Autism is becoming the fastest-growing serious developmental disability in the United States. That was the purpose of putting that in these amendments, and I thank the chairman for agreeing with us to the importance and seeing that additional funds go to these very worthy causes.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment that would take \$49 million from an account that was zeroed out in the President's budget request, and transfer it to two Institutes at the National Institutes of Health that I believe need additional funding—one working to fight cancer, and one working to fight autism.

Since President Nixon unofficially declared war on cancer in his State of the Union Address of 1971, much progress has been made in the area of cancer research. Over the past three and one-half decades, science has continued to break down barriers in the fight against this disease. Today, cancer is no longer the mystery disease that it once was, and researchers know infinitely more about the prevention, detection, and treatment of the disease than ever before.

All this research is beginning to bear fruit. Fewer people died from cancer in 2004 than in 2003 and the American public is witnessing declining rates for most major cancer types, including breast cancer, prostate cancer, and colorectal cancer. But there's much more work to be done.

I thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for increasing the budget of the

National Cancer Institute in this year's bill. I just think that we can do a little more. And this is an obviously higher priority with far broader application to the American people.

We can also do a little more to fund research for a serious problem facing the country: autism.

According to Autism Now, the largest autism foundation in the country: 1 in 150 children is diagnosed with autism; every day 67 children are diagnosed with an autism spectrum disorder, which translates into a new case almost every 20 minutes; and autism is the fastest-growing serious developmental disability in the United States.

According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, in my home State of New Jersey, the rate of new autism spectrum disorder cases is the highest in the country. One in sixty boys in New Jersey is affected.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would also increase the budget of the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke by \$10 million. This Institute, part of the National Institutes of Health, is the organization within the Federal Government that is primarily responsible for organizing the research into autism.

The account that this amendment would take from was proposed to be eliminated entirely by the administration, as it has demonstrated to be duplicative and ineffective. My amendment retains some funding in that account, but reduces it. If these appropriations bills are about priorities, I ask that we make research on cancer and autism a priority, above duplicative and ineffective programs.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 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. 61 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is this strikes an earmark, \$200,000, for the Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Let me explain, Mr. Chairman. I know that the gentlewoman from Nevada, who is here, and I believe the gentleman from Nevada also are supportive of this. What this amendment is not about is about the merits of this particular academy, as I understand it is a charter school, or whether it is a good school or not.

I received a call yesterday from the director of the Andre Agassi Foundation, who has provided a lot of the funding for this school, inviting me to come to the school in August and to see what they are doing and take a tour. And that is very nice and very flattering, but that actually isn't the point. I am sure it is a very fine school. I am sure it is doing lots of great work. But my understanding is that this school is at least half, if not more than that, funded by charitable donations, including from Mr. Agassi and from one of the Las Vegas casinos and lots of other people.

What I raise this about is whether we should be using earmarks to give out like this to what are essentially charitable works. Now, I am sure there are many other good schools in Nevada. There are many in my area. I am sure there are fine museums. I am sure there are fine research facilities. I am sure there are all kinds of different things that we can spend Federal money on.

But I don't think that when the taxpayers pay their taxes that they intend that part of it is a repository for us, as Members of Congress, any of us as Members of Congress, to delve into that money and go out and say this is a charitable organization which I find worthy in my district and here is the taxpayers' money for that from me. Because it is not from me. It is not from the Member of Congress. It is the taxpayers' money. And I think we are better off leaving the taxpayers with their own money so they can give it to whatever charitable organizations, schools, museums, historical developments, research, that they feel they should. And I just don't feel that it is our right, as Members of Congress, to hand this money out, no matter how beneficial or how worthy the cause is, to hand this out to various charities in our districts, because it is not our money, and act as though it is something that we did.

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in the strongest possible opposition to this amendment.

In his misguided zeal to identify a high-profile example of wasteful Federal spending, the author of this amendment has instead provided me with an opportunity to sing the praises of a member of my community who has used his personal and professional success to help those that are less fortunate.

In 2001 Andre Agassi opened a charter school in Las Vegas, the Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy. It is in one of the most disadvantaged areas in my congressional district. Agassi Prep currently serves students in grades K-

10, with grades 11 and 12 being added in the next 2 years, for a total of 630 students when enrollment is complete. The first class will graduate in 2009. The student body is 96 percent minority.

This earmark, which I think the gentleman for highlighting, would go to the Andre Agassi Prep's Technology and Multimedia Initiative and will increase the use of computer technology in math, science, reading, and language instructions.

□ 1230

This is exactly the type of environment we should be encouraging for all of our students in all of our schools.

Andre Agassi has been a tireless advocate for this academy and for numerous other philanthropic endeavors, including the Boys and Girls Clubs in Las Vegas, raising more than \$60 million and contributing a substantial amount of his own money to improve the lives of children, youth at risk in my community. There is nobody that has done more for people in this community, my community, than Andre Agassi.

The only reason we're talking about this project on the floor today is because a famous name is attached to it. But whereas my colleague on the other side hopes to find a celebrity asking for Federal handouts rather than digging into his own pocket, he has instead highlighted a model citizen and a leader who has tried to make a difference and convince others to do the same.

It is one of the fastest growing areas. This is a very important earmark. I am proud to take this earmark. I will defend it with all my strength and ability.

At this time, I would like to yield whatever time is remaining to my colleague from Nevada, JON PORTER.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate many Members of this body that are looking for ways to eliminate waste, fraud and abuse, but I'm extremely disappointed that they've chosen this project.

I must say that I'm afraid some of my colleagues haven't really done their homework. And I appreciate my friend and colleague from Nevada, Congresswoman BERKLEY, for stating some of the obvious.

This particular program is what we need in America. And there is even a Web page today that shows this as an example of what's wrong with America. I want to stand here today and say this is what's right with America. We need to encourage public/private partnerships. Here is an individual that has adopted a charter school, a strong platform with the Republican Party, charter schools. It is a public charter school that he has adopted and writes a check for close to \$3 million a year to keep it operating.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I'm embarrassed. This is what's right about America, not what's wrong about America. This particular school is serving a population that needs our help

and assistance. We admit here day after day that we're not funding special needs kids enough, and we are not. This is another example of how we can help this very important population.

And again, as my colleague said from Nevada, this is an example of an individual that is giving of his time, of his life to support our community, close to \$60 million a year. He is giving to the community \$3 million of his own money into this school.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment. And I personally am very disappointed. This is an example of what's right about America. Mr. Agassi has done everything he can to help kids. He helps needy kids at our child welfare program, Boys and Girls Clubs across the community. He's not standing there with his hand out, he's standing there with support.

So Mr. Chairman, I ask this body to oppose this amendment, and I am extremely embarrassed.

Ms. BERKLEY. Reclaiming my time, let me sum up.

I'm going to urge defeat of this amendment. And before I yield back the balance of my time, I want to reiterate that I represent one of the faster growing areas in the country. If we are forced to rely strictly on formula funding for Federal assistance, we will always be behind the eight ball. We depend and rely on these earmarks in order to keep up with the latest technology and importance of providing for the people that I represent. I'm sorry that I had to even come down here to defend this earmark. I'm proud of it.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, you know, I don't disagree, and I'm not in a position to disagree with anything about this school said by either the lady from Nevada or the gentleman from Nevada. Again, let me reiterate, that is not my point.

My point is that there are probably many other schools that are worthy. There are probably all kinds of health considerations that are worthy. There are probably museums that are worthy. There are all kinds of things that are worthy. But the Federal Government does not traditionally fund charter schools. Schools are inherently local and State, and I think should be, and hopefully will continue to be. It's not a Federal school. And so I just don't think that it is right or appropriate that any of us pick something and essentially say this is where we're going to use the taxpayers' funds in a charitable endeavor.

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

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. WALSH of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to my colleague's comments about charter schools.

Having been the co-author of charter school legislation in Nevada in the late 1990s, it truly is a Federal program. We do have funds available through grant processes that help charter schools. Unfortunately, we needed help immediately and this was the way to do it. As a matter of fact, this earmark isn't even in my district, it's adjacent to my district in Nevada. But it is traditional, it is what we do as a Congress. Another example of why I think Members understand their districts better than this full body, which is why we are here today in opposition to this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 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. 62 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service, City College of New York, NY.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would eliminate a \$2 million earmark for the Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service at the City College of New York, New York.

Currently, Mr. Chairman, the City College of New York does not have a Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service. The Web site shows there are 16 centers of study, none of which bear Mr. RANGEL's name. So ostensibly this \$2 million is going to be creating the Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service.

Currently, according to the Web site, it appears that most everything dealing with public service careers at the City College of New York currently goes through the Colin Powell Center for Policy Studies, which was founded by a charitable grant in 1997.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. RANGEL provided to me yesterday a brochure here on the Center for Public Service in New York. And this has a lot of stuff in it, admittedly, it mentions many things. But there are a few things in it I thought were troubling, because amongst the things that it says this center will have are, quote, "a well-fur-

nished office for Congressman Rangel." Second, "the Rangel Library to house its Rangel archives." And it goes on to say, quote, "The Rangel archivist librarian will organize, index and preserve for posterity all documents, photographs and memorabilia relating to Congressman Rangel's career."

House rules, and House rule XXI, clause 6 says, and I quote, "It shall not be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report that provides for the designation or redesignation of a public work in honor of an individual then serving as a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner or Senator." In other words, the rule says that we don't name public works after ourselves while we are in Congress.

Now, it's my understanding from the Parliamentarian that this amendment does not violate the letter of that rule. I would argue, and argue to my friends in the majority, that it would violate the spirit. I really do not think this is a road we want to go down, where we, as Members, have the ability to create and name things after ourselves using public funds while we are in office. If you think about that, there are five colleges or universities in my district. I'm sure if I went to one of them, any of them, with \$2 million and said, Let's have the John Campbell School of Fiscal Responsibility, I'm sure they would at least listen to that. But I don't think that would be right and I don't think that would be good and I don't think that would be proper. And I don't believe that this earmark is either.

So, I would request that my friends on the majority side and on the minority side consider, before you knee-jerk oppose this amendment, consider what this is opening up for this House. And do you really want to open up that we're going to have earmarks to name things after ourselves?

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

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition because I'm supporting the spirit and the rule.

Let me make some things abundantly clear that this would not only not violate the spirit in which we are doing this, but 60 years ago Charles Rangel was a high school dropout on the streets of Lenox Avenue, and the only thing that brings him to this Congress is the G.I. Bill. And in my community, where only four out of 10 kids manage to finish high school, I've devoted my entire life in working with the public and private sector in trying to keep our kids in school, and giving them the opportunity to get an education.

The days that we think that education is a local issue are over. As we move toward globalization, it is going to be far more important for every

young person, every person in this country to be exposed, to get the education, and to compete.

This is not a question of Federal funds being used to start anything. The City University came and asked would I start a drive to raise the money, which they already raised \$25 million, in order to do this. And all the office things that you're talking about, when you talk about archives, it means after I leave here. And I do hope that there would be an office there, as we bring people in to encourage people to get an education, to go into public service. I cannot think of anything that I am more proud of. I wish we had more of this type of thing.

And so it just seems to me, as you have seen fit to apply for an earmark here, that you understand what it is. I've been in office for 38 years, I don't need any accolades. My community has given me that. My predecessor served for 26 years before me. So I do hope that when you start talking about we understand that you can do this, but we're anxious to make certain that people don't want this, anybody that has given 38 of their years to the Congress, anybody that was able to go back to high school under the G.I. Bill when they were 23, anybody that spends his time inspiring kids to go to school, to stay in school, to get an education, to get married, make contributions in anybody's community, and the city college that stood on a hill, where I had no idea that it was a college when I was a kid since nobody in my family had gone to college, anybody that can get this Congress to support something like that, I would laud not only the success in getting it done, but the spirit in which it's being done.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. You said that this is not starting this, but it does not exist today; is that correct, sir?

Mr. RANGEL. We have corporation people making contributions. The school does not exist. It will be announced in October. And I hope my Federal Government is a part of that, as I know my city and State are going to be a part of it, not because my name is on it. I would feel just as strongly about this if it wasn't. But somehow they feel, as some people do, that my name on it will drive and be able to raise the private funds, and so far \$25 million has been raised. And I want my government to be a part of that effort.

The brochure is what is being sold to encourage people, including you, to understand what we're trying to do and what we're going to do.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. And so, you don't agree with me, or see any problem with us, as Members, sending taxpayer funds in the creation of things named after ourselves while we're still here?

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. CAMPBELL, I would like to answer you. I would have a

problem if you did it because I don't think that you've been around long enough that having your name on something to inspire a building like this in a school—it might be that it would be in order for you to get publicity and to get reelected. But since I've been here 38 years and have not really had any opposition from the other side, it doesn't serve any function for me, except to try to encourage people to participate with government, local government, teachers, in order to keep our kids in school.

So, I am proud of the fact that they're using my name in order to create this. And it's going to be created. As I said, if you had gone to the Web site, you would have gotten a number, you could have gotten in touch with President Williams, he would have told you we've collected \$25 million, and that would be it.

So, not only do I not see anything wrong, but I wish more public servants that have the ability to do this would get involved in this type of thing. I think it's very important.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. If the gentleman would yield, is there, then, a number of years in which someone can have been in Congress in which you are then allowed to name something after yourself?

Mr. RANGEL. No. But I'm convinced that after you're here a while that you would find out it's the quality of service and what you have produced for your constituents rather than how long you've been here.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I just think that putting our constituents first is what this place should be all about, and putting our country first.

The gentleman from New York is a distinguished combat veteran, with 38 years service in this House. But we have seen people leave this House to great glory, and to even be elected President or ambassador, captains of industry. And other of our colleagues have gone straight from this Chamber to jail. And the decision is best made by history. The collective wisdom of our rules is that, in general, we don't name things after ourselves when we are great and powerful, but no independent judgment could be leveled.

□ 1245

I support this project. I think this project is a good one. But I would just ask would the gentleman entertain a unanimous consent request simply to remove his name to advance this project, but to delete the current ego from this?

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. I tried to make it clear, and I wish I had been better at it, that as flattered as I am that they are using my name, I am thoroughly convinced that the only reason they are using my name is the ability to attract funds to get this thing going. So for me to be able to remove my name from it, I would say that the \$25 million that they raised was in bad faith, and the money that they intend to raise, that I would not lend my name to, they would never have done this unless I agreed.

Mr. KIRK. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is a very powerful chairman. If he supports this project, they will come. But I worry about setting the precedent of everyone else naming things after themselves.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In conclusion, it includes an office, et cetera. I just don't believe that we should use the power and authority we have while in office to use taxpayer funds to create monuments to ourselves or to participate in the creation of a monument to ourselves. That is just not something that I believe we should be doing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I just want to commend the Democrats. We always said that names should be placed next to the earmarks. This earmark is going beyond the spirit of the law. The name is on the earmark.

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

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.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Garrett amendment pertaining to the Department of Labor and the National Institutes of Health, which was previously adopted by a voice vote and accepted by the committee, I would like to clarify that the amendment does not specify which Department of Labor programs would be impacted.

Adoption of that amendment does not create any legislative intent that

would require the Department of Labor to reduce funding for the migrant and seasonal farm worker program.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the American Jazz Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, for exhibits, education programs, and an archival project.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for “Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration” is hereby reduced by \$200,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair.

Before talking about this amendment, there wasn't time for me to speak on the last one, I just want to say that I don't think it is the road that we want to go down to start naming facilities or programs after ourselves. I think that the rules may be a bit vague, but they seem clear enough that we shouldn't do that. The dialogue that I heard was, Are you worthy to have something named after you if you have just been here a few years? Does it take 38 years? What does it take?

Frankly, I think it would take a lot more than \$2 million to get any college or university in my district to name something the “Flake Center,” for a myriad of reasons. But, having said that, I just don't think it is a road that we should go down. So that is why I supported the gentleman's amendment. I hope others as they come to the floor will, as well.

This amendment would prohibit \$200,000 in Federal funds from being used for the American Jazz Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, for exhibits, education programs, and for an archival project. It reduces the cost of the bill by a consistent amount. I couldn't think of any jazzy line here, but I will just say that earmarks like this probably give taxpayers all over the blues.

This earmark would come out of the Institute of Museum and Library Services account, or the IMLS. The IMLS administers a competitive grant program for museums, libraries and zoos. This committee has recommended this program be funded with nearly \$18 million.

Here is part of the problem, I think, with earmarks, particularly in this bill. We are often earmarking funds that are in programs at the agencies

that are already designated to be awarded on a competitively bid process. This jazz museum, I am sure, has submitted applications. Perhaps they have won grants over the years. But maybe this year they didn't. So what earmarks typically do are circumvent the process that we have mandated to be established with these agencies.

We often complain about Federal agencies not listening to us and going out and spending willy-nilly. That is often the case, certainly. It is our job, then, to call them in and say, we want to change your program. We want to have you competitively bid projects.

I should point out that much of what we criticize the agencies for we are doing here in spades. Earmarks are, by their very definition, no-bid contracts. We are saying to people out there, if you can't get your grant through the competitively bid process, come to us anyway, and we will earmark those funds for you. So there is no concept, no discussion of merit.

Try as they might, I am sure the Appropriations Committee is not in a position to adequately scrub and vet all of these earmark requests. That is simply not their role and shouldn't be their role. We shouldn't put that burden on the Appropriations Committee.

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

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

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me first of all say that on the positive side, I do have respect for the gentleman from Arizona. He is consistent. He is not mean-spirited with his opposition. There is a lot of mean-spirited conversation that goes on here.

I should say to him, however, that this Member of Congress placed all 120 requested earmarks on my Web site in March, not at the request of anyone. I did it. I am proud of my earmarks. I want everybody to see them. I don't think there is enough money going, though, to this particular project.

When I was mayor of Kansas City, Missouri, we built the American Jazz Museum. It is the only museum on the planet dedicated to the preservation of America's only art form. Jazz is the only art form created in the United States of America. We have what is called the John Baker Collection. If students at the University of Arizona want to study the industry of jazz, the art form of jazz, and they would like to see the soundies, the only place they can see the John Baker Collection, the largest collection of old black and white soundies, is the American Jazz Museum in Kansas City.

People from across this Nation, actually from across the world, come into Kansas City. The city put money into it. Of course, as a former mayor, I know that we send unfunded mandates

down to the city. So the city, particularly, since I left office, reduces the funding each year. Since people are using this museum from all over this Nation, I'll bet there are people in Arizona, I hope they are watching, who are using the American Jazz Museum.

So, I believe, first of all, that I have been as transparent as anybody could be. The comments we received from people in our district, Republicans and Democrats, is thank you for being transparent. I don't hide any of it. I want everybody to look at it, examine it. It gives me an opportunity to stand here, and hopefully people in my district are watching me now to stand here and not only defend the earmark, but to promote the American Jazz Museum.

This is the home of Charlie “YardBird” Parker, who was born and raised right there and went to school around the street from the museum. This is the place where Count Basie organized his band. This is the place where Jay McShan organized his band. Every major jazz artist in the world wanted to play 18th and Vine.

Now, there is some debate about whether Kansas City or New Orleans is the Mother of Jazz. Of course, New Orleans is wrong, and I try to help them when I can. But the point here is that we need, Mr. Chairman, to have people who are going to put up earmarks to be in a position to feel good about them and to express it. So I don't see this so much as a defense, but as an opportunity to promote what I think is one of the legitimate projects for funding from the United States Congress because it serves the people of this Nation.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman whose earmark this is. I believe he knows that. I commend him for earlier than just about anybody putting his earmarks on his Web site. Certainly, this has been a good reform. I have been complimentary, and I remain so, of the majority party's willingness in January to go down this road and actually require this much. It follows some of what we did in the fall as Republicans. Frankly, in some areas, I think it did better than we did.

This isn't a case of something looks untoward in this earmark, or somebody is trying to get some private gain. It doesn't seem to me to be that at all. It is simply a question of, is this a proper priority? Should Members of Congress be able to designate money like this, particularly in this case, when we have a Federal agency with a program to award grants and an account with \$16 million that we appropriate every year to award grants under this program? That is my question here.

I think that certainly, as mentioned, jazz is uniquely American. I can't imagine them submitting a proposal that would not be granted. It seems like a great place. It seems to be appropriate. What is at question here is,

should the Congress be doing this? That is where I am.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

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

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

□ 1300

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to get a few things off my chest with regard to this earmarking issue.

I know that policy questions are complicated, and I know that budget questions are complicated. I recognize, therefore, that substantial members of the press and some Members of the Congress as well in both bodies seek to find other more simple issues which are small enough to get their mind around. And so we have spent a good amount of time the last 3 weeks talking about earmarks. I want to put some things in perspective about earmarks.

In the Financial Services bill, out of all of the money provided in that bill, 1.5 percent was devoted to earmarks.

In Interior, 0.43 percent of all the money appropriated was provided for earmarks.

In Transportation, 1.4 percent of the entire bill was allocated through earmarks.

And in this bill, it is slightly less than 0.20. That is a very tiny portion of the overall bill.

The executive branch allocates or directs spending at least 10 times as great as does the Congress and I don't see or hear much squawking about that.

I just want to suggest this: I don't happen to be comfortable with the earmarking system because it is a pain in the neck to me, it takes an incredible amount of time, and I would much rather spend that time on policy. But the fact is that it is a constitutional prerogative of the Congress to do so. And I would submit it creates a much more fair system. An example, when Speaker HASTERT ran this place last year, here he is the Speaker of the House, and yet if the Congress earmarked no money, all the dollars would go back to Illinois and they would be directed by a Democratic Governor. So Speaker HASTERT would be part of the body that raised the money at the Federal level and sent the money back to States and local governments; and yet without the earmarking process, the most powerful and influential man in Congress would have nothing to say about how that money was allocated in his own State. I submit that is not right.

Or take myself. I chair the Appropriations Committee. I think I spend more time and, frankly, I think I know at least as much about the Federal budget as anybody in this institution, not because I am so plugged in but because of my job and the fact that I have been here a long time, and even an idiot ought to be able to pick up a fair amount of information as long as I have been here.

So I would simply ask the question why should I serve in this body, try to help my district, and then discover that for 16 straight years we had a Republican Governor, I had absolutely nothing to say about funds that were distributed in my State without the earmarking process.

The earmarking process, if it is used correctly, allows individual Members to target things in their own district that they think will contribute the most to improving the living conditions or the educational conditions or the cultural conditions in that district. I don't think there is anything wrong with that.

But I find it incredibly amazing and amusing that we are talking about 0.19 percent of all of the funds in this bill. How much time have we spent talking about basic education philosophy? How much time have we spent talking about which of these education programs really work? How much time have we spent in this debate talking about the programs? The answer is zip because some people prefer to deal with small things.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind my colleagues of some important facts as we deliberate on these earmarks. I think it is very important to understand that we have reduced the dollar value of earmarks in this bill by 50 percent from the levels that the Republicans had when they were running this House of Representatives. A 50 percent reduction. We have cut 41 wasteful programs from the budget in this appropriations bill. We have saved over \$1 billion over last year.

So instead of getting involved in the intricacies of one earmark after another, let's keep focused on the facts that count. And the fact that counts is that we reduced this budget and slashed those earmarks in half.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make two final points. The first is the people in the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri, Harry Truman's district, will have the opportunity to judge whether or not I should have placed these projects before Congress for earmarks next November. I am measured by my representation in that district. I would suggest that they are going to be very pleased with what I have done.

The other issue is that we are talking about a \$200,000 earmark, and I had hoped for significantly more than that. We are spending \$285 million a day, \$11 million a hour in Iraq. If you subtract \$200,000, that would reduce the number of Coca-Colas in Iraq by about four cases based on the price they have been gouging.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. 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. 6 offered by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio:

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

SEC. _____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 4.6 percent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, one of the previous speakers from the majority party talked about how this legislation in front of us has reduced the number of earmarks. I believe his quote was there are 41 programs that have been eliminated from last year's appropriation bill. Nevertheless, this bill increases spending \$10.8 billion more than the President requested, 7.7 percent more than the President requested. It is \$7 billion, or a 4.6 percent, increase over last year's appropriation.

So my amendment is real straightforward. It says we are not going to go back to the President, we are not going to cut it, using the term "cut" to the President's requested level, we are going to go back to last year's funding level, a level funding amendment, a hold-the-line amendment, whatever you want to call it. It is certainly not a cut, although that has typically been the argument made by the other side of the aisle.

This is the sixth amendment I have offered in the appropriations process. Each one has been the same, to hold the line on spending. I don't do it to be a pain in the rear to the committee or to the ranking member. I appreciate the work of the committee and our ranking member and those involved on this committee in bringing this bill forward.

I do it because we have a spending problem. We have a spending problem in this Congress and in this government, and there is going to come a day

when we are going to have to deal with it. There is no better time to start than now, and no better place to start than to say let's just hold the line because here is what happens every single time government continues to spend and spend and spend. It inevitably leads to higher taxes, higher taxes that hurt our economy, higher taxes that hurt our standing in the international marketplace. But most importantly, higher taxes that hurt families out there trying to do the things for their kids and their grandkids so they can experience the American dream.

If you don't believe me that spending is going to lead to higher taxes, all you have to do is look at yesterday's Roll Call where there is a story. In fact, we just had the distinguished chairman from the Ways and Means Committee down here defending an earmark in his district, but he is talked about and the article talks about the tobacco tax that they are looking to put on the American people to fund increased spending.

The old line, it's tax and spend, tax and spend politicians; it's actually the opposite, it's spend and tax, spend and tax. Spending drives the equation, and that is why we need to begin to get a handle on spending. That's what this amendment does.

In the course of offering these amendments over the last several weeks, we have consistently heard two arguments from the majority party. The first is the old devastating cut argument, that somehow if we just spend what we spent last year, that will somehow be terrible and the sky will fall and the world will end and everything will go to chaos. I find that hard to believe in light of the fact that countless number of American families have to do that all the time, live on last year's budget. But somehow, government never seems to be able to do that.

The other line that we have heard, and I find this one somewhat amazing, but the line is how dare Republicans talk about holding the line on spending because you increased spending over the last several years as well. I am fascinated by that argument because the argument, when you boil it down, is this: Because Republicans spent too much, we are going to spend more.

So I fail to see the logic in those two arguments. What I do understand is this, Mr. Chairman. Government spends too much. Families know how to budget. We should be able to do the same thing. Families don't just get an automatic 4.6 percent increase in their budget. We should look to hold the line on spending. That is what this amendment does. It will help set us on the path of fiscal discipline so we can begin to deal with the big problems that I referenced earlier that are going to be out there with entitlement spending, and begin to get a handle on our budget so that our economy can continue to grow and prosper.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to make a couple of short observations. We are told by this gentleman, and we have been told, and we have been told, and we have been told for 3 days that somehow it is this bill which is responsible for the outrageous fiscal mess facing the country. I just want to say one thing: Yes, this bill spends \$10 billion more on our kids, on our workers, on our obligation to provide access to health care to people who don't have it, than the President does. I plead fully double guilty. I would do twice as much if I could. I would do three times as much if I could because the country needs it.

This is the bill that makes the investments that will make our country stronger economically, educationally and socially not just today but for the next 10 years. That's what this bill is about.

We have got a 2 percent difference between us and the President in terms of what we are trying to spend in this bill versus what he thinks we ought to spend. I have just told you where we have put it in the right places. Where does the President want to put money? The President wants to spend five times as much as the difference that we have with him on this bill, he wants to spend five times as much giving tax cuts to people who make more than a million bucks a year. He is going to give 57 billion bucks to people in this country who make over a million bucks a year. We think that money, a portion of it, is better spent on kids who need it and on sick people who need it. And we make no apology for it.

The other thing I would simply say is that the other place that the President wants to spend it, he wants to spend 60 times as much as that \$10 billion on that stupid war in Iraq, the worst foreign policy blunder in the history of the Republic.

So we plead fully guilty to having a meaningful 2 percent difference between the President and us. We plead fully guilty, and I wish it were more.

□ 1315

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the Republican leader, friend and gentleman from Ohio, for 1 minute.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my colleague for yielding, and I rise today to support the gentleman's amendment.

The bill before us spends some \$10 billion more than the President requested, \$7 billion more than what this bill spent last year. And what the gentleman seeks to do is reduce the overall amount of spending in this bill to the level we spent last year.

Now, our job as Members of Congress is to make decisions, decisions about spending, and when we keep increasing spending and increasing spending, guess what? There's no reason to make a decision. We don't have to make the tough choices because we just keep spending more.

Now, this bill is some \$7 billion more than we spent last year. This will be on top of the bills that we've already spent this year, spending some 10 to \$12 billion more than the President asked for and above last year's levels.

On top of that, there's \$6 billion of additional spending that was in the continuing resolution in February; \$17 billion more in the supplemental spending bill for Iraq and Katrina, over and above what was needed in those theaters. And the appropriation process is not finished yet.

What's happening here is we're continuing to spend more. We've got the largest tax increase in American history coming, and I thought we were here to ensure that our kids and their kids had a better chance in life than what we had. I mean, every generation of Americans has been proud of the fact that they left the country and left opportunities for our children and their children that were better than what we had. And I think it's our obligation to make sure that our kids have a better chance at the American Dream than what we had.

But we're not doing that. We're mortgaging our children's future by continuing to raise taxes and increase spending. We've done it all year, and we're not even to the end of the year yet. Now we're only in July and we've got numbers that will add up to close to \$100 billion of additional spending. How much is enough? How much is enough?

I think that the gentleman's amendment is a good amendment, just to bring the spending level in this bill down to last year's level, and let's make the tough choices that the American people sent us here to make.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman.

They say on the other side, and the gentleman has said, that we have a spending problem and that they left the country in better shape. Our friends on the other side are talking about leaving the country in better shape. I think we need, Mr. Chairman, to remind them of the history here.

What we're talking about is just 6 short years ago President Clinton left office with a budget surplus of \$5.6 trillion, and a lot of us at that time were talking about how we were going to invest in education and health care and the important things that our country needs and that make our country stronger.

And in 6 short years, 6 short years, our Republican friends have driven this country into a deficit situation. We're

talking projected now on a 10-year basis \$3 trillion or more in deficit.

So I don't see how our friends on the other side of the aisle can claim the mantle of fiscal responsibility. I don't see how they can claim in any way that they have left the country in better shape. I don't see how they can claim that they're fighting spending. I mean, this was, under them, borrow and spend, borrow and spend. That was the message. And what we're trying to do here in this particular piece of legislation is get under control a situation where we invest again in the things that the American people really care about: invest in education, investing in our workers so that we can have a competitive workforce, investing in Pell Grants to help students get the very best education.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask how much time both sides have left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Each side has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, before yielding to my friend and gentleman from Arizona, let me just respond to one thing real quickly.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee talked earlier about all the new spending, and the other side has a definition for success for them is more spending. Our side actually believes the definition of success should be success.

And I always look at education. I came from the general assembly in Ohio, and one of the things you focus on so much in the general assembly budget process is primary and secondary education. And if you look at what's happened, and this is for every State, but I can just give you the numbers on Ohio.

We have 612 public schools in Ohio. In 1977 we had 2 million K-12 kids. Today we have 1.8 million. So we've had 200,000 less kids in K-12 public school, 612 districts in our State. Over that 30 years, 200,000 less kids. Dollars spent per pupil, dollars spent per aggregate, dollars spent for facilities, dollars spent any way you want to define dollars spent adjusted for inflation is a tremendous increase.

So you have got 200,000 less kids. So you've got the graph going this way. The economists have always got these graphs. Graph coming down on number of students, graph going up adjusted for inflation, and what are the results? It's a straight line. So you spent a boatload more money on 200,000 less kids to get the exact same result. So more money may mean more learning in some places, but to make the blanket statement more money means more education, more money means more learning is simply not true, and the facts are on our side.

So we define success as actually being success, not giving more money and hoping that good things are going to happen, and if they don't, you know what we're going to do, give them more money next time. We don't define it

that way. We say if kids are really learning, that should be success, not the fact that we've given them more money.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

It was brought up before that we're not talking about what the Federal agencies do. We talk a lot about what Congress does with earmarking, but there's an area of complaint I've heard about what the Federal agencies are doing. Well, this is the time to have that discussion. Right now.

We're looking to reduce the amount spent, the amount that we appropriate to the Federal agencies. Yes, they waste money, a tremendous amount of money. They waste money in my own district. This is the time that we say, hey, hold back a little, reprioritize, don't spend as much, and yet we're not doing it.

Instead, we say, well, you're mispending money and so we're going to mispend some money with earmarking. We don't like the way you have prioritized, so we're not going to actually go in and provide oversight and say, all right, stop spending money this way or that way. We're just going to add to it with our own priorities.

Let me just give an example. It's often said we don't ever give examples of specific programs. I'll give you one. I believe it was last year or maybe the year before GAO came out with a study saying that the DARE program was a waste of money, basically, or we weren't getting the bang for the buck that we should. What did we do? We increased funding for it. Instead of saying, you know, maybe it's not run as it should be, maybe we should scale back on it, force them to change it or scrap it altogether, but instead we increased funding for it.

That goes on across the board. GAO studies that we often commission are always followed by, well, they must need more money. Not the money's being misspent. They just need more of it.

That's what this amendment is all about to say, hey, Federal agencies you're mispending money; you're spending too much; it's time to scale back, and by the way, we can scale back on our own as far as earmarking as well.

So we never hear about the Federal agencies misspending. Here's one saying they do. They do in your district; they do in my district. This is the opportunity to say enough is enough. Let's cut back. Let's have some fiscal responsibility here.

So I commend the gentleman for his amendment, and I urge everyone to support it.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentleman's argument. At least his argument is con-

sistent. I appreciate the gentleman's integrity, and I appreciate the principles of his argument. But I must say, sitting here listening to some of the other Members on the other side of the aisle consistently raises issues of inconsistency.

The gentleman who's offered this amendment has said we should go back to last year. That's all we're doing is going back to last year so we can hold the line on spending. Why we would want to go back to last year? When last year was there ever an attempt to hold the line on spending?

Mr. Chairman, the other side spent and spent and spent and borrowed and borrowed and borrowed. The difference between us is we want to invest in America's families. The other side, Mr. Chairman, decided to spend to give special interest giveaways. We want to spend to make sure that kids can get Pell Grants and go to college and compete in the global economy. They wanted to spend on no-bid contracts to Halliburton. We want to spend to make sure that seniors can heat their homes in the winter because of high oil prices. They wanted to spend on \$13 billion in tax cuts for oil company executives who I don't think are eligible for LIHEAP. That's the difference between us.

We just had a debate earlier about the propriety of Members of Congress putting their names on projects that are funded by the Federal Government. I would suggest to my good friends that if there were an earmark for a facility called the Congressional Hypocrisy Treatment Foundation, there wouldn't be a plaque large enough for all of their names.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, some simple facts. The President's budget would have us spend as a share of our total national income 48 percent less on education, health care, science, job training, et cetera, than this country spent in 1980, and by 2012 he would have us spend 57 percent less than we spent in 1980.

That creates a problem because we're going to have 27 million more Americans in the next 10 years. We're going to have 12 million more seniors needing health care. We're going to have 2.7 million more kids in elementary and secondary school. We're going to have 2.2 million more students in college. And, unless we change our ways, we're going to have 11 million more Americans without health insurance.

That's why we don't want to go back to last year. We want to move ahead to try to deal with the problems coming at us. We see them; they're there. We ought not to stick our head in the ground like an ostrich. We ought to deal with them, and that's what this bill does.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, can I ask how much time is left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. ISRAEL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member from New York.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this amendment.

There were a couple of things that were said in the debate that I just want to try to get a little clarity on.

I served here in the late 1990s, and I recall that Republicans, as the majority party, passed a balanced budget in 1997. In 1998, we had our first balanced budget. Now, President Clinton was President at the time, but I believe I heard someone on the other side say President Clinton left the country with a \$5.6 trillion surplus. I think they're mistaken. I think what they meant to say is President Clinton left the United States Government with a \$5.6 trillion debt.

Now, that debt has increased, but the fact is that when we were in the majority party, for the first time since the 1940s, we produced a balanced budget. The President does not have the power of the purse; the Congress does. We created that surplus. We created the balanced budgets, and there was no surplus left at the end of the Clinton administration. We actually paid down the debt about a half trillion dollars, about \$500 billion. That was good work.

Things changed pretty dramatically in 2001 when our Nation was attacked. We went to war, we had a recession, and the dot-com bubble burst.

But we produced that surplus. We produced those balanced budgets. Not the President of the United States. The Congress. That's where the power of the purse resides.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Could I inquire, Mr. Chairman, how much time we have on our side?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has 4½ minutes.

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

□ 1330

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this would almost be sad if it really wasn't so comical.

I think what a lot of folks are witnessing today is some more smoke and mirrors, another magic show that they may have seen somewhere.

We have the chairman of the Appropriations Committee who said that the President's budget would spend 48 percent less this year on education and some other things that he mentioned than 1980, but yet they talk about what kind of spending spree we are on. I can't imagine what kind of spending spree the Democratic majority must have been on in 1980.

Let me say this. We keep hearing a lot of history lessons, a lot of history in here. For some reason we don't want to talk about the future.

But we keep hearing about the \$57 billion from the people in this country that make over \$1 million. Now, I really don't know if that's true or not. I am going to assume the chairman of the Appropriations Committee knows if that's true or not.

But it's almost like he sounds mad that he can't get his hands on somebody else's money. He says, you know, we can't get that \$57 billion, and we want to spend it. I am mad about it.

You know what? We are spending too much money on the war on terror. Well, look, I have only been here 3 years, but I know one thing. I know that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the Democratic leadership over there can stop this war today, today. They got 232 votes. They control the purse strings, they can stop it today.

The supplemental budget that we passed that our leader talked about was \$20 billion more than the President requested. The chairman of the committee said, you know what, I would spend \$10 billion more. What's stopping him? He is already spending \$11 billion more. What's stopping him from spending \$10 billion more.

Because you know why? I think they are afraid to tell you that these things that they are investing in, that's what they like to call spending taxpayers' dollars. The things that they are investing in is coming out of the American people's pocket. They are making investments for the people of this country that they don't even have any say in. It's time we wake up.

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

The gentleman just said the things that they are investing in and implying that the Democrats are making these investments. Yes, we are making these investments. They are investments in strengthening American families, making sure kids can go to college, making sure people can afford to heat their homes.

I will tell you something else, it's not just us, this bill came out of appropriations with a strong bipartisan majority. The most conservative Members of the other side voted for this bill. It's not that we are making these investments as Democrats, it's that most mainstream Members of Congress, with responsibilities to our districts, are making these investments.

Now, maybe there are some who are so far on the other side, so far on the fringe, that they would argue with their own conservative Members that an investment in college education is a bad idea. But the fact of the matter is, they are in a very, very small minority.

This bill has strong bipartisan support in the Appropriations Committee. Republicans and Democrats work together despite the opposition from such a fringe minority.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. Would the gentleman from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Sure.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I was wondering, I will ask it as you are walking, do you believe that the Federal Government has responsibility for any K-12 education programs?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I think that the Federal Government, if they want to fund K-12, it should be in block grants to the local school districts for them to be able to spend the money to the needs of their local school districts and the needs of the State.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You do believe in Federal spending on education at the local level?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I think that if the Federal Government is going to spend money on education, that they need to send it to the State as a block grant for the State Department of Education to spend in their local districts.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

I wanted to make sure, because as we had the conversation, I have heard many gentlemen who were up here earlier say they didn't believe in any Federal spending for education, local education, at all.

I just want to clarify that you, at least, do believe that we do have an obligation to spend money. I appreciate you saying that.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. You know, I have listened to you many nights and I respect you, because I really believe that you are a true believer in what you are saying.

Let me just say this, that I am part of that fringe.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I know. I have been here.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. You are part of a fringe, somewhat of a fringe.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I don't think I am.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Being part of that fringe, I am proud of the fringe.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, that's twice in the past 2 days that our friend from Georgia has admitted being on the fringe. In response to the claim that I am on the fringe voting for this bill, I would just like to say I joined his colleagues, every Republican on the Labor-H subcommittee from all over, conservative Republicans, in support of this bill.

The gentleman from New York; Mr. REGULA, the gentleman from Ohio, these are balanced, fair investments.

As the gentleman from New York stated, we are not raising taxes. Check, keep your forms from last year, your tax forms, and compare them to next year. There will not be an increase in your taxes.

What we are doing is we are not spending the money on the banks, we are spending it on the kids. We are not giving it to the oil companies, we are giving it to the kids for education and health care.

It's a difference in priorities. There is not a tax increase in here, and the bottom line is we make investments into the future of our country.

I find it offensive and staggering that the minority leader can come here, along with our friends, and talk about leaving the country in better shape than they found it, or that we have that obligation. Three trillion dollars in debt under your watch, Republican House, Republican Senate, Republican White House, \$3 trillion.

The gentleman from Ohio wasn't here, but this Congress asked the Secretary of the Treasury to raise the debt limit five or six times so they could go out and borrow more money from China, more money from Japan, more money from OPEC countries. So we don't need lectures on how to leave the country better off than we found it.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would just ask the gentleman, my friend from Ohio, how does increasing spending 4.6 percent over last year's bill, how does that help address the \$3 trillion debt problem that I admit, I wasn't here, I admit that's a real problem.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Would the gentleman yield so I could ask you a question?

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I would be happy to yield. I asked you a question.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You will probably remember, because we were in the State Senate together in Ohio, there was a study done by the University of Akron. It said every dollar that the State of Ohio invested in higher education, they got \$2 back in tax money. This is an investment we are going to make, and we are going to yield returns.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, I would argue that every dollar we let the American taxpayer keep gets earned and returned to the economy, and that's what ultimately allows us to deal with the \$3 trillion in debt. That's why we are offering the amendment that we bring forward.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That's been the philosophy, and it hasn't worked.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. It has too worked. The deficits are coming down right now because of the tax cuts that were put in place earlier this decade. We have seen that happen right now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We raised the debt limit six times. How can you say it worked?

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Yes, sometimes facts are a strange thing. The Federal Government does not have a revenue problem.

Revenues increased by 14.5 percent in 2005, 11.6 percent in 2006, and are projected to grow an additional \$167 billion, or 7 percent this year, because we let the American family keep more of their money, spend it on the things they want to spend it, instead of saying to them, you know what, we are going

to increase spending 4.6 percent in this bill and \$20 some billion in this appropriation process that we have done.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Two seconds, I would just say if your philosophy has worked, you would be in the majority right now.

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how many speakers the other side has?

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I think our time is done.

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

Mr. Chairman, the differences we have heard in this debate are entirely clear. We want to, with Republicans on the Appropriations Committee, who by a widespread margin supported this bill. We want to continue to invest in America's families and in their future. A very small group of Members on the other side want to continue going to the past where they were spending taxpayer dollars on special interest giveaways.

There are people, in all of our districts, who are scratching their heads trying to figure out how they are going to send their kids to college so they can compete in a global economy. The President wants to slash or eliminate college affordability programs for 1.5 million students.

Now, that's why Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee supported investments that will make additional Pell Grants available so that people who are working hard, playing by the rules, and want their kids to advance can send their kids to college. This isn't a radical idea.

This was a bipartisan consensus on the Appropriations Committee. But those who are offering these cutbacks don't agree with Republicans and Democrats who believe in making investments so that people who play by the rules and work hard can send their kids to college.

There are people in our districts who are trying to figure out how they are going to pay for their skyrocketing home heating oil costs. The President wants to cut home heating oil programs by \$379 million and take away assistance to 1.5 million people.

That's why Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee agreed that we should invest a fraction of that, \$880 million to make sure that an additional 1 million people can pay their heating oil bills. Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee, bipartisan, there are a few who say, no, no, we should continue giving tax cuts to big oil company executives rather than giving people the ability, helping people with the ability to pay their home heating oil costs.

There are people in our districts who can't figure out what to do if they get cancer, how they are going to have access to health care programs. The President wants to cut medical research at the NIH by \$480 million and

cut preventive health care services by \$220 million. That's why Democrats and Republicans join together on the Appropriations Committee to invest \$1.3 billion to improve health care access and help 1 million Americans receive treatment and increase investments in NIH.

This is about priorities, bipartisan common-sense priorities. This is about those of us on both sides of the aisle who believe that we should invest in strengthening America's families and a very small group who believe that we should continue to borrow to give away money to the special interests.

I want to conclude by reminding my colleagues how we go about making these investments, not by raising taxes. They are going to keep saying it and saying it and saying it. That's not how we do it. We cut 41 programs. We slashed earmarks in half. We saved \$1 billion.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would rather not talk about what one party did one year and what one party did another year, because I think there is substantial support in both parties for the bill that we have before us today. I want to walk through what the impact of this cut would be on this bill.

If we pass this amendment, we will be cutting \$1.2 billion from No Child Left Behind, the President's signature education set of programs. We will be cutting \$684 million from Title I grants. We will be cutting \$519 million from IDEA. That's a program which both parties have fought for the last 3 days to try to increase.

We would be cutting \$717 million from Pell Grants, reducing scholarship awards for millions of students, despite the fact that the cost of higher education has gone up by 40 percent the last 5 years. We would be cutting \$1.4 billion from the National Institutes of Health, money that we use to combat cancer, heart disease, Parkinson's and the like. We would be cutting \$100 million from community health centers, denying needed health care and dental services to almost half a million people.

We would be cutting \$53 million out of the President's request to prepare the country for a potential pandemic flu. We would be cutting \$320 million from Head Start, \$98 million from Child Care Development Block Grant. We would be cutting \$446 million from the Social Security Administration, denying the resources that agency needs to maintain and keep open its local offices and reduce backlogs of disability and SSI claims.

So people have a choice. What's more important, their own accounting sheets or these investments in the country?

The fact is, with the exception of the gang of four, virtually every Republican who has offered an amendment

has done the same thing that Democrats have tried to do. They have tried to find ways to increase programs that they think are important to the country's future.

I would submit I don't think those Republicans are out of step, and I don't think those Democrats are out of step. I think the folks who are out of step are the gang of four offering the amendments.

□ 1345

I believe that most Americans, and I think most Republicans, would rather invest the funds now to prepare our workforce to be better trained, our kids to be better educated, and our health care system to be more efficient and more and more humane. That is what this bill is all about, and I think that there is a bipartisan consensus in this House to stick with this bill. So I would urge respectfully rejection of the amendment, as I make one other point.

We have the \$1.4 billion initiative of add-ons to try to discourage women from having abortions. Instead of lectures, we provide resources to make their lives better if they decide to have those kids. This bill would cut about 40 percent of that initiative out of the bill. I happen to think that initiative is too important to sandbag, and this amendment sandbags that effort. So I would urge rejection of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

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

SEC. _____. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$1,517,480,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues who are endeavoring to bring about some responsible spending here in Washington. I think this debate is helpful. It is helpful for the American people, because

what it demonstrates is a difference in philosophy.

Before I get to the specifics of my amendment, I want to mention, we have just heard a litany of projects that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee said would be cut with the previous amendment, and he went through: No Child Left Behind cut \$1.2 billion; title I, \$684 million; IDEA, \$519 million; Pell Grants, \$717 million cut.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, what the American people understand is that the amendment that was just proposed would keep funding level. Not cut, level, which means that there wouldn't be any decreases over this current year of spending; there would be the same amount of money. It is what Americans do every year when they have a difficult challenge financially.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we have a difficult challenge financially this year in our Nation. And, consequently, to label those things cuts just isn't so.

But I rise to offer my amendment, which is affectionately known as the Hefley amendment. Former Congressman Joel Hefley from Colorado offered this amendment on multiple occasions. It is a 1 percent reduction in the increase of this Appropriations bill.

Now, to look at the big picture, look at where we are in terms of numbers right now, this current year enacted for this portion of the Federal Appropriations covered \$144.6 billion. The President's request, the administration's request, as we all know, was less than that, \$140.9 billion. The bill that we have before us is \$151.7 billion; \$10.8 billion more than the administration's request, more than the request of those that we charge for running this portion of our Nation.

My amendment that I am offering now would, instead of having this bill be \$151.7 billion, would say let's have it be \$150.2 billion. So, a significant increase over last year but a 1 percent reduction from the increase, an increase that would be greater than the rate of inflation but a 1 percent reduction than that that comes from the committee. And the reason for that is because of the financial situation that we find ourselves in as a Nation.

If you, Mr. Chairman, or I or any of our constituents find themselves in a situation where they need to save some money, then oftentimes what they will do is say we need to cut back across the board on the kinds of things that we are spending. And this amendment simply states that, out of a 1 percent cut, we ought to be able to find one penny out of every dollar to save for our children's future. And the rationale for that is because it is not our money, Mr. Chairman, it is not Congress's money. It is the hard-earned money of the American taxpayer. And we hear a lot about priorities, and we ought to be prioritizing. And that is what budgetary bills are, that is what appropriations bills are, making priority judg-

ments for the hard-earned American taxpayer money. Our priority on this side is that hardworking American taxpayer.

So we rise to offer this amendment that we believe to be a responsible amendment. It outlines the differences between the two sides very clearly. We believe that there ought to be at least one penny out of every dollar that we ought to be able to find in terms of savings for this area for the next year, and offer it sincerely and honestly and respectfully. I would encourage my colleagues to accept the amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's plea. I will again remind my colleagues that Republicans and Democrats on a bipartisan basis came together in support of these investments in America's families. I do not recall the gentleman coming to the floor arguing for a 1 percent cutback when it was time to give rich oil company executives a \$14 billion tax cut.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment but I thank the gentleman for offering it, because it reminds us of what this debate is really about. We are debating about whether we will invest in America's future. We are debating what kind of a Nation we expect to be.

My chairman, fellow committee members of both parties, and the vast majority of people around the country believe in America's future. We believe that America's best days are ahead of us. We believe that the American people can compete and succeed in the global economy, and that the most talented, industrious, and ingenious people on Earth are the American people. And we believe that, to ensure our bright future, we must invest in the American people today.

The America we see ahead of us is one where every child has the opportunity to go to college regardless of whether their parents did and regardless of whether they are rich or poor. They receive the best job training, develop the strongest skills, are empowered to create by laws that reward innovation, and have a government that is working for them, not against them, in foreign markets.

In the America we see, every child and their parents has access to decent health care, and no one working full time, playing by the rules and contributing to the prosperity of the country, has to become impoverished because of the catastrophic illness in the family. No parent should have to mourn the loss of a child it could not provide health care for, and no child should grow up in a home without one of its parents for lack of the same access to care.

For our parents' generation, this vision of America's future resembles their own fondest hopes. Our parents and their parents struggled so that we could enjoy a higher quality of living, better schools, better hospitals, and a safer world than what they knew. And, by and large, this greatest generation was successful. America is a better, more prosperous Nation because of their struggle.

But the generations that went before us did more than struggle; they also invested. They built schools, they built hospitals, they built our Armed Forces, and they invested in America's future. If America is to enjoy the same bright future we have in mind, that investment must go on.

Fortunately, this vision of an America where our best days are still ahead of us is a bipartisan vision. It crosses every economic, political, and generational line. We all want and believe that we can bring about a more secure and more prosperous future for our children and grandchildren. And we believe we can do so, must do so, in a fiscally responsible way by paying as we go.

Sure, there are some who do not share these values or who believe that we can achieve this bright tomorrow without any investment, without any contribution or sacrifice on our part. They are the "get something for nothing" crowd, the "I got mine, you get yours" crowd. They do not believe America needs our investment. And the future? Well, the future can take care of itself.

Some of these naysayers you will hear from today, some you have heard from already. Masquerading under a banner of fiscal prudence they will say, "We cannot afford the investment." It is a masquerade. These are the same people, of course, who drove our national debt to the highest in history through a half decade of borrowing. And theirs was the worst form of borrowing; borrowing that led to no investment and, therefore, to no improvement in the Nation's foundation.

Our parents' generation had them, too, these masqueraders, the "something for nothing" crowd. But just kind of imagine what kind of an America we would live in today if our predecessors had followed their irresponsible siren song. We would still be traveling along dirt roads instead of highways, with crops rotting in the fields, long-term economic stagnation, a bleak presence, and an even bleaker future. We would, in sum, have become that Nation that Franklin Roosevelt so presciently warned against, a Nation with a substantial portion of its people ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and insecure.

It is indeed fortuitous that these voices are few now and were few then, that the overwhelming bipartisan majority of committee members and Americans recognize that we have a responsibility to our Nation's future, and that responsibility requires sound investment.

In 10 years, 2.7 million more kids will be in K-12 schools, and America will be ready for them because we insist on it. In 10 years, 2.2 million more students will be in college, and our universities will be ready for them with a state-of-the-art education because we insist on it. In 10 years, the global economy will be even more extensive and American workers will be competing and winning because we will have invested in them. And, yes, it is because we are insisting on it now.

We believe in America's future. We believe our best days are ahead of us. And we share the belief that our parents had before us that we are responsible for that bright future, and that future requires investment.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is available on both sides?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 11 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I was heartened to hear my good friend talk about the promise for the future, because that is exactly what we are talking about. We are talking about the future. It was a bit of an Orwellian speech there, because the actions of this bill don't match the wonderful sunshine that the gentleman paints, but that is all right, because that continues to be the mantra that we hear.

Americans know that when you hear the word "investment" in this Chamber that what that means is taxes, and it points out the fundamental difference between the majority party and the minority party. The majority party believes that government spends hardworking American taxpayer money better than hardworking American taxpayers. That is the fundamental difference, and that is what this discussion is about. So I am pleased that the gentleman who just spoke shed light on that, because he indeed did.

I yield 4 minutes to my good friend, the gentledady from Oklahoma, and look forward to her comments on a fiscally responsible approach to this appropriations bill.

□ 1400

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Chairman, let me just say I appreciate the good work of the committee. And I know it takes a lot of effort to bring people together for setting the spending priorities and the policies of our Nation, and I know there have been a lot of hearings and testimony on this particular piece of legislation. And I want to commend the committee for their hard work, both Democrats and Republicans.

But I do rise to support this amendment. I think it's a reasonable amendment, to look at how we can, in this Congress, be more fiscally conservative, how we can control our spending.

I've had so many people come up to me since I've been elected as a newly

elected freshman saying, we have to do a better job in Congress of controlling our spending.

This particular amendment cuts the budget by 1 percent. The budget that has been recommended is \$10 billion over last year's. \$10 billion is more than we spend in the State of Oklahoma's whole State budget. \$10 billion is more than that. So I think it's reasonable to say that we would like to cut this amount by 1 percent. I don't know how people can argue with that.

Now, I've heard a lot of discussion here today about how this piece of legislation invests in education, health care, social systems, it's for the future of our children; and I don't think you'll find anyone up here who will argue against those things.

I've also heard some people stand up and say today that the Republicans like to spend money when it's their turn, but when we're spending money, then we're against it.

Well, when you look at the spending amounts that have occurred over the last many years in this Congress I, frankly, don't approve of that. I think we have been spending too much money in this Congress, and I'm not going to lay blame on either side, other than just to say that a 1 percent cut in this budget, to me, seems reasonable. There is an increase in spending for the important things, social programs, education, health care.

I've also heard some of the people who have spoken today talk about the future and about stupid political blunders, spending on policy like the Iraq war. Well, I guess we can have that debate, which we have had, for many, many months. But what I can say is that the money that has been spent by this Congress, and some people have asked, you know, has the money gone to wise things? I personally think that protecting our Nation, protecting our national security and spending that money is a well worth cause.

We're talking about the priorities that we're going to be having here in Congress. Some people have said well, look at the various appropriations bills that we've already had that we've been voting on. Some were \$10 billion more, some were \$7 billion more, \$12 billion more. You didn't object to all the different spending levels that there were. When you add all those things up, that adds up to a lot of money.

And I guess all that is to say that no one in my State has called me and said, please tell Congress to spend a little bit more money. Please tell them that I'm not paying enough, and I have some more.

But what I do hear my people back home say is, set the priorities. Determine what's reasonable. Be fiscally responsible in how we're spending our money.

People are concerned about the rising cost of gas, the rising cost of health care. They're concerned about education, they're concerned about taking care of those who can't take care of themselves.

I think it is reasonable for us to look at a 1 percent cut in this budget, but yet still meet the priorities of this Nation in taking care of the people that need to be taken care of in this appropriations bill.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I would just say to the gentlewoman that in fact she may not be getting calls from people saying that it's harder for their kids to afford college, or that gas prices are getting higher, or that they're worried about their health care. But many Republicans and Democrats are getting those calls, which is why there wasn't a single Republican in the Appropriations Committee who voted against this bill.

The gentlewoman also said that we've got to be fiscally responsible. Well, that's why so many Republicans joined us in supporting this bill, because in fact this bill cuts 41 programs that didn't make sense any more, and reduces by half the number the dollar value of earmarks that we had in the past.

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Chairman, this has been a very interesting debate, and one of the aspects of it with which I find myself in agreement is the assertion by my friend on the other side of the aisle that there is a display of differences of opinion and attitudes with regard to the way in which we handle our fiscal responsibilities here, and there is no question about that.

If you look at the last 6 years, while the Republican Party has controlled every aspect of this government, they managed to succeed to almost double the national debt. They now have us in a situation where we owe almost \$9 trillion, \$8.9 trillion.

They continue to spend, as a result of their initiatives, now, about \$11 billion a month on Iraq, the illegal invasion of Iraq which they perpetrated and are interested in carrying out.

What we're trying to do here in this particular bill, and in the context of our budget responsibilities, is to focus attention on the needs of the American people, what we as a Congress ought to be doing in the context of our responsibilities, serving the American people, doing what's right for them, improving the possibility, the prospects of education, making it easier for our children to get the best possible education that they can get, making it easier for people to get the health care that they need, making it easier for people to deal with housing situations and circumstances so that people have proper housing.

In other words, our objectives and our priorities are to improve the quality of life of the American people, while your obvious priorities and objectives are to decrease the quality of life of the American people, which is consistent with your objective in the context of this particular amendment.

You want to reduce the amount of money that is available for education,

reduce the amount of money that's available for health care, reduce the amount of money that's available for housing and other things that are essential to the American public, while you keep wasting more and more money in Iraq.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair, and again I appreciate the gentleman's passion. We believe that in order to improve Americans' lives you have got to let them keep more of their hard-earned money and that's what this amendment does, allows Americans to keep more of their hard-earned money.

Madam Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 4 minutes to my good friend from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. If the American people, Madam Chairman, are watching this debate, they've certainly seen a lot of name calling and a lot of shouting, and now we're having our motives questioned. I personally try to not go down that road. I assume my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I'm sure their purposes are noble. But I must admit in the 4½ years I've been here, I've certainly been called a lot of names. I think this afternoon's the first time I've been called part of the fringe. I thought fringe had more to do with curtains. But here we are as part of the fringe, I guess, because we believe that the government shouldn't grow faster than the people's ability to pay for it. And somehow that's being called a fringe opinion.

We believe that it's the people's money, and not the government's money. Yet we are being told by our Democrat colleagues that's a fringe opinion.

We happen to believe that the best housing program and the best education program is a paycheck, not a government check; but somehow our Democrat colleagues have chosen to tell us that that's a fringe opinion.

And then we hear lectures from our Democrat colleagues saying well, when you guys were in the majority you spent too much money. So Madam Chairman, their response is well, we're going to spend even more. That logic defies me.

Now, they focus a lot on their noble purposes, Madam Chairman, and they focus a lot on the benefits of all this spending that they care to do. And again, I would like to point out, this particular amendment says that this bill will grow by 3.8 percent instead of 4.8 percent. I suppose that's another fringe opinion as well.

But you know what, Madam Chairman? My friends on the other side of the aisle don't focus upon where this money is coming from, and so they talk about their investments on behalf of the American people. Well, Madam

Chairman, maybe the American people want to make their own investments.

You know, I listen to the Ward family in my district from Garland, Texas, and they write, "Dear Congressman, a tax increase in the spending is going to fuel the taxes, the largest tax increase in American history courtesy of the Democrat Party." So all this spending in this bill is fostering a tax increase on the American people. So the Ward family in Garland says, "A tax increase this year would wipe out my ability to continue my daughter's education."

Well, I've got a message for the Ward family in Garland. Don't worry. Don't worry about it. The Democrats have an investment that they're going to make on your behalf. So don't worry about the \$3,000 a year they're going to take from you.

I also heard from the Kincaid family in Garland. "In my particular case, an additional \$2,200 in taxes would cut into the finances I use to pay for my son's education."

The gentleman from Garland, Texas in my district goes on to say, "I really believe that, given more money, Congress will spend more money. That's not the answer."

Well, I guess we ought to tell the Kincaid family in Garland, Texas, don't worry about your son's college education. The Democrats are going to make an investment for you.

I heard from the Brock family in Dallas, Texas, also in my district. "Dear Congressman, with this tax increase I could not pay for a semester of college for my daughter if I had to send \$2,200 more to the government."

Well, again, we have good news for them. Don't worry about all the money that they're taking. The Democrats have an investment for you.

So, again, Madam Chairman, what our friends on the other side of the aisle don't seem to realize is that all this great government spending and all these wonderful investments they have are coming out of the pockets of the American people. In many respects, we are not having a debate over how much this Nation ought to spend on health. We're debating who's doing the spending. It ought to be the family.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, it's time for a fact check for the American people. The gentleman said, well, we may have spent a lot of money; but now you're spending more.

Fact: This bill saves \$1.1 billion over last year.

Fact: This bill slashes earmark dollar value 50 percent from last time.

Fact: This bill eliminates 41 programs that don't make sense any more. Facts count.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, we believe we do have a fringe four or five here in the Congress. And it's not, when the gentleman refers to me or the gentleman from New York or the chairman, you're talking about a

bill that passed out of the committee with unanimous support from Democrats and Republicans. You will see on the floor it will pass with Democrat and Republican votes. This is a bipartisan bill.

But we have a fringe group in the House that consistently wants to try to find out and try to figure out how to make things work. And what this bill does is it invests in our future. And the bottom line is this. We're now competing with 1.3 billion people in China, 1.2 billion people in India, competitive global economy.

And over the last few years, we've seen for the average American people, and the gentleman from Georgia said, well, we want people to keep more of their own money. So do we. But they haven't been over the past few years.

There's been a \$3,200 increase in their energy costs, a \$1,200 increase in their health insurance, a 40 percent increase in college tuition. Wages for college grads in the last 4 or 5 years is down 5.2 percent.

Gas prices, the fastest growing part of the budget has been the interest payments on the debt. But our bill addresses middle class family wages, down \$1,669 over the past 2 years. So the American people have not been able to keep more of their own money. And so our agenda, through this bill and other bills that we have passed addressed that issue.

How do you reduce the cost of energy? You make investments in research and development, and that will yield us benefits down the line.

How do you help families send their kids to schools? You invest money into the Pell Grant. You cut student loan interest rates in half. And the difference really has been with the student loan interest rates, we're not spending any more money. What we're saying is that money is not going to go to the banks. That money is going to go to the kids and the students, and we're going to cut the student loan interest rates in half and increase the Pell Grant.

We have money in here for our community health centers, so kids can get preventative care, so they end up they can get treated for a cold, instead of ending up in the emergency room for a much higher price to the taxpayer. So we're making significant investments. And this bill will help secure a strong future for the United States of America.

We need to get more kids in college. We need to invest in foreign languages. That's what this bill does. And I'm proud of this bill, on a bipartisan basis.

And I think it's important for the people, Madam Chairman, who are listening as this goes into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. What do they want? They want an investment in their future, and that's what this bill does. It makes that investment to secure our future and make us strong and move us in a new direction.

□ 1415

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, a lot is being said, a lot of numbers are being thrown around, a lot of claims are being made, even claims that facts are facts. And I just wanted to clarify a point that my good friend from New York made, and that is that this bill saves \$1.5 billion over last year. I don't understand that statement because last year we spent \$144.7 billion in budget authority, enacted, and this year it is \$151 billion, so almost \$8 billion more than last year.

So the facts, I think, need to be checked. Let's try to be accurate. Everybody wants to thump their chest and say what a great party they have. But the facts are we are spending \$8 billion this year more than last if this bill passes.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments that I believe point clearly to what the facts are.

I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 2½ minutes.

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, I rise on behalf of the fringe in America. Madam Chairman, that would be the fringe that believes that governments ought to live within their means, ought to pay their bills, ought to balance budgets.

The gentleman from Ohio, whom I respect and admire his style as a legislator and a leader, has coined the phrase "fringe," and I want to embrace it. I want to come to this floor and say every American who believes that we ought to balance the Federal budget, who believes that we ought to come together across the political divide and reform entitlements, who believes we ought to wrestle to the ground an \$8 trillion national debt, that fringe is the fringe that I represent in America and those with which I proudly stand.

And let me say I know that number 8 trillion very well. On my way to the floor today, I passed the office of clearly a dozen of the gentleman from Ohio's colleagues' offices, Democrats all, who anyone looking on wouldn't necessarily know, who all have signs in front of their office lamenting an \$8 trillion national debt. And as the other gentleman said, I lament the role of the Republican majority in creating that, and I fought members of my own majority in years that we saw the debt go from \$5 trillion to \$8 trillion.

But I say on behalf of the fringe, the fringe of Americans who say govern-

ments ought to live within their means, they ought to balance budgets, they ought to make the tough choices in a bipartisan way to live within the fiscal values that the American people represent, I say let's deal with it. And this cut today brought by the gentleman from Georgia is a modest step to be sure. It is a 1 percent cut. It says instead of doing with a 4.8 percent increase over last year, the Federal Government will have to get by on a 3.8 percent increase over last year. And it doesn't seem to me to be too much to ask, with an \$8 trillion national debt, for us to come together and begin to trim and begin to make the hard choices. But it won't solve the real problem, and my cherished colleagues on the other side of the aisle know this. We have to get past the names; we have to get past the categories, and we have to represent the fringe of America that wants to see us balance this budget.

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

Well, Madam Chairman, it is refreshing to hear some candor on the other side in their admission that there is a fringe. And that is, in fact, a matter of fact because there wasn't a single Republican vote against this appropriations bill in committee.

Now, those who define themselves on the fringe would suggest that the answer to America's problems is a 1 percent solution. We can rein in our deficit that they built up with a 1 percent cutback.

I don't know where they were, and I have a very high regard for their position, but I do feel an obligation to ask where were they in offering amendments to cut \$13 billion in giveaways to the richest oil company executives making the largest profits in the history of humankind? Where was the 1 percent cut amendment then? Suddenly we could afford that, but we can't afford additional Pell Grants for the steelworker that the gentleman refers to.

Where were they with an amendment for a 1 percent cut in excessive payments to Halliburton, \$1.47 billion in payments to Halliburton that have been found by the Federal Government to be fraudulent? Where was the amendment to cut those payments by 1 percent? We could afford excessive and fraudulent payments to Halliburton, but we can't afford additional investments in cancer research and access to health care for the American people.

I would respect my colleagues if they showed more consistency. But there has not been that consistency. It is not about spending. It is about spending on the wrong things and the wrong priorities.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SCHIFF. I think I may have the gentleman's answer to where was the fringe when the giveaways to the oil

companies and the Halliburtons were taking place; why wasn't there an effort to cut those giveaways by 1 percent.

Those who wanted to cut those profits and those giveaways were not part of the fringe. The fringe we are talking about here today is the fringe that says we want those obscene oil company profits. We want those obscene profits for Halliburton. But we want to cut over \$1 billion out of education, out of health care. That is the fringe we are talking about.

The overwhelming bipartisan majority of us want to balance the budget. We are working hard to do that. But we don't want to balance the budget on the backs of our kids and on the backs of those who need health care and on the backs of our workers who need training. And that, I think, is the fringe that we are talking about here today.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman.

I will conclude, Madam Chairman, by suggesting that the mainstream view, the view that has been endorsed on a bipartisan basis by mainstream Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee and the American people is that we should make investments in education. The fringe view: more oil money for oil companies.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I would like to again simply walk us through what this cut means in specific terms. This amendment would cut \$257 million from the President's No Child Left Behind education flagship program. It would cut \$144 million from title I, denying more than 40,000 students those title I services. It would cut \$113 million from Special Education. It would wipe out every single amendment but one that was passed on this floor in the last 2 days to enhance Special Education, most of those amendments coming from the Republican side of the aisle.

It would cut \$156 million from Pell Grants. It would cut \$300 million from the National Institutes of Health for medical research in cancer, heart disease, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's and the like. It would cut \$22 million from community health centers. Over 100,000 of the uninsured would not have access to those services. It would cut \$70 million from Head Start, \$21 million from the Child Care Development Block Grant. It would cut \$27 million from LIHEAP.

I want to remind you, in LIHEAP, the bill itself only restores half of the cut that was made last year by the President and the Congress.

It would cut \$97 million from the Social Security Administration. Members are climbing all over me saying, "What are we going to do to keep my local Social Security offices open? What are we going to do to eliminate the multi-

month backlog in people applying for Social Security disability?" I will tell you what they are going to do. This will add to it. It will add to the problem.

So with all due respect to the sanctimony that we hear from those who belatedly cry about the Federal deficit, I didn't hear them crying about the Federal deficit when they voted to spend \$600 billion on an ill-advised war in Iraq. I don't hear them crying about the fact that \$57 billion in tax cuts for millionaires adds \$57 billion to the Federal deficit.

So I just think we need to recognize that I believe the vast majority of Americans and I believe substantial portions of both parties in this House believe that this bill is responsible in real dollar terms. All of the domestic appropriation bills that we will produce and have produced this year amount to a 1 percent increase in real terms.

One of the gentlemen over there claimed that these were not cuts. Well, let me tell you something. If you appropriate the same amount of money this year that you appropriated last year but inflation eats away at that and so does population growth, if you don't adjust for inflation and population growth, then to each recipient of the services under this legislation there is indeed a cut to them. And that is what counts. It is the impact on their pocketbook. It is the impact on their ability to get help to send their kids to school.

It is an impact on the couple in my District who called 31 dentists to try to get some help with their kid who had to have the braces taken off his teeth. They couldn't get any of them to take them because the dentists wouldn't take Medicaid patients. They didn't have a local clinic. So the mother held the kid down while the father took the braces off with a pair of pliers.

That wouldn't happen to any child of a Member of Congress. The gentleman is smiling about that. I don't think that is anything to smile about. I met that woman.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. The conversation that I was having with my assistant to the right resulted in my glee, not to your comment.

Mr. OBEY. I understand.

But let me simply say, Madam Chairman, these cuts, these will be cuts in terms of the services that we are trying to provide to these people. It is immoral. It is unconscionable that we allow 44 million Americans to go without health insurance.

This bill will deliver health care coverage to 2 million more Americans than got it last year. It will make up in a tiny way for the indifference, the massive indifference, which has characterized this country the past few years on the issue of health coverage.

I would urge a "no" vote on the amendment and support for the underlying bill.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1430

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MRS.

MUSGRAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 23 offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

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

SEC. ____ . Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.5 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, the amendment that I'm offering today to this appropriations bill would make a cut of just one-half of 1 percent of the overall funding of the bill.

You know, my friends on the other side of the aisle, Madam Chairman, are talking about how we are "fringe" Members of the House of Representatives. You know, when I go into my district and I talk to people, one thing that they really want Congress to do is rein in spending. We hear lots of individuals say, you know, we have to live within our family budget, how come Congress doesn't have to do that? I was proud to be in the State legislature in Colorado where we had an amendment to our Constitution forcing us to live within our means, so to speak, in the State of Colorado. We could not spend money that we didn't have.

Well, here in the Federal Government, it seems that even though as I walk down the hallways of the office buildings, the Longworth House Office Building, I see many signs on easels out in the hall talking about our \$8.8 trillion debt. We are being constantly reminded of that. And you know what? I think that is very appropriate. I think every American ought to see that placard and see what we have, \$8.8 trillion debt.

And as I think about that, I'm just offering the Members of Congress yet another opportunity to do the right thing, the right thing being exercising fiscal discipline, just a modicum of fiscal discipline, 1.5 percent. So the increase in this bill would go from 4.8 increase to 4.3. Now, some people would

miscategorize that as a cut. It is not a cut. It is still an increase in spending of 4.3 percent.

So I would ask my colleagues to identify with the American people who admire people who can live within their means, who don't spend money that they really don't have, but show the discipline to do the right thing.

And I'm asking for this cut today. How many people can visualize a \$100 bill? You give someone a \$100 bill and say I want you to spend this wisely, but let's just save 50 cents of that \$100 bill. How many people would say that that was unreasonable?

Madam Chairman, I'm saying today that this Congress needs to start on the right path. I'm asking for a .5 percent amendment to this appropriation bill.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Well, another fringe offering. Now we're down to .5 percent. The solution to America's problems is now down to .5 percent. The solution to America's problems is now down to .5 percent, less Pell Grant money so the kids can go to college, higher fuel bills in the winter for people who can't pay their fuel bills. I never saw a .5 percent reduction in funds to Halliburton. I never saw a .5 percent reduction in the \$13 billion in giveaways to Big Oil company executives, who are making the world's greatest profits. But now suddenly, when it comes to reducing people's heating bills or reducing their college costs, we want them to have another .5 percent burden because the burden they have just isn't enough.

This is déjà vu all over again. It was a bad idea on the amendment before this. It was a bad idea on the amendment before that. It's still a bad idea, it's just down to a .5 percent bad idea.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

And since my friends on the other side of the aisle have embraced their fringeness, I would like to just point out to you from the Roll Call today, around the Hill there is a festival, 11-day play, this weekend. I know many of you go home, so many of your staff may want to attend this, it's the Capitol Fringe Festival. So you may be able to attend and completely embrace the fringeness.

But again, as the gentleman has said, Madam Chair, when we first got in the majority in January, we tried to pass out of this House, in our Six in '06, provisions that we passed, campaigned on and then passed. One of the provisions was to strip \$14 billion from the oil companies. And our friends, who are now wanting to take this money from Pell Grants and investments in education, investments in health care,

voted against stripping the oil companies of \$14 billion. And this is what we're talking about.

This bipartisan committee passed out of the committee unanimously, on support of the Republicans on that committee, with the support of the Democrats on this committee, well thought-out pieces of legislation, well thought-out amendments in the committee, supported unanimously by both sides. And what we're saying is, we have to make these investments.

And there is no tax increase in this year's budget, none, zero, that's it. You can't point it out. In 2007, keep your forms, 2006, or last year's forms, and compare them to next year's, and there will be not one dime of an increase. All we did was we took that money that our friends were giving to the banks and we invested that money in the kids. The \$14 billion that was going to the oil companies at their times of highest profits is going into health care and education now and alternative energy.

As I said earlier, this is very simple. We're in a globally competitive market, and we need to make investments into our kids and into our future. That's what this bill does.

Now what you're saying is, with tuition costs going up 40 percent, health insurance going up \$100 a year, and energy costs going up \$3,200 a year, that the solution to that problem and every other problem we have in the country right now is a .5 percent cut that would put additional burdens on families who are trying to send their kids to school, would reduce the money that we're making into making our citizens healthier and community health clinics so that at the end of the day would allow us to prevent people from ending up in the emergency room and costing us billions and billions of dollars more.

These are good investments, voted on in a bipartisan way, and will secure the strength of our country in the future.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, I won't be at the Fringe Festival this weekend, I will be going home to Colorado. I will be talking to the folks that are working hard every day, raising their children, trying to make ends meet, and worrying about higher taxes. And I think they should be worrying about higher taxes because when we have increases like this, we're going to see those placards in the hallway with a national debt ever increasing.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank the gentlelady from Colorado for yielding, and for her excellent, truly excellent amendment.

I have been following the debate for some time now. Like many of our colleagues, sometimes we have to follow it in our office as we are conducting other business. And I hate that we have stooped to sort of name calling, which unfortunately I have seen.

I guess the gentleman from Ohio says that we're embracing the "fringe"

label, and so therefore I suppose I'm down here to make the fringe larger. And I guess there is a little humor in that, and I will just take it in that sense because I'm sure my friend from Ohio didn't mean any harm by it.

But as my good friend, Mr. PENCE, said in his comments, that if the fringe are those hardworking Americans who think they make better decisions on how to spend the money that they earn than we do here in Congress, then I'm in the right place.

We heard that this amendment, this very modest amendment to look for .5 percent savings would place an increased burden, a .5 percent increased burden on the American people. There is no question that the largest tax increase in American history will place a huge burden on the working families of America.

And with all respect to my good friend and colleague from Ohio, the Democrats' budget, in order to balance as the rules require by the end of the budget period, does impose the largest tax increase in American history. And already we're starting to see the majority party have to start to pay the price for some of the budget gimmicks that have been involved in making that work.

Now, the Democrats, while increasing spending, it seems like almost across the board, certainly in the Department of Labor, couldn't manage to keep the spending for the Office of Labor Management Standards at last year's level. There they could find the cut. When it came to the office whose responsibility is to find the crooks who are stealing from union members, they found a way to impose a 4 percent cut in that office. And what a shame that is.

I offered an amendment, it received some bipartisan support, but nevertheless, on a largely partisan basis, that amendment was defeated. That amendment would have just restored the funding to last year's level for the only office in government who has the responsibility and the capability to hunt down and catch the crooks that steal from our American workers, but the majority party could find a way to cut there.

So, I think that the choice here is clear. It's been stated by many of my colleagues. Many of us, fringe or not fringe, believe that the American people can make better decisions on how to spend their money, and we should let them do it.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chair, I would just pose a question to the gentlewoman from Colorado and would yield to her for a response.

I am just curious as to how public education is funded in the State of Colorado.

I will yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. The public education system in Colorado is funded by tax dollars, primarily coming from property taxes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Thank you. Reclaiming my time, the gentlewoman's proposal

would impose an across-the-board cut in No Child Left Behind. No Child Left Behind is a Federal program that local school districts must honor. It is a huge unfunded Federal mandate. And I don't know about the gentlewoman's school districts, but I know that my school districts come to me all the time saying, Washington is forcing us to do these programs, but they're not giving us the money that they promised, which means that we have to raise taxes.

And so I would respectfully suggest to the gentlewoman that a .5 percent cut in this bill is a .5 percent property increase in her congressional district, because those poor school districts don't have the ability to say yes or no to those programs. They've just got to provide the services and find the money for it.

We don't think that local property taxpayers should have to bear that burden. We believe, along with every single Republican in the Appropriations Committee, that the Federal Government should assist in those programs.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wanted to take a moment to address the nature of the proposed amendment, and the amendment before it, and perhaps the amendment after it, the whole nature of the across-the-board amendments. Because I think the beauty of across-the-board amendments, in the eyes of the authors of those amendments, is that they're anonymous in their cuts; they're anonymous in the pain they distribute. They can go home to their district and say, oh, I'm not in favor of cutting education, I'm in favor of across-the-board cuts. Or I'm not in favor of cutting home heating oil for people, no, that would lack compassion, but I am for across-the-board cuts. What's a 1 percent cut? What's a half of 1 percent cut? Well, what it is is hundreds of millions of dollars taken out of education or out of home heating oil or out of health care or out of cancer research or out of special education.

So let's not take ourselves off the hook here. And I would be willing to yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Do you support cuts in home heating oil assistance? Are you ready to stand up here and say to your constituents, yes, I am for cutting home heating assistance? Do you support cuts in special education? Are you willing to say here today to your constituents that I support cuts in special education? I support cuts in abstinence programs. I support cuts in cancer research. Would you tell us if you support cuts in home heating assistance?

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Well, there is a thing called "Orwellian speak." And when we have a bill that has a 4.8 percent increase and we go to 4.3, that is not a cut.

Mr. SCHIFF. Reclaiming my time, I will be happy to yield if you will an-

swer the question. The question is, do you support cutting home heating oil assistance? It's a yes or no question, it's not complicated. Do you support cutting heating home assistance for poor people? Yes, I support it?

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Well, if the gentleman would yield, that funding is increased in this legislation, and you know it.

What is at issue here is how do you define "cut"? 4.8 to 4.3 increase.

Mr. SCHIFF. Reclaiming my time. I'm not surprised that I can't get a yes or no answer. I'm not surprised that the gentlewoman is not willing to stand up and say, yes, I support cutting this because I have other priorities. Home heating oil, that's not one of them. Large oil industry profits, that's one of my priorities. Halliburton, that's one of my priorities. But cutting heating oil, that's not a priority, or cutting special ed.

Let me ask you another question; do you think that cuts in college education funding, higher education funding, can be done without cutting the number of kids who have access to college? Do you think we can cut funding from this bill for higher education funding without reducing the number of kids that can go to college?

And you say, it's just half a percent we're cutting from higher ed, or the increase in higher ed, or however you want to phrase it. But the cut is real that you're proposing. So what does that mean? 25,000 more kids can't go to college?

□ 1445

Is that a fair number? Well, maybe that is too much. Should we say 10,000 more American kids can't go to college because of your cut? Is that a fair number? Would you support that? Would you support your amendment if you knew that?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and to follow customary courtesy in the process of yielding and reclaiming time.

The gentleman may continue.

Mr. SCHIFF. Through the Chair, in my remaining time, I would ask the gentlewoman from Colorado whether she is willing to support her cuts if she knows that it will mean fewer children in Colorado can go to college.

I would be happy to yield for an answer to this question. Through the Chair, to my colleague from Colorado, if her cuts mean that fewer of her constituents in Colorado can go to college, is she still willing to propose those cuts?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, I think what I should do is purchase a dictionary and have my friend on the other side of the aisle look up what a cut is.

When you go from 4.8 percent increase in spending and you take away

.5, you end up with a 4.3 percent increase in spending. That is what this legislation does. Even with this modest amendment that I offer, it would still be a 4.3 percent increase.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Madam Chairman, I have been enjoying hearing the debate here today. As usual, sometimes Republicans and Democrats appear to be passing each other a little bit in the night. It seems to me from hearing comments now from a number of Democratic speakers that there is an implicit assumption based on all of their arguments, and that is, hey, this is important, education is important, and this is important, and heating oil is important, and all this stuff; therefore, the government has to do it all for everybody.

Now, I think the other assumption, and this is the assumption that I make, is that Americans are buying an awful lot more government than we can afford. That is what my constituents are telling me. That is common sense. Going back to my district, things are getting more and more expensive. We keep increasing everything that government does.

The idea is, well, you are not compassionate because you don't want to add more money to government subsidies to do this and government subsidies to do that. Hey, the logical conclusion on that is the government would get 100 percent of your paycheck. I don't think that is why we are competitive.

I have also heard people say that we are in a global economy, as though being in a global economy somehow excuses that the Federal Government should do everything for everybody. I am not buying that assumption. The reason we are competitive in a global economy is because of free enterprise. There is one thing about a safety net. But we are buying too much government.

To add insult to injury, now the Democrats have just passed the biggest tax increase in the history of the United States. They are griping about one-half of 1 percent of a cut in one little bill in discretionary income, and they are adding the average of \$3,000 per household across this entire Nation. Now, it would be interesting enough if they just add \$3,000. The trouble with doing that this year is, guess what, you will get the \$3,000 next year and the next year after that and the next year after that. But the spending is even more.

So we are hearing an objection, and it is all couched in this, oh, don't you care about poor people with fuel oil heating bills and about education and stuff. The trouble is, we are spending too much. What part of that don't we get? So somebody offers this timid little amendment for one-half of 1 percent, and it is like the wheels are going to fall off.

I have to say in answer to the questions, look, we are just buying too

much government. We have to start somewhere. I appreciate the gentlewoman's amendment. She is at least starting on one piece of one bill here. While I call it a little bit of a timid amendment, I am certainly prepared to vote for it.

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

Madam Chairman, I would yield to the gentlewoman if she cares to answer this: The committee report states that the committee recommends \$15,027,000 for prevention grants to reduce the abuse of runaway youth. Does the gentlewoman advocate a .5 percent reduction in a \$15 million budget to prevent the abuse of runaway youth, which was supported unanimously in the committee?

Madam Chairman, I will yield to the gentlewoman.

If the gentlewoman can't answer, I will ask her to give us an answer to this: the committee report, unanimously approved in committee, recommends \$42,430,000 for community-based child abuse prevention.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I ask the gentlewoman whether she is advocating a .5 percent reduction in a \$42 million line item for community-based child abuse prevention. I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman for an answer.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISRAEL. I will yield to the gentlewoman for an answer, since it is her amendment. I will not, at this time, yield to the gentleman.

I would like to yield to the gentlewoman, since it is her amendment.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. If I may answer your question, first, I would like to point out that, I just realized this, up here to my right in the front of the room, in the front of the Chamber, there is a dictionary. Perhaps the gentleman would like to look up the word "cut." Perhaps the gentleman would like to look up the word "rationalization." Because the gentleman knows that there is still an increase of 4.3 percent in this bill, even with this modest amendment.

You know what? You can rationalize anything. You can be altruistic with someone else's money. We need to curb spending.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I reclaim my time.

Madam Chairman, I am using the terms the gentlewoman insists on. I am reading directly from the committee report. The committee report states that there is \$26,848,000 for adoption opportunities. Because we all want to reduce the number of abortions in the United States, so there is \$26,848,000 for adoption opportunities. The gentlewoman's amendment would, as I understand it, reduce by .5 percent the amounts that are in this bill.

So, Madam Chairman, I ask the gentlewoman again, and I will yield to her, is she advocating a .5 percent reduction in the committee recommendation of \$26,848,000 for adoption opportunities?

I will yield to the gentlewoman, since it is her amendment.

If she cares not to take the time, I will ask the gentleman. I will yield to the gentleman if he can answer this, Madam Chairman. I would yield to the gentleman, if he would choose to answer this question.

The committee report recommends \$9.5 million, out of a \$2.5 trillion Federal budget, \$9.5 million for the adoption incentives programs. I would ask, Madam Chairman, whether the gentleman supports a .5 percent reduction in adoption incentives.

I would also ask, Madam Chairman, this: the committee recommends a total level of funding of \$141 million for the Community Based Abstinence Education program. That is the level of funding that the committee, on a unanimous basis, Republicans in the mainstream and Democrats in the mainstream, agree on.

I will yield to the gentleman, Madam Chairman, if he can say is it the position of the fringe that we should actually cut by .5 percent \$141 million for Community Based Abstinence programs.

I will yield to the gentleman, Madam Chairman.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman that under his logic that \$141 million proposed in here is actually a cut, because it is a cut from \$150 million. It is a \$9 million cut from \$150 million. Why aren't we spending \$150 million?

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I reclaim my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. You see, you only can measure from what—

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I reclaim my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded to follow customary courtesy in the process of yielding and reclaiming time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, may I ask how much time I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1½ minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I would just state at some point, two plus two has to equal four. It can't equal what you want it to be; it has to equal four.

These are the amounts of funding that are in this bill, reported by Republicans and Democrats. Every single mainstream Republican, every conservative Republican on the Appropriations Committee, supported these numbers. The gentlewoman says, no, no, we have to shave .5 percent from these numbers.

I am still waiting to hear whether a single Member on that side would pub-

licly say that they want to cut adoption programs, abstinence programs, runaway youth programs, child abuse programs.

I will yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I hate to interrupt this beautiful debate going on, but I think it is important for us to make a point. We offered our friends in the fringe an opportunity within the first 100 hours we were here to strip \$14 billion from the oil companies, corporate welfare that they were getting from the United States taxpayers, and you all voted against it, or at least most of you did. You had a chance for \$14 billion from the oil companies. But you choose to come here now and take it out of the hide of the students and the middle-class families who are trying to make ends meet.

That is the difference. This is a change in priorities. You had a chance for \$14 billion from the oil companies. You were silent. Now you choose to do it for programs that are going to make us stronger in the long run.

So I thank the gentleman, I thank the Chair, I thank the ranking member for putting together such a great bill here, and I think we should leave it as it is and not ask the people who have had increased energy costs, a 40 percent tuition increase, now to say wait a minute, we don't want to help you with that. We want to cut that by .5 percent, too.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, since we had a rudimentary arithmetic thing here, two plus two equals four, I just want to remind my friend, Madam Chairman, that a 4.8 percent increase minus .5 percent still equals a 4.3 percent increase in spending.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Florida (Mr. FEENEY).

Mr. FEENEY. I thank the gentlewoman.

I would suggest that the real math is that this amendment would still anticipate a \$6.5 billion increase, yet it is being called a cut.

I had to come down from my office, because I heard that if you were an advocate for taxpayers, you are now part of the fringe of this Congress. If you are an advocate for fiscal responsibility, suddenly you are part of the fringe. Sadly, I would have to acknowledge, if you care about fiscal responsibility and taxpayers in this Congress, you are becoming part of the fringe.

Increasing the budget expenditures by 4.3 percent is somehow going to lead to the end of civilization and the death of all of the children out there and throwing people out of hospital beds.

I would remind all of my colleagues, we have a 10th amendment in this country. Over the years, we now have a \$150 billion-plus annual budget to deal with things like labor, health care and education. It isn't a question of whether or not we are going to spend money in America on health care and education. It is a question of who does the spending and who gets to control it.

I would ask every American, as the Federal budget has skyrocketed and we have taken control and micromanaged their health care and education, has public education gotten cheaper? Has it gotten better? Has America's health care system, as we spend so much money on health care, gotten cheaper and gotten better?

Winston Churchill once famously said, there is nothing one government learns so readily from the last as how to spend other people's money, i.e., the taxpayers.

Sadly, this new majority did not learn the lesson that some of us learned in the last several Congresses: we are spending too much, we are abusing American taxpayers, and the notion is that if you care for children, if you care for people that need health care, you have to confiscate as much money out there from taxpayers and working people as possible and you have to micromanage the way it gets spent on so-called "their behalf."

The bureaucrats are happy. The regulators are happy. The politicians in Washington are fat and happy. But the American taxpayer and the people that need real education services and need choices in health care are not happy.

With that, on behalf of the fringe that cares about taxpayers in this Congress, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, as I hear the comments from my friends on the other side of the aisle, I would almost remember when my children were small and they actually believed in Santa Claus. They thought that whatever they wanted, they could have. We had to learn some lessons. They had a wish-list, and then we had to live within our means.

When I think of the good things, and, by the way, I am very happy to hear that my friend on the other side of the aisle supports abstinence education, when I hear about spending in these areas, there is a finite amount of money. When you are promoting government programs, you are reaching into the pocket of the taxpayer. That is the only place we get our money, from the American taxpayer. And as we think about the largest tax increase in history, I think we ought to realize this burden, and I just picture this enormous burden on our children and our grandchildren that we are leaving.

In the meantime, we can be proud of our spending, because we are spending for very noble things, and there are very many noble things in this bill.

□ 1500

But what we are doing is we are crushing our children and our grandchildren with this \$8.8 trillion debt, this \$8.8 trillion debt that is growing under this majority.

I was one of the ones in the back of the room, you're right, my friends on the other side of the aisle are right. We spent too much. The Republican Party are guilty of that.

But there were those of us who were budget hawks then that said our party not only should cut taxes but should restrain spending. We were saying that and we are saying it now as we see the majority party going down the road at an even more rapid pace, spending more money, increasing that enormous burden on our children and grandchildren.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I will make the same observation as I made last night. What we have going on here, in my judgment, is Operation Diversion. You have a bunch of people in this House who are perfectly comfortable with the fact that the tax policies that they have voted for will deliver \$57 billion in tax cuts this year to people who make over a million dollars a year. That is five times as much money as the increase that we have in this bill above the President's request.

And you have people who have voted for the war in Iraq, which has spent \$600 billion in a case of mistaken identity as they mistook the stocky guy with the mustache, Saddam Hussein, for the tall guy with the beard, Osama bin Laden, and that mistake has cost us \$600 billion when you take into account the President's newest request. That is 60 times as much as the addition we have above the President's budget for these programs.

They voted for all of that, and now they want to scramble away from the deficits and the debt that that has produced. And they try to divert the attention of the public and say, oh, the real cause of our fiscal mess is the fact that these crazy Democrats are trying to put more money into education and more money into health care and more money into job training.

Well, I plead fully guilty. We are trying to do that because yes, we do believe that these are investments. We think that kids are better off if you put more money into education than if you take it away. And we think society is better off economically and morally if we do more to help people who need health care than less.

Now this amendment would cut the following amounts from the bill: It would cut \$128 million from this bill for No Child Left Behind.

It would cut \$74 million from Title I. It would cut \$56 million from IDEA. Republicans and Democrats alike have spent the last 2 days trying to increase funds for IDEA; now they want to cut it back by \$56 million.

They want to cut from this bill \$78 million for Pell Grants, despite the fact that college costs have exploded.

They want to cut \$148 million from this bill for the National Institutes of Health.

They want to cut \$48 million from this bill for the Social Security Administration.

They want to cut \$69 million from this bill out of programs that we have here to try to discourage women from having abortions. Now if they want to vote for that, be my guest. We don't happen to think, and I think there are significant numbers of our friends on the minority side of the aisle who don't happen to think that is a good idea.

We do have to make choices, and the basic choices here are do we want to defend the 2 percent increase in these programs above the President's level, because that is what it is, it is a 2 percent difference. And if you don't believe my definition, then take a look at CQ and National Journal because that is the way they define it.

Do you want to put 2 percent more into the health and education of the country, into the training of our workforce, or do you instead want to use it for additional money in Iraq and additional money for tax cuts for the most wealthy people in this country, most of whom would gladly see a reduction in their take if we could improve the quality of our workforce and the quality of our education and the quality of our law enforcement?

I plead fully guilty to agreeing with them, and I would ask for a "no" vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

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

SEC. ____ . Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.25 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, first of all, I am happy to stand up here and identify myself with, as the majority party says, "the fringe." You know, you may have noticed recently that the approval ratings for this Congress are not

very good. In fact, I think the latest I saw was that only 17 percent of Americans believe that this Congress is doing a good or a fair job. So I guess that being on the fringe of this Congress is meaning that we agree and associate ourselves with 83 percent of the American people. I would tell my friends on the majority that I am very happy to be on the fringe in Washington but on the mainstream outside of Washington.

And the mainstream outside of Washington wants to keep their own money to spend it on what they want. And they believe, Madam Chairman, even if the other side doesn't, Americans believe, and they are right, that government wastes some of their tax money. And what this proposed amendment does is it would increase spending on this bill by 4.6 percent instead of 4.8 percent. It is a reduction over what is proposed by a quarter of a percent. A quarter of a percent. It still provides an increase of \$6.6 billion over last year.

So under this amendment if there is a government program that is scheduled to get a million dollars, it would instead have to struggle through on \$997,500.

Madam Chairman, I would ask you, I understand that it appears that the Members of the majority party believe that life as we know it will end if that million-dollar government program must exist on \$997,500, but I don't think that the majority of Americans feel that.

Let me point out again that first of all this amendment is not a cut because one equals one. Two is more than one even if you want three. So this amendment still enables a gigantic \$6.6 billion increase in spending on this bill. But what it would do is it would put \$379 million back in taxpayers' pockets, back towards deficit reduction. So it is not a cut.

The other thing that is amazing to me in this whole debate and discussion is there seems to be a direct correlation on the majority side between how much you spend on something and the outcome you are going to get. If that were the case, you could take every school in America, line them up by how much money is spent per student and you should see a direct correlation with the outcomes with how those students succeed out of school.

Well, there are many situations where there are schools spending \$3,000 to \$4,000 a student significantly outperforming schools spending 10, 12, \$15,000 per student in the same place.

Why if there were a direct correlation between how much you spend on something and the outcome, then wouldn't Paris Hilton be the most well-adjusted kid on the planet; and I think perhaps she is not.

So does anybody out there believe that in this gigantic bill of billions and billions of dollars, that there is not one-quarter of a percent of waste, that is not one-quarter of a percent less that any given agency could do without than they have now?

Now I know that my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to have a very difficult time understanding what it means to save the taxpayers a little money, what it means to ask government to be a little more efficient, so I would like to explain it to you graphically, if I may.

This, Madam Chairman, represents 100 percent of a government program. I have used a donkey because I feel that is something that the majority party has some familiarity with. This represents 100 percent of a government spending program.

Let's look and see what we have seen so far. There was an amendment to reduce this program which has already been increased by 1 percent, so there is 99 percent of a government spending program.

Madam Chairman, I would suggest perhaps people in the gallery and people at home may not even be able to tell much of a difference. But the majority party rejected that.

The amendment from the lady from Colorado was a half a percent reduction, so here is 99½ percent of a government spending program. Looks to me like that donkey is pretty much intact. I think it could probably survive. But that was rejected just a moment ago by the majority party.

So here is one last chance, one more chance. I would ask my Democratic colleagues: Can this government program survive like that with 99.75 percent of its spending? You know what, I think the American people will look at this and say yeah, they can. You know what that means, it means that \$379 million back in the American people's pockets and back to reduce this deficit and hopefully leading us towards no longer stealing the Social Security surplus. I don't think they see much difference here, but they will see a difference at home.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

□ 1515

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I appreciate all these donkeys on posters. We won't say anything about the 3 trillion elephants that ought to be on these posters, the \$3 trillion in debt that part of this fringe has supported when they wanted to spend more money on Halliburton, more money on tax cuts for big oil companies, didn't see any amendments to cut those amendments. Now we see amendments to cut or reduce the amount of spending and investment in other funds.

I would, Madam Chairman, through the Chair, ask the gentleman that if we were, you know, I guess in Washington two plus two can equal whatever you want it to be if you listen to other side, Madam Chairman. But I would like to, using the gentleman's own definition of

cuts and no cuts and using his posters, I would ask the gentleman, Madam Chairman, and I'd be happy to yield to him through the Chair.

The gentleman seeks a cut, an actual cut, in Abandoned Infants Assistance. Now, this isn't a cut in any increased investment, I would say to the Chair. In fact, funding for Abandoned Infants Assistance is at \$11,835,000 for abandoned infants, and if the gentleman would read the report, he would note that it says this amount is the same as the fiscal year 2007 funding level. No increase here.

Madam Chairman, I would ask the gentleman through the Chair whether he is standing on this floor advocating an actual cut in the Abandoned Infant Assistance Program match.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISRAEL. I yield to the gentleman from California if he would like to answer that specific question.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Thank you. You know, the question before us is \$11.8 million, as I mentioned to you before, is a cut from \$12.5 million. So the question I would ask you back is, well, why is it not \$12.5 million?

Mr. ISRAEL. I reclaim my time. The gentleman has argued that a cut's really not a cut because the rate of spending is increasing. The rate of spending does not increase in this program, Madam Chairman. It is the same spending as last year, which means that the gentleman's cut is an actual, concrete, specific, documented reduction in Abandoned Infants Assistance from last year.

Madam Chairman, I would go on to another program and through the Chair ask the gentleman if he would like to, since he was unable to give me a yes or no answer on the last example, I will provide another one.

Madam Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman if he would like. Is the gentleman advocating an actual cut in community-based child abuse prevention? Because the funding for community-based child abuse prevention is not increased in this budget, not by a penny, and so the gentleman's cut actually reduces it below last year's level.

Madam Chairman, does the gentleman advocate to his constituents a cut in community-based child abuse prevention? And I would yield to the gentleman if he desires to respond.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Thank you for yielding. You know, I was trying to do the math on the previous one. I guess the question before us is this: can the program you described before, because I'm a little behind on my math here, that was \$11.8 million, can it survive on \$11.78 million? Is that going to mean the end of the world as we know it? Is that going to mean that this program is devastated? Are you telling me that there is not a quarter of a percent that any agency or any program in government can find that they can do their job as well?

Mr. ISRAEL. Reclaiming my time, I'm suggesting that it was more than a quarter percent when it came to a \$13 billion tax cut for the biggest oil company executives on Earth, and it was more than a quarter percent cut when it came to excessive fraudulent payments to Halliburton.

But when it comes to runaway youth, domestic violence, law and order, abandoned infants, anti-gang programs, I would rather that the money go to those investments rather than to special interests.

So I would ask, again, to the gentleman through the Chair, is the gentleman advocating a cut in adoption opportunities because the adoption opportunities program, Madam Chairman, is funded without an increase at the same level as last year. Would the gentleman agree, Madam Chairman, that the cut that he proposes means an actual cut in the program for adoption opportunities from last year's level? At least can we agree that two plus two equals four or four minus two equals two. Can we at least agree on that, Madam Chairman?

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I guess that means that you have proposed a cut in that program if it's already below where it was. So I guess you had proposed a cut in that program. So I would ask you, I guess, if you cut that program, you must have some reason that you believe that it should be cut.

Mr. ISRAEL. I reclaim my time one more time, and then I will reserve the balance of my time. The gentleman has offered an amendment to actually cut programs. We have listed, Madam Chairman, a variety of programs that didn't receive one penny of increase in this budget, in this appropriation, and I've asked the gentleman will the gentleman acknowledge that his amendment is an actual cut on these programs: adoption assistance, abstinence, anti-gang activities, safe and stable families, domestic violence. Is it actually a cut below last year's level? Yes or no, and I would yield to the gentleman for a yes or no answer.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. If you already established it as a cut below last year's level, then yes, it is. But I would ask the gentleman that, is the gentleman proposing to increase the deficit, which, with this amendment, the deficit would go down and taxpayers would have more money?

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, this amendment and this appropriations bill saves \$1.1 billion.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair must ask Members to bear in mind the principle that proper courtesy in the process of yielding and reclaiming time in debate, and especially in asking another to yield, helps to foster the spirit of mutual comity that elevates our deliberations above mere argument. Members, when yielded to,

should defer to the yielding member when he or she reclaims the time.

The gentleman may continue.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the Chairman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished Republican whip, Mr. BLUNT, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for bringing this amendment to the floor.

I'd actually thought, based on the other things I was doing today, that the case was being well-made that a \$7 billion increase is an increase. And I didn't plan to come to the floor this afternoon. I had a number of other things I was working on that I thought were important. I was watching the debate and assuming that the case was being well-made until I heard in the last debate that a 4.3 percent increase was a cut. And I was so stunned by that, a 4.3 percent increase was a cut, a six-something billion dollar increase of the \$7 billion that the majority hopes to increase was a cut, that I decided I'd come to the floor for a minute, and I've been amazed on the floor at what I've heard.

I've heard the gentleman just ask a series of questions about the Abandoned Infants Assistance Program that's the same funding as last year's level; the community-based child abuse program, prevention program, that's the same funding as last year's level; adoption opportunities that I believe I heard were below last year's level.

And I'm not asking the gentleman specifically this question, but I'm asking myself this question: why is that? Why is that that Abandoned Infants Assistance could be funded at last year's level and somehow that's appropriate? Is it less important than it was last year? Is it less important than the many unauthorized things that this bill funds for the first time ever? Why is it that we're not doing more, as the past Congress always tried to do more, in IDEA? Why is it that NIH, in the debate we heard yesterday, the National Institutes of Health, didn't deserve the funding that the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee found a funding source for for that to be raised? Why is it, if inflation is a factor, that we don't care at least at an inflationary level about Abandoned Infant Assistance or we don't care at least at an inflationary level about community-based child abuse prevention?

The gentleman from California is saying let's just cut this by one-quarter of 1 percent, one-quarter of 1 percent, a growth of still almost \$7 billion, but instead, we're funding the unauthorized Full Service Schools Act. Now, why are we funding the unauthorized Full Service Schools Act, but we can't find enough money to keep adoption opportunities at at least last year's level? I'm amazed by what I've heard here on the floor.

Why is it we're funding the unauthorized sexual education program? Why is it that grants to local education that could be funded at \$25 billion, because that's what the Congress in the past says we could allow, are only funded at \$14.4 billion?

Part of the problem here is, once again, we're authorizing on an appropriations bill. We're trying to come up with new programs instead of fulfill the promise of the last programs. IDEA took major growth in funding in the last 10 years, but we haven't sustained that level in this bill because we're trying to fund new things.

And I just close by saying that every American knows that \$7 billion is an increase and 4.9 percent is an increase, as was 4.3, as is 4.4.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California, a member of the committee, Mr. SCHIFF.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to address some of the arguments.

I wanted to say about my friends on the other side of the aisle because, in fact, my friends on the other side of the aisle in committee, the Republican Members, uniformly supported this bill and support this bill. So I have to say that I address these remarks to a minority of the minority, the self-applied fringe that we've been describing or talking to today.

The beginning of their argument was, well, we want across-the-board cuts, we don't really want to have to identify exactly what we're cutting. That's a little hard to sell back home, so we're going to do across-the-board cuts. That's a little more palatable.

We said, well, let's look at where we're cutting, and then the argument was, okay, they're not cuts. They're reductions in the increase.

So then we point out, well, actually you're giving the impression that everything's being increased. Everything is not being increased. Many things are being kept flat. So aren't we really cutting those things that are flat in the budget? And my friends in the minority of the minority said, yes, I guess that's right. I guess we are really making real cuts with these across-the-board proposals, but let's not really look at what we're cutting. That's not very attractive.

And my friend says, okay, so if we're making real cuts, is it really the end of the world if we're making real cuts? Well, I guess it depends on who you ask.

One of the things we're making a real cut to is the bone marrow program. Is that the end of the world for us here in Congress to make a real cut, in real dollar terms, to the bone marrow program? Well, it may not be to any of us at this moment, but for some child out there, it just may be the end of the world. For some parent of that child, some parent has to watch their child suffer with cancer, the inability to get a bone marrow transplant and the failure of research into bone marrow

transplants, it just might be the end of the world for that parent as well as that child.

What are the things that my friend would make real cuts to? He would make real cuts to scholarships for disadvantaged students. He would make real cuts for nurse education. Does my friend think we have more nurses than we need? He would make real cuts for emergency medical services for children. Again, is that the end of the world? Well, for one child it just might be.

He would make real cuts for organ transplantation, real cuts for the National Cord Blood Inventory. Is that the end of the world? Well, for some child, maybe not our children, it just might be.

We would make real cuts, under the gentleman's amendment, to children's mental health. Is that the end of the world? Well, for a child who ends up taking their own life, it just might be the end of the world.

It sounds a lot more palatable when we say, well, it's a 1 percent cut or it's a half a percent cut. Is that the end of the world? Well, for one child it just may be.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time each side, I suppose, has remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes. The gentleman from New York has 6 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, you know, this is so interesting listening to this fiscal debate and talking about we are the fringe. Well, let me tell you, FRINGE is a great acronym, and let me tell you what FRINGE is a great acronym for.

And I think it is very appropriate for those of us on our side of the aisle because fringe means this: Fiscal responsibility includes no government excess. Fiscal responsibility includes no government excess. Now, Madam Chairman, that is what the people tell us they want. Get this fiscal house in order.

□ 1530

That is what they want. They don't want you to spend more. They want you to spend less. Government does not have a revenue problem. Government has a spending problem. All of this about across-the-board cuts don't work.

If I may tell you why across-the-board cuts do work, the reason is this. You have the opportunity within a department to decide where you would like to reduce. I would recommend, as with many of our States, you go in and you make those reductions out of the bureaucracy.

You don't have to take one single penny out of any program. You can take it out of the bureaucracy. That is

where you go, and that is why across-the-board cuts work. That is why they use them in State after State after State because they have balanced budget amendments, because they cannot spend more than the rate of growth of the economy in that State.

They work. And, yes, fiscal responsibility includes no government excess. Now, yes, there is some real long fringe down there because, it is way down by great big, overblown, heavy bureaucratic programs that do not respond to the needs of the American people.

I think it is time that we say let's get this under control. It is the hold-on-to-your-wallet Congress. If we are not happy, they will leave you in tatters, not fringe.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chair, I don't know if every single Republican on the Appropriations Committee who supported this bill would appreciate being called big spenders or fiscally irresponsible. I am very pleased that the mainstream of Republicans and Democrats worked together on this.

I don't know where all the talk was about fiscal responsibility when we were appropriating \$13 billion in tax cuts for big oil companies and spending money on fraudulent payments and no-bid contracts to Halliburton.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the committee.

Ms. LEE. Let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for your diligence in this debate.

Madam Chairman, I would like to briefly make a couple of points with regard to this whole notion of government excess. When you look at, for example, the military budget, we all support a strong national security, a strong military.

However, a military budget of close to \$500 billion, when you look at the waste, fraud and abuse that is in this budget, and also when you look at a measly \$60 billion that should be cut in Cold War era weapons systems, I can't, for the life of me, figure out why we shouldn't get the kind of scrutiny and the laser focus on this government excess over at the Pentagon. It makes a lot of sense to me if you really want to put your deeds and your words into some kind of real action as it relates to our Federal budget.

Also, let me just say something about these across-the-board cuts and who they impact. When you look at our future, when you look at our young people, when you look at individuals who deserve a second chance such as ex-offenders who had done their time who now want to pick up with their lives, who need education, job training, vocational training, when you look at our health care system that is in shambles, when you look at our young people and the drop-out rates and the type of after-school programs and drop-out prevention programs that we are talking about, these across-the-board cuts in many ways would decimate these programs. That means that certain

segments of our society who need this safety net and need these initiatives would just drop through the safety net, whatever is left of that safety net. For the most part, it has been decimated over the last few years.

Also, many of these people do pay Federal taxes and they deserve some of their Federal taxes back. I hear you all talk about tax cuts, and the American people deserving their tax dollars back to spend more, right? Fine. Many of these programs that you are talking about cutting are programs that are designed to help those who do pay tax, and who do deserve some of their Federal taxes back and who do deserve to live and seek the American dream, just like anybody else who makes \$100,000 more or more.

I would hope that some type of rational thinking would prevail out of this debate today and rethink some of these notions of cutting initiatives and cutting the safety net out of those that really need it the most, those that the American dream is still a nightmare for and those that, if we listened and did all that you want us to do, we would have more homeless on the streets. We would have more people just hanging on in the twilight of their lives. I think that we need to know that this budget that the chairman has crafted today really will help enhance the quality of life for millions of Americans.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chair, just one comment for my colleague from California, let me just say that I completely agree with you that the Pentagon is not immune from waste, fraud and abuse, nor is the Defense budget, nor is any part of the Federal Government. I agree with you on that point.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, after all of this debate, I still cannot believe that people don't understand what the word "cut" means. I took the opportunity to go look it up in my dictionary. I would urge my Democrat colleagues to do the same.

They might find a reduction in amount. Only in Washington would somebody call an increase of 4.6 percent a cut. People all over America would love to have their salaries cut if it would only increase 4.6 percent.

I think I just heard the previous speaker say that people who pay taxes ought to get some of their money back. Well, maybe it shouldn't be taken from them in the first place.

But let's go back to the term "cut," because the only budgets that are being cut here today are the family budgets of hard-working Americans all across this land. It is their budgets that are being cut.

The budgets like the Flores family in Garland, who says, "I am a divorced mother with a child in college and a

child in daycare." When you increase taxes, you are going to wipe out the hope of the first college graduate in the family. To my colleagues on the other said of the aisle, that is the budget they are cutting. They are cutting the Flores family budget. They are cutting their education program.

They are cutting the education program of the Mouton-Tedder family in Chandler, this largest tax increase in history, that they are imposing on the American people. They write in, "If I have to pay more taxes, then I can't afford to go to school." Once again, Democrats cutting education budgets for families in America.

They are cutting the health budget as well. I heard from the Winters family in Tennessee Colony. "Please do what you can to stop the wasteful spending. I am retired and disabled. I am raising my three grandchildren and one great grandchild. I sometimes can't afford my own medicine."

The only budgets that are being cut here are the Democrats cutting the health budgets and the education budgets of the American family. It ought to stop.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, may I ask how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2½ minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Chairman, we have an interesting contrast here. We have these self-described fringe legislators that are here on the floor speaking up. You might call them extremists or radicals, whatever.

But we also, in comparison to that, we have an incredible bipartisan process that has been going on this. This subcommittee met for many, many hours, the Labor-H Subcommittee chaired by our wonderful chairman, Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH, met for many hours and came up with a bipartisan bill.

Then that bill was presented to 66 Members of this House in a full appropriations hearing, and it was approved. Not a single Member of the 66 Members voted against that bill. They all approved it, sent it on to the floor. You have this marvelous work product that Members have put many, many hours into, and they have labored over. They were all laboring over education, health care, worker protection. That is really the thrust of what we are doing here today.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. How much time do I have remaining, Madam Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1 minute.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, I stand here as a member of this fringe that is happy to associate with the 83 percent of Americans who think this Congress is doing a poor job.

We have got a lot of talk about cuts, but there is one thing that's clear.

There is an increase in this bill as written. There is an increase of \$6.6 billion in the deficit over what there would be if this bill held spending flat. That is an increase in raiding the Social Security surplus, and that will lead to the many tax increases that your side is currently proposing both in your budget and in other bills floating around in both this Chamber and the other. Those are increases there. This bill will not stop those increases, but just a little bit of a time, a quarter of a percent, it will help to slow the growth.

I would ask for everyone's support on this bill.

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, we have heard in this debate that the other side is not really cutting programs, they are cutting the rate of growth of programs. But we provided about a dozen programs that get no increase in this budget, that in fact will be cut from last year's. So the fact of the matter is that these cuts are real, and these cuts hurt families.

Now, this is all about choices, and it goes back to this. Not a single member of this fringe group who disagrees with their own Republican caucus that supported this bill in the Appropriations Committee came to this floor to argue for a 2 percent cut, a 1 percent cut, a 5 percent, a .5 cut. When it came time to give \$13 billion to the big oil companies, then there was plenty of money to go around.

But now the argument is we can't afford to give people who want to send their kids to college an increase in Pell Grants. Not a single amendment was offered by this fringe group when it was time to provide Halliburton with dollar after dollar after dollar so that \$1.47 billion was found to be fraudulent and excessive. I didn't hear a single one of this fringe group come to the floor and argue for cuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, it is sometimes amazing to me just how small some congressional debates can be. We have heard a lot of bloviating on this floor today about whether something is a cut and whether it isn't a cut. We have had a boy scout debate about dictionary terms.

But the real question to ask about this bill is simply to ask, is it adequate to the needs of the country? Do we really need to simply continue the status quo by going back to last year's level, or do we need to recognize that there is more than one deficit in the country? Do we really think that we can afford to continue to avoid dealing with the deficit in educational quality, the deficit in health care access, the deficit in worker training?

Do we really think that we can avoid, or that we can afford to avoid investing

to increase the number of quality teachers in this country? Do we think that we need to do more or not to help millions of kids who need a better deal in special education? Do we need to do more than we are doing now to help workers who lose their life's work because of the forces of globalization?

Are we comfortable continuing to see the number of research grants for cancer, for heart disease, for Parkinson's disease, continue to decline, or do we think that we ought to make an investment, a collective societal investment, so that we can do more to attack those diseases?

Those are values questions. That is what we have to decide here today. This amendment is largely symbolic. It gives people a chance on both sides to talk to some more, as though we haven't, God help us, talked enough already.

But we are now roughly at the point where we will have to decide what our priorities are.

□ 1545

This bill is about 2 percent above the President's budget for these items. That is what we are talking about; we are talking about devoting 2 percent more of the Federal budget than the President wants to devote to deal with the deficits in education, health care, job training, worker protection, and the like.

Each Member is invited, in my view, to make their own choice, but I think the choice is clear. We have had a huge increase in the gap between the richest people in this country and everybody else over the past 20 years. This bill attempts to deal with the results of that gap by providing additional grace notes to help the people who haven't been in that top 1 percent so they get a little better deal in sending their kids to college, so that they get a little better deal in being able to find doctors who will take care of them without begging in the community health clinic, so they can find some job training so they maybe can get a job that pays two-thirds of what their job paid before they were bounced because of bad trade deals or globalization. That is what this bill attempts to do.

It has traditionally had bipartisan support through the years in this country. It would be a shame if that bipartisan support didn't continue. I urge rejection of the amendment and support for the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 67 offered by Mr. PENCE:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act shall be available to Planned Parenthood for any purpose under title X of the Public Health Services Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

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

Mr. PENCE. Allow me to say there are many good things happening in federally funded Family Planning clinics nationwide: 5 million Americans served, 90 percent of whom are low income; 900,000 unintended pregnancies were averted by title X family planning funding; and it is reassuring that abstinence education is required for all clients. But today, I am offering an amendment that is very simple.

The Pence amendment states that no funds under title X may be granted to Planned Parenthood. Planned Parenthood is the largest recipient of title X funding, and it is the largest abortion provider in America. Last year alone, Planned Parenthood's own annual report states that it received more than one-third of its \$1 billion budget from government contracts and grants. And, again, according to their annual report, Planned Parenthood performed more than one quarter of a million abortions.

Millions of pro-life Americans should not be asked to fund the leading abortion provider in the United States. Now, let me stipulate, I know that title X funds may not be used for abortion. And my amendment does not cut or reduce the budget for family planning in this appropriation bill; it simply prevents appropriated funds from reaching an organization that profits from the abortion trade.

It is time the American people stop funding the Nation's largest abortion provider, and I urge support for the Pence amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I seek the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin such time as he may consume.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I really wish that the gentleman had not offered this amendment, and let me be very frank. I spent most of the last 6

months trying to convince Democrats, primarily liberals, who are now in control of the House, not to try to use their new majority to change any language in this bill that had anything to do with abortion or family planning. I have asked them, in an effort to provide bipartisan support for this bill, to recognize other people's values as well as their own. I have asked them, therefore, to leave alone the six abortion-related or family planning provisions which are in the existing law which many on this side of the aisle oppose and some on the other side of the aisle oppose.

I have asked them to leave alone the Hyde amendment; I have asked them to leave alone Dr. WELDON's amendment. And I had some real fights on this side of the aisle about that, not just with people in my caucus, but with a lot of outside groups. A lot of like-minded people on the left will get together and talk and, after they talk to each other, they think they have taken a public opinion poll. And I have asked them to lay off this bill so that we can try to find common ground on an issue that has divided us for so long.

And we put together an initiative which provided well over half a billion dollars in special funding for programs to help discourage women from having abortions, and we have been able to keep that issue out of here. I have asked Members not to offer amendments on any of these items.

But now, in return for that, we get from the other side of the aisle from one gentleman an amendment that in essence upsets the apple cart. I think that is unfortunate. I can't do a whole lot about it, but I think the gentleman knows that an amendment like this would not survive conference anyway, and yet it is being offered. And what it does, at the last minute, is to blow up a consensus which we have tried to build over the last 3 days that we all ought to be willing to live under the same laws that we were living under when the Republicans were controlling this House and when they passed the legislation that I am now defending. So I would simply ask the gentleman, in the interest of our being able to work together on these issues, to withdraw his amendment.

He doesn't like Planned Parenthood. I don't care whether Planned Parenthood gets money or not. What I do care about is that the women who are served by Planned Parenthood get the services to which they are entitled under the Constitution. And so I would ask the gentleman, in the interest of the bipartisan neutrality that we have tried to build over the past 2 months, to consider withdrawing the amendment, and I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, with acknowledgement of the gracious remarks of the chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Pence amendment.

Planned Parenthood claims to work to reduce abortions, but happens to be the number one abortion provider in this country. This raises an obvious question: Why are taxpayer dollars being used to subsidize the largest abortion supplier in the United States?

Planned Parenthood clinics receive funding in the name of their family planning services; however, there are many clinics in which family planning and abortion services are co-located in the same building, share a common set of basic resources, out one door and into the other.

Abortion services generate more net revenue when clinics can rely on Federal dollars to pay for lighting, heating, building maintenance, and even rent. Planned Parenthood receives a recordbreaking \$305 million in taxpayer funding, and they made record profits last year. And what did they do with those record profits last year? Planned Parenthood performed 265,000 abortions, the most ever in a year.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this Federal backdoor subsidy of Planned Parenthood, the world's largest abortion provider, and support the Pence amendment.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Title X of the Public Health Services Act reaches our most vulnerable populations and is a primary source of reproductive health services for low-income women, lowering the rate of unintended pregnancies, reducing the need for abortion, and decreasing infant mortality and morbidity. It is good public policy.

For many women, Planned Parenthood is their only source of health care. In some States like Wisconsin, Utah, and my own Connecticut, Planned Parenthood is the only title X provider. It sees 65,000 patients a year in Connecticut and provides critical family-planning infrastructure in our State.

This amendment would be devastating, especially for the thousands of women whose sole source of medical care is these clinics. This amendment plainly discriminates against the uninsured, leaving the most vulnerable in our society in the most helpless situation. If we truly do value, if we value, as we say we do, women's health, we cannot sabotage title X, we cannot strip Planned Parenthood of funding, and we cannot pass this amendment.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I want to respond substantively to the gracious comments of the chairman whose work on this legislation I acknowledge heartily. But as to the issue of protecting all the values that the Republican majority advanced, I would hasten to remind that in the Foreign Operations bill we did great violence to the historic Mexico City policy. That change came. We must end the practice of funding Planned Parenthood.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, I would remind one of the previous speakers that there are no title X cuts in this amendment.

What this amendment does is to state that Planned Parenthood cannot receive those funds. Planned Parenthood in 2005 did perform 260,000 abortions. That is something that we know. I think it is also important for us to note that it was Planned Parenthood who was the lead plaintiff in the legal challenge against the partial birth abortion ban legislation that is now the law of the land.

This is the right move. I commend the gentleman from Indiana for bringing the amendment forward and for bringing to our attention the need to make certain that taxpayer dollars are not used in abortion clinics around this Nation.

Mr. PENCE. Might I ask how much time I have remaining, Madam Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1¾ minutes.

Mr. PENCE. I yield 50 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Madam Chairman, there is one thing regardless of where you happen to be a Congressman. Every single one of us has something in common if you are from Congress, and that is that we have people in our districts, some who call themselves pro-life and others who call themselves pro-choice, and many of them are deeply convicted of their views on this issue.

Now, the question before us today is, is it reasonable to force people who really do believe that abortion is killing children, is it reasonable to force them to pay money to subsidize that killing? Is that respectful to do that? Planned Parenthood is the biggest abortion provider in America. Is it reasonable to compel some of our constituents who believe that this is killing to take part in that?

Mr. PENCE. It is my pleasure to yield 50 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona, the eloquent Mr. FRANKS.

□ 1600

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Chairman, abortion on demand in America is the greatest single cause of death in our Nation's history. We have killed nearly 50 million of our own unborn children since the criminal Roe vs. Wade decision in 1973. That is 15,000 times the number of lives lost in the 9/11 terrorist attack.

Planned Parenthood is the foremost promoter and provider of abortion on demand for any reason or no reason. In the last fiscal year, this government appropriated more than \$300 million to this death dealing organization.

Madam Chairman, it has been said that a government is what it spends. For this government to appropriate one penny of the taxpayers' money to an organization that kills unborn children and emotionally impoverishes

their mothers is a disgrace that undermines the core essence of the United States of America and betrays everything that our soldiers lying out in Arlington National Cemetery died to preserve.

And Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to find the courage to vote for the Pence amendment.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, the issue here is not Planned Parenthood. The issue is whether women have a right to have full access to family planning. State health departments run 57 percent of the clinics that receive Title X funds. Planned Parenthood affiliates operate 14 percent of Title X supported clinics. Hospitals and family planning clinics and other non-privates make up the rest of the Title X clinic system.

Under the law, none of these funds can be spent for abortion. But Planned Parenthood clinics use their Title X funding to provide family planning and health services to millions of women, and it is those women who would be hurt today by this action, not Planned Parenthood.

I would urge a vote against the amendment. It seems to me that we ought to be content to live under the same arrangements that we were content to live under when the Republican Congresses were writing the law.

It seems to me that we need to be finding ways to avoid dividing the Congress and dividing the country because of our ideologies.

This amendment has nothing to do with abortion. It has everything to do with whether or not we are trying to find common ground on this cluster of issues, and whether or not women are going to be allowed to get the services they need in areas where the only services available to them come from the organization in question.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I would like to just say, I have voted for the ban on partial birth abortion. I consider myself a pro-life Democrat.

But I will say that this amendment will increase the number of abortions that are performed. Fifty percent of abortions are performed on women who live within 200 percent of poverty. If they don't have access to prevention, they will end up getting an abortion. And I believe that if we truly want to prevent abortions from happening in the United States of America, we have an obligation, a moral obligation, to fund programs like this and prevent unintended pregnancies. Those are the poor women who end up going to abortion clinics and having abortions.

Let's prevent the number of abortions from increasing by rejecting this amendment. And the more money we

spend on prevention, that will mean we will continue to reduce the number of abortions.

And I want to thank the gentleman for working on this with us.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, this amendment is not related to abortion. This amendment is a frontal assault on family planning. Make no mistake about it. Whether you are pro-life or whether you are pro-choice or anything in between, you ought to be pro-family planning. And this amendment negates that, and I would urge defeat of the amendment.

If I have any time left, I would yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPP. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and associate myself with the remarks and the eloquent statement of Chairman OBEY and my colleagues.

And I speak from the perspective of a nurse who worked for many years with these women and their families in the community I'm from. Title X is our Nation's primary program to provide family planning services. According to the Guttmacher Institute, Title X has been so successful that for every public dollar invested in family planning, \$3 are saved in Medicaid costs alone for pregnancy and newborn care.

In hundreds of communities across this country, the nonprofit Planned Parenthood is the major implementation of precisely the reproductive health care necessary to carry out effective family planning and to reduce unintended pregnancies. And they are contributing, these nonprofit organizations, to the successful implementation of Title X services.

So I urge my colleagues to stand for family values and to vote against this amendment so that you can protect your constituents' access to proven, effective family planning services which have as their goal to reduce unintended pregnancies.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. I thank the Chair for yielding, and at this time I would yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Pence amendment as strongly as I can advocate. The Title X program provides comprehensive family planning services, as well as a wide range of other preventative health care services, including breast exams and instruction on breast self-examination, pap tests for early detection of cervical cancer or pre-cancerous conditions, testing for high blood pressure, screening and appropriate treatment for sexually transmitted infections, HIV screening, counseling or adoption, foster care and pregnancy termination referrals to specialized health care.

Pursuant to Federal statute, no Title X funds may be spent on abortions.

The question was raised, is it reasonable to ask us, members of Congress, to fund abortions when we find abortions so abhorrent? But that's not the question before us.

The question before us is, is it reasonable to deprive women of reproductive information and services to prevent unwanted pregnancies, and therefore, even avoid the question of whether or not to have an abortion? And the answer is no.

This is about family planning. Planned Parenthood is the Nation's leading reproductive health care provider. For over 9 years Planned Parenthood has provided low-income, uninsured and underinsured women with vital reproductive health care services they need.

I'll conclude by pointing out Planned Parenthood operates health care centers in every State in the Nation, serving over 5 million, men, women and teens and their communities each year. The services Planned Parenthood provides are needed, and to deprive them of this funding, I think, would be a colossal mistake.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, at this time I would yield such time as he may consume to the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. I thank my colleague from New York for his extraordinary courtesy. And let me say, I regret that this debate will only take 15 minutes. It is a great and serious matter, and I think the dignity with which it's been conducted thus far is evidence of the capacity of this Congress to discuss even the most contentious issues of our time in a manner that reflects civility and favorably on the institution.

Now, that being said, let me clear up a few points. This is not, as the chairman said, "a frontal assault on family planning." There are no cuts in Title X in the Pence amendment. The Pence amendment states plainly that no funds under Title X may be granted to Planned Parenthood.

Planned Parenthood is the largest recipient of Title X funding, and it's also the largest abortion provider in America.

And as to whether we are living under the same arrangements, as the chairman said, and I respectfully quote, "same arrangements under Republican rule," it seems to me just a short time ago we saw this new majority overturn much of the decades long Mexico City policy that prevented Federal dollars from going to organizations overseas that provide abortion for family planning.

I think this Nation needs a domestic Mexico City policy. And frankly, if the common ground that this Congress has reached means tens of millions of Federal tax dollars going to the largest abortion provider in America, that is not a common ground I can accept.

Say "no" to Federal funds for Planned Parenthood in Title X. Say

"yes" to family planning funding through Title X. Say "yes" to the Pence amendment.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Chairman, I oppose this amendment, which is nothing less than an attack on the nation's most trusted source of reproductive health services and information. The Pence amendment would single out Planned Parenthood for exclusion from the Title X program, at odds with the principles repeatedly articulated by the United States Supreme Court.

Planned Parenthood is the nation's leading reproductive health care provider. The vast majority of services that Planned Parenthood provides are services to prevent unintended pregnancies, and test and treat for sexually transmitted infections, as well as breast and cervical cancer screening.

The vast majority of Planned Parenthood patients have incomes at or below 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level, women who are four times more likely to face an unintended pregnancy. For many women, and especially those in rural areas and underserved communities, Planned Parenthood is their only source of health care. Title X helps 575 Planned Parenthood clinics to provide over 3 million women with family planning services each year.

Madam Chairman, if we are to reduce the number of abortions in this country, as Mr. PENCE clearly desires, we must get serious about prevention. Each year publicly funded contraceptive services help women prevent 1.3 million unintended pregnancies, which would otherwise result in 533,800 births, 632,300 abortions and 165,000 miscarriages. In the absence of publicly funded family planning, the number of abortions each year in the United States would be 40 percent higher than it currently is. In fact, from 1980 to 2000, Title X clinics helped women prevent nearly 20 million unintended pregnancies, nine million of which would have ended in abortion. By restricting Title X, Mr. PENCE's amendment would likely increase the number of abortions, particularly among our teenagers.

We should oppose Mr. PENCE's amendment because it is an inhumane attack on the quality of life of low-income women in this country, but moreover, we should oppose it because it does not make good public health sense. Gutting funding for family planning will never bring us towards a day with fewer abortions, it will only increase the devastating costs imposed on society by unintended pregnancies among young women and teenaged girls.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chairman, the activities of Planned Parenthood are a concern for many of us. In Alabama, there was an unsuccessful abortion at a Planned Parenthood clinic, and the baby was born with severe injuries including a hole in her heart. Planned Parenthood has always been a glaring exception to the long-standing policy in the House of not allowing taxpayer money to be used to provide abortions. It claims that Title Ten money is not being used for abortions. The reality is that any Federal dollar that goes to a clinic where abortions are being performed, ends up facilitating an abortion.

The Pence Amendment is a simple way to clear up whether Federal tax dollars are being used properly. Title Ten money should not go to any organization that provides abortions. This is an issue of being accountable to taxpayers and consistent with the Hyde Amend-

ment that we have passed on a bipartisan basis for 31 consecutive years. Therefore, I urge support for the Pence Amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chairman, I am dismayed that this Congress, including Members of my own party, has again decided to eliminate funding for the Denali Commission and cripple the economic lifeline to hundreds of small communities throughout rural Alaska.

When health crises arise, options are often extremely limited in rural Alaska. Health issues or emergencies that require hospital care often involve costly air transportation that can take as much time and money as a flight from New York to Los Angeles, if weather permits. For local health care, the typical rural community health facility is aging, small and inadequate to provide necessary services. In one of its earliest decisions, the Denali Commission designated rural health care as a top priority for Commission support and is continuing its work to provide safe and appropriate infrastructure which will improve health care delivery for rural Alaskans.

Through its health care program, and in partnership with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and Alaska health providers, the Commission is working to address the infrastructure needs of communities statewide to ensure all Alaskans receive safe and reliable health care.

In 1999, the Commission was granted authority by Congress to address rural Alaska health care issues. This authority authorized the Denali Commission to plan, construct and equip health, nutrition and child care projects across the state. Potential projects include hospitals, health care clinics, and mental health facilities including drug and alcohol treatment centers. In 2001, the Commission identified rural primary care facility needs in more than 288 rural communities, and estimated the cost of needed rural primary care facilities to be \$253 million.

Since then, more than 200 communities have sought assistance from the Denali Commission. And in addition to constructing several essential village primary care clinics, the Denali Commission has funded major design initiatives for needed replacement hospitals in Nome and Barrow. It has now completed clinics in over 65 of these remote communities.

Now, in 2007, Congress is telling the Commission that they no longer see a need for the Denali Commission. They are looking to cut \$39 million when the real need in my State is several times that amount. Have the health care problems in rural Alaska been miraculously fixed overnight? Have any Members of the House visited Alaska and seen firsthand that rural health care is no longer an issue for Alaskans? The answer to both is a resounding "No."

The Commission works tirelessly each year to make sure that my Alaskans are not treated like second class citizens and eliminating these funds will be devastating. It is my hope that the Senate has more sense and will continue funding this essential program. I will work with my colleagues in the other chamber to make sure that this happens—Alaskans deserve better.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Chairman, I would like to express my support for the FY 2008 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Bill. This bill takes an important step in providing affordable education and quality health care. The strength

and the future security of our country depend on our investment in health, education, and insuring that the needs of our workforce are addressed. H.R. 3043, as drafted, includes increased funding for many programs important to our state and local education, health, and labor agencies.

The bill addresses increases in funding at all education levels from early childhood to higher education. Although most of these increases are still below FY 2005 levels, it is the beginning of reversing the decline in Federal funding which has not been compatible with increased costs related to NCLB (which imposed new and stronger mandates on our State and local education agencies). H.R. 3043 provides for \$1.6 billion over last year's level to fund NCLB programs, especially for Title I programs to help poor children. The bill also provides for increased funding for Head Start centers, as well as special education grants that benefit 6.9 million children with disabilities.

I would like to extend my support to the Gwen Moore-Tom Cole-Bobby Scott-Carol Shea-Porter amendment that will put a stop to the harmful Upward Bound (UB) evaluation that is being conducted by the Department of Education. The Upward Bound program has been threatened both financially and administratively and I am hopeful that my colleagues will not support provisions that threaten to eliminate this long-standing program. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment that would eliminate the Absolute Priority program, which is an evaluation tool used by the Administration to justify the elimination of the UB program.

As the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Health Braintrust, I would be remiss if I did not mention the positive direction that this bill takes the health and well being of Americans, and the important steps it takes to bolster our health care infrastructure.

This bill increases funding for critically important programs, such as HCOP and other provider training programs, as well as for critically important Federal agencies and offices, such as the National Center for Minority Health and Health Disparities at the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and SAMHSA.

Unlike the President's budget, this bill represents the positive direction we need and should take to ensure that our health care system—at every level, from research, to training, to actual care—has the capacity and resources to adequately treat the millions of Americans who access it. I am enthusiastic about provisions in H.R. 3043 that provide funding in my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, for follow-up glaucoma screening and perinatal care. These programs are an important part of bridging the gap for the elderly, low income and uninsured individuals.

Despite its numerous amendments and three days of debate, the bill as written provides funding for programs that help to improve our Nation's education, health care and labor programs. I urge my colleagues to support its final passage.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I rise today to oppose the amendment offered by my colleague from Indiana, Mr. PENCE to the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2008.

Mr. PENCE's amendment would deny Federal funding under Title X of the Public Health

Services Act to Planned Parenthood health facilities throughout the country. As a supporter of Planned Parenthood and the services that it offers to my constituents in my central New Jersey district, I firmly oppose this purely political amendment.

This should not be an anti-choice or pro-choice debate about one of the many services that Planned Parenthood provides. In fact, according to Federal statute, no money from Title X can be used for abortion services. Title X makes grants to public and private nonprofit organizations to provide family planning and basic reproductive health care information and services to low-income women. Therefore this debate should be about prevention. It should be about continuing to provide women with the necessary tools for proper prevention, including contraception and education. It should be about protecting women's health by providing women with access to reproductive health care.

Planned Parenthood's 841 affiliates provide reproductive health care services to 5 million men and women annually including 84,500 in the state of New Jersey. 63 percent of these patients receive reproductive health care services and 37 percent receive family planning services. Through family planning services Planned Parenthood estimates that its services prevent over 631,000 unwanted pregnancies annually.

Cutting Title X funding to Planned Parenthood is nothing short of irresponsible. The low income women who are served through Title X are four times more likely to face an unintended pregnancy. As a safety net provider, Planned Parenthood plays a critical role in serving these women. Title X has proven to be effective and prevents 1 million unwanted pregnancies each year. Planned Parenthood, as the Nation's oldest and largest family planning provider, is responsible for preventing 60 percent of unwanted pregnancies and we should not act to prevent women from getting the reproductive health care they need. I urge my colleagues not to support the Pence amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The only purpose this amendment serves is to decrease access to family planning services and to mischaracterize the critical, life-saving work of Planned Parenthood affiliates.

Let me be clear. Under current law, Title X funds can not be used to pay for abortions. Nothing in the underlying bill changes that. Therefore, I am left to assume that the services the sponsor of this amendment wishes to cut include family planning, cancer screening, prenatal care and deliveries, fertility information and support groups, and support and advocacy for victims of sexual assault.

I am proud to defend the hundreds of Planned Parenthood affiliates, including the Hudson Peconic affiliate in my Congressional District. The dedicated work this affiliate and others like it engage in are the reason that more than five million men and women have access to any health care at all.

Their commitment is something that should be recognized and commended, not demonized. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Pence amendment, which would deny Federal funding to one of the most important family plan-

ning and women's health organizations in the country. Current law prohibits using Title X funds to provide abortion services. Planned Parenthood has not violated this law. In fact, Planned Parenthood uses completely separate funds to provide these services.

Ninety-seven percent of the services that Planned Parenthood provides are related to pregnancy prevention and women's health. The majority of their work focuses on low-income women, a population at greater risk for unintended pregnancies. Oftentimes a local Planned Parenthood clinic is the only place where women have access to basic health care, including birth control. In addition to family planning assistance, Planned Parenthood also provides cancer screening for breast and cervical cancers, as well as testing and treatment for sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV and AIDS. These are essential health services for women, and it would be irresponsible to discontinue Federal funding for them. I urge my colleagues to support healthcare and family planning for women by voting no on this amendment.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds in this Act may be used to employ workers described in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. OBEY. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. We've been asking Members through the day if they would drop their remarks if we accept their amendments so that Members can catch their planes. Would the gentleman be willing to do that?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I'm very amenable to that process of doing business about every time I come to the floor. I would be happy to thank you for that.

Mr. OBEY. In that case we'll accept the amendment on this side of the

aisle. In accepting this amendment, I would make the following two points:

One, I believe it is merely a re-statement of current law which already prohibits the employment of unauthorized aliens. I do not read it as imposing any new burdens on those who use funds appropriated under this Act. Rather it is fully consistent with the current legal obligations imposed on all employers, regardless of whether or not they use such funds.

Two, I am concerned that the amendment may place an undue enforcement burden on the agencies that receive funding under this bill. I plan to discuss that aspect with the administration.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And I would drop my remarks, except to say that this closes the issue with government working and hiring illegals. That's a State issue.

I yield back.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 37 offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Public Broadcasting Service to sponsor events at the Filmmaker Lodge at the Sundance Film Festival.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. OBEY. Again, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. OBEY. Same deal.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I'll close the same deal with the chairman, and I will not describe this. The RECORD will show what this amendment does. And I'd be happy to urge adoption.

I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. My understanding is that there are no further amendments or colloquies left on either side of the aisle. Is that his understanding, also?

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, that's my understanding, also. There are no further amendments, no further colloquies.

Mr. OBEY. Then, what I would simply like to say, Madam Chairman, is

that this bill is the product of 5 months work on both sides of the aisle by some very dedicated people. Mr. WALSH is the new ranking member on the subcommittee, but he has performed like an old timer. I am proud of the fact that the subcommittee worked hard on hearings. And, I'm proud of the fact that we've largely come together on substance.

I would hope that that would be recognized by the endorsement of many Members on both sides of the aisle when the roll call vote is opened. This bill is not a matter of accounting.

□ 1615

This bill is not a matter of political theory or political party platforms.

This bill, more than any other, meets the needs of all of those in society who are not among the most well-connected and the most privileged. But even for the most well-connected and privileged, this bill provides a lot because all of us benefit every time a child is educated. All of us benefit every time an American citizen gets the health care he or she needs. All of us benefit every time a worker is educated so that our workforce becomes more competitive. All of us benefit when a single teacher achieves new skills. There is nothing in the world more damaging than a dull or a bad teacher, and there is nothing more wonderful than a well-trained, intelligent one.

So I would urge Members to recognize that the issue isn't whether some program is defined as a cut or an increase. The issue isn't whether we like the President of the United States or not. The issue is whether or not we are building the kind of country we want to have over the next 10 years. To do that, it takes investments. And, yes, investments cost money. And, yes, I plead fully guilty to wanting to provide even more than we can in this bill. But it is essential if we want to remain competitive. It is essential if we want to have equal access to opportunity in this country. It is essential that we invest in bills like this.

And I thank the gentleman from New York for his assistance in trying to do just that, as well as every other member of the committee and subcommittee.

There is a reason why there were no votes expressed in opposition to this bill in full committee, and that is because this is the people's bill. It is the product of input from each and every Member from the most conservative to the most liberal, and I think there is not a member of the subcommittee who would not verify that.

With that, Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

For my part, it was a great experience going through this 5 months with you. It was a lot of work. I think I speak for the staff as well when I say we are all pretty tired from all the

work that we have done. And, of course, they had to put together a continuing resolution and a supplemental to boot. So I know I join the chairman in thanking the staff for the remarkable work that they have done, both sides of the aisle. These are professional people who obviously care about the issues, but they are not as concerned about the partisan aspects of this as we are.

When the chairman talked about our experience here together, we combined about 57 years of experience here in the Congress. Most of that side falls on his watch and not mine, but I am getting up there too. And it is great to be able to work with someone who has the command of these issues that he does. And I remember asking him, and I have said this a couple of times, Why on God's green Earth would you want to be chairman of the full committee and the subcommittee also? And he said, Because the subcommittee issues are the issues I came here for 38 years ago. And he is making a mark on them today.

There has been some partisan back-and-forth here, which is as it should be. The Founding Fathers wanted us to have a clash of ideas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. They wanted us to have the contest of ideas here. The fight should be over words and ideas and not with swords and other weaponry.

But mostly what we have done is we have found what we disagree on and talked about it. But overall, overwhelmingly, both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, agree that the issues in this bill are priorities for the Nation. Maybe we think we should spend 5 percent less or they think they should spend 5 percent more, and I don't want to discount the differences. There are big differences between the two parties. And I am very proud that our party on our watch did balance the Federal budget, did produce surpluses before a crisis of international proportions affected us in 2001.

But suffice to say, I have great respect for the gentleman from Wisconsin. Over the years he has made me as mad as anyone else because sometimes his arguments are just too good to argue with.

So let me just end by thanking him for honoring our requests. I think we worked out a pretty good bill here, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

An amendment by Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. SOUDER of Indiana.

An amendment by Mr. CAMP of Michigan.

An amendment by Mr. WESTMORELAND of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

Amendment No. 62 by Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Amendment No. 16 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 23 by Mrs. MUSGRAVE of Colorado.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Amendment No. 67 by Mr. PENCE of Indiana.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

Page 125, after line 2, insert the following:
 SEC. 522. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay a bonus or other performance-based cash award to any employee of the Social Security Administration or the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services who holds a position to which such employee was appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or a Senior Executive Service position (as defined by section 3132 of title 5, United States Code).

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 238, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 672]

AYES—185

Akin	Boustany	Chabot
Alexander	Boyda (KS)	Coble
Bachmann	Brown-Waite,	Cole (OK)
Bachus	Ginny	Conaway
Baker	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Barrett (SC)	Burgess	Cuellar
Barrow	Burton (IN)	Culberson
Bartlett (MD)	Calvert	Davis (KY)
Barton (TX)	Camp (MI)	Davis, David
Bilbray	Campbell (CA)	Deal (GA)
Billirakis	Cannon	Dent
Bishop (UT)	Cantor	Diaz-Balart, M.
Blackburn	Capito	Donnelly
Blunt	Carney	Drake
Boehner	Carter	Dreier
Boozman	Castle	Duncan

Ellsworth	Kuhl (NY)
Emerson	Lamborn
English (PA)	LaTourette
Everett	Lewis (CA)
Fallin	Lewis (KY)
Feeney	Loeb sack
Flake	Lucas
Forbes	Lungren, Daniel
Fortuño	E.
Fossella	Mahoney (FL)
Fox	Manzullo
Franks (AZ)	Marchant
Frelinghuysen	McCaul (TX)
Galleghy	McCotter
Gerlach	McCrery
Gilchrest	McHenry
Gillibrand	McHugh
Gillmor	McKeon
Gohmert	McMorris
Goode	Rodgers
Goodlatte	McNerney
Gordon	Mica
Granger	Miller (FL)
Graves	Miller (MI)
Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary
Hastert	Mitchell
Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)
Hayes	Murphy (CT)
Heller	Murphy, Patrick
Hensarling	Murphy, Tim
Hill	Musgrave
Hobson	Myrick
Hoekstra	Neugebauer
Hunter	Paul
Issa	Pearce
Johnson (IL)	Pence
Johnson, Sam	Peterson (PA)
Jones (NC)	Petri
Jordan	Pickering
Keller	Pitts
King (IA)	Platts
King (NY)	Poe
Kingston	Porter
Kirk	Pryce (OH)
Klein (FL)	Putnam
Kline (MN)	Radanovich
Knollenberg	Ramstad

NOES—238

Abercrombie	Davis (AL)
Ackerman	Davis (CA)
Aderholt	Davis, Lincoln
Allen	Davis, Tom
Altmore	DeFazio
Andrews	DeGette
Arcuri	Delahunt
Baca	DeLauro
Baird	Diaz-Balart, L.
Baldwin	Dicks
Bean	Dingell
Becerra	Doggett
Berkley	Doolittle
Berman	Doyle
Berry	Edwards
Biggert	Ehlers
Bishop (GA)	Ellison
Bishop (NY)	Emanuel
Blumenauer	Engel
Bonner	Eshoo
Boren	Etheridge
Boswell	Farr
Boucher	Fattah
Boyd (FL)	Ferguson
Brady (PA)	Fortenberry
Brady (TX)	Frank (MA)
Braley (IA)	Garrett (NJ)
Brown (SC)	Giffords
Butterfield	Gingrey
Buyer	Gonzalez
Capps	Green, Al
Capuano	Green, Gene
Cardoza	Grijalva
Carnahan	Gutierrez
Castor	Hall (NY)
Chandler	Hare
Christensen	Hastings (FL)
Clarke	Herger
Clay	Herseth Sandlin
Cleaver	Higgins
Culberson	Hinche
Cohen	Hinojosa
Conyers	Hirono
Cooper	Hodes
Costa	Holden
Costello	Holt
Courtney	Honda
Cramer	Hooley
Crowley	Hoyer
Cummings	Hulshof

Regula	Miller (NC)
Rehberg	Miller, George
Renzi	Mollohan
Rogers (AL)	Moore (KS)
Rogers (KY)	Moore (WI)
Rogers (MI)	Moran (VA)
Ros-Lehtinen	Murtha
Roskam	Nadler
Royce	Napolitano
Ryan (WI)	Neal (MA)
Sali	Norton
Schmidt	Nunes
Sensenbrenner	Oberstar
Sessions	Obey
Shadegg	Olver
Shays	Ortiz
Shuler	Pallone
Shuster	Pascrell
Simpson	Pastor
Smith (NE)	Payne
Smith (TX)	Perlmutter
Souder	Peterson (MN)
Space	Pomeroy
Stearns	Price (GA)
Sullivan	Price (NC)
Tanner	Rahall
Taylor	Rangel
Terry	Reichert
Thornberry	Reyes
Tiahrt	Reynolds
Tiberi	Rodriguez
Turner	
Upton	
Walberg	
Walden (OR)	
Walsh (NY)	
Wamp	
Weld (FL)	
Weller	
Westmoreland	
Whitfield	
Wicker	
Wilson (NM)	
Wilson (SC)	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	

Rohrabacher	Stark
Ross	Stupak
Rothman	Sutton
Roybal-Allard	Tauscher
Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)
Rush	Thompson (MS)
Ryan (OH)	Tierney
Salazar	Towns
Sánchez, Linda	Udall (CO)
T.	Udall (NM)
Sanchez, Loretta	Van Hollen
Sarbanes	Velázquez
Saxton	Visclosky
Schakowsky	Walz (MN)
Schiff	Wasserman
Schwartz	Schultz
Scott (GA)	Waters
Scott (VA)	Watson
Serrano	Watt
Sestak	Waxman
Shea-Porter	Weiner
Sherman	Welch (VT)
Shimkus	Wexler
Sires	Wilson (OH)
Skelton	Wolf
Slaughter	Smith (NJ)
Smith (NJ)	Smith (WA)
Smith (WA)	Wolf
Snyder	Woolsey
Solis	Wu
Spratt	Wynn
	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bono	Davis (IL)	Jindal
Bordallo	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall
Brown, Corrine	Faleomavaega	Tancred
Carson	Filner	
Cubin	Harman	

□ 1649

Messrs. BRADY of Texas, INGLIS of South Carolina, LAMPSON and PRICE of Georgia changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. GARY G. MILLER of California, SHAYS and LOEBSACK changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. KLEIN. Madam Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 672 on H.R. 3043, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “aye” when I should have voted “no.”

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 672, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The next 14 votes in this series are 2-minute votes. The Chair requests the cooperation of Members in processing these votes in an expedited manner.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. GINGREY: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by the Commissioner of Social Security or the Social Security Administration to pay the compensation

of employees of the Social Security Administration to administer Social Security benefit payments, under any agreement between the United States and Mexico establishing totalization arrangements between the social security system established by title II of the Social Security Act and the social security system of Mexico, which would not otherwise be payable but for such agreement.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 254, noes 168, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 673]

AYES—254

Aderholt	Emerson	Lynch
Akin	English (PA)	Mack
Alexander	Everett	Mahoney (FL)
Allen	Fallin	Manzullo
Altmire	Feeney	Marchant
Arcuri	Ferguson	Matheson
Bachmann	Flake	McCarthy (CA)
Bachus	Forbes	McCaul (TX)
Baker	Fortenberry	McCotter
Barrett (SC)	Fossella	McHenry
Barrow	Fox	McHugh
Bartlett (MD)	Franks (AZ)	McKeon
Barton (TX)	Frelinghuysen	McMorris
Bean	Gallely	Rodgers
Biggart	Garrett (NJ)	McNerney
Bilbray	Gerlach	Melancon
Bilirakis	Giffords	Mica
Bishop (GA)	Gilchrest	Michaud
Bishop (UT)	Gillibrand	Miller (FL)
Blackburn	Gillmor	Miller (MI)
Blunt	Gingrey	Miller, Gary
Boehner	Gohmert	Mitchell
Bonner	Goode	Moore (KS)
Boozman	Goodlatte	Moran (KS)
Boren	Gordon	Murphy, Patrick
Boswell	Granger	Murphy, Tim
Boucher	Graves	Musgrave
Boustany	Green, Gene	Myrick
Boyd (FL)	Hall (TX)	Neugebauer
Boyd (KS)	Hare	Nunes
Brady (TX)	Hastert	Pearce
Brown (SC)	Hastings (WA)	Pence
Brown-Waite,	Hayes	Peterson (MN)
Ginny	Heller	Peterson (PA)
Buchanan	Hensarling	Petri
Burgess	Hergert	Pickering
Burton (IN)	Herseth Sandlin	Pitts
Buyer	Higgins	Platts
Calvert	Hill	Poe
Camp (MI)	Hobson	Pomeroy
Campbell (CA)	Hodes	Porter
Cannon	Hoekstra	Price (GA)
Cantor	Hooley	Pryce (OH)
Capito	Hulshof	Putnam
Cardoza	Hunter	Radanovich
Carnahan	Inglis (SC)	Rahall
Carney	Israel	Ramstad
Carter	Issa	Regula
Castle	Johnson (IL)	Rehberg
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Chandler	Jones (NC)	Renzi
Coble	Jordan	Reynolds
Cole (OK)	Kagen	Rogers (AL)
Conaway	Keller	Rogers (KY)
Costa	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)
Costello	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Cramer	Kingston	Roskam
Crenshaw	Kirk	Ross
Culberson	Kline (MN)	Royce
Davis (AL)	Knollenberg	Ryan (OH)
Davis (KY)	Kuhl (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Davis, David	LaHood	Salazar
Davis, Lincoln	Lamborn	Sali
Davis, Tom	Lampson	Saxton
Deal (GA)	Latham	Schmidt
DeFazio	LaTourette	Schwartz
Dent	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Donnelly	Lewis (KY)	Sessions
Doolittle	Linder	Shadegg
Drake	Lipinski	Shays
Dreier	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Duncan	Lucas	Shuler
Edwards	Lungren, Daniel	Shuster
Ellsworth	E.	Simpson

Skelton	Thornberry
Smith (NE)	Tiahrt
Smith (NJ)	Tiberi
Smith (TX)	Turner
Souder	Udall (CO)
Space	Upton
Spratt	Walberg
Stearns	Walden (OR)
Sullivan	Walsh (NY)
Tanner	Walz (MN)
Taylor	Wamp
Terry	Weldon (FL)

NOES—168

Abercrombie	Hinojosa	Olver
Ackerman	Hirono	Ortiz
Andrews	Holden	Pallone
Baca	Holt	Pascrell
Baird	Honda	Pastor
Baldwin	Hoyer	Payne
Becerra	Inslee	Perlmutter
Berkley	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Berman	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Berry	(TX)	Reyes
Bishop (NY)	Jefferson	Rodriguez
Blumenauer	Johnson (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman
Braley (IA)	Jones (OH)	Roybal-Allard
Butterfield	Kanjorski	Ruppersberger
Capps	Kaptur	Rush
Capuano	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Castor	Kildee	T.
Christensen	Kilpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kind	Sarbanes
Clay	Klein (FL)	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kucinich	Schiff
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott (GA)
Cohen	Lantos	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sestak
Courtney	Lee	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Levin	Sherman
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Cummings	Loebsack	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Lowey	Snyder
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)	Solis
DeLauro	Markey	Stark
Diaz-Balart, L.	Matsui	Stupak
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (NY)	Sutton
Dicks	McCollum (MN)	Tauscher
Dingell	McCrery	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McGovern	Tierney
Ehlers	McIntyre	Towns
Ellison	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Emanuel	Meeke (FL)	Van Hollen
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Velazquez
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Etheridge	Miller, George	Wasserman
Farr	Mollohan	Schultz
Fattah	Moore (WI)	Waters
Fortuño	Moran (VA)	Watson
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Watt
Gonzalez	Murtha	Waxman
Green, Al	Nadler	Weiner
Grijalva	Napolitano	Welch (VT)
Gutierrez	Neal (MA)	Weller
Hall (NY)	Norton	Wexler
Hall (TX)	Hastings (FL)	Woolsey
Hastings (FL)	Hinchev	Wynn

NOT VOTING—14

Bono	Davis (L)	Jindal
Bordallo	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall
Brown, Corrine	Faleomavaega	Paul
Carson	Finer	Tancredo
Cubin	Harman	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1655

Mr. MEEK of Florida changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. WU, Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. POMEROY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. McINTYRE. Madam Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 673 on H.R. 3043, I mistak-

only recorded my vote as “no” when I should have voted “aye.”

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 673, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOUDER:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the National Labor Relations Board to recognize as the exclusive bargaining representative of employees any labor organization that has not been certified as such by the National Labor Relations Board pursuant to section 9(c) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 159).

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 255, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 674]

AYES—167

Akin	Drake	Knollenberg
Bachmann	Dreier	LaHood
Bachus	Duncan	Lamborn
Baker	Ehlers	Latham
Barrett (SC)	Everett	Lewis (CA)
Bartlett (MD)	Fallin	Lewis (KY)
Barton (TX)	Feeney	Linder
Bilbray	Flake	Lucas
Bilirakis	Forbes	Lungren, Daniel
Bishop (UT)	Fortenberry	E.
Blackburn	Fortuño	Mack
Blunt	Fox	Manzullo
Boehner	Franks (AZ)	Marchant
Bonner	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)
Boozman	Gallely	McCaul (TX)
Boren	Garrett (NJ)	McCrery
Boustany	Gilchrest	McHenry
Brady (TX)	Gillmor	McIntyre
Brown (SC)	Gingrey	McKeon
Brown-Waite,	Gohmert	McMorris
Ginny	Goode	Rodgers
Buchanan	Goodlatte	Mica
Burgess	Granger	Miller (FL)
Burton (IN)	Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary
Buyer	Hastert	Moran (KS)
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Musgrave
Camp (MI)	Hayes	Myrick
Campbell (CA)	Heller	Neugebauer
Cannon	Hensarling	Nunes
Cantor	Hergert	Pearce
Carter	Hobson	Pence
Chabot	Hulshof	Peterson (PA)
Coble	Hunter	Petri
Cole (OK)	Inglis (SC)	Pickering
Conaway	Issa	Pitts
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Platts
Culberson	Jones (NC)	Poe
Davis (KY)	Jordan	Price (GA)
Davis, David	Keller	Pryce (OH)
Davis, Tom	King (IA)	Putnam
Deal (GA)	Kingston	Radanovich
Dent	Kirk	Ramstad
Doolittle	Kline (MN)	Rehberg

Renzi Shimkus
Reynolds Shuster
Rogers (AL) Simpson
Rogers (KY) Smith (NE)
Rogers (MI) Smith (TX)
Rohrabacher Souder
Roskam Stearns
Royce Sullivan
Ryan (WI) Taylor
Sali Terry
Schmidt Thornberry
Sensenbrenner Tiahrt
Sessions Tiberi
Shadegg Turner

Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler

Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu

Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

Bostany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger

NOT VOTING—14

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

NOES—255

Abercrombie Gillibrand
Ackerman Gonzalez
Aderholt Gordon
Alexander Graves
Allen Green, Al
Altmire Green, Gene
Andrews Grijalva
Arcuri Gutierrez
Baca Hall (NY)
Baird Hare
Baldwin Hastings (FL)
Barrow Herseht Sandlin
Bean Higgins
Becerra Hill
Berkley Hinchey
Berman Hinojosa
Berry Hodes
Biggert Hoekstra
Bishop (GA) Holden
Bishop (NY) Holt
Blumenauer Honda
Boswell Hooley
Boucher Hoyer
Boyd (FL) Insee
Boyd (KS) Israel
Brady (PA) Jackson (IL)
Braley (IA) Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
Butterfield Jefferson
Capito Johnson (GA)
Capps Johnson (IL)
Capuano Johnson, E. B.
Cardoza Jones (OH)
Carnahan Kagen
Carney Kanjorski
Carson Kapтур
Castle Kennedy
Castor Kildee
Chandler Kilpatrick
Christensen Kind
Clarke King (NY)
Clay Klein (FL)
Cleaver Kucinich
Clyburn Kuhl (NY)
Cohen Lampson
Conyers Langevin
Cooper Lantos
Costa Santolero
Costello Larsen (WA)
Courtney Larson (CT)
Cramer LaTourette
Crowley Lee
Cuellar Levin
Cummings Lewis (GA)
Davis (AL) Lipinski
Davis (CA) LoBiondo
Davis, Lincoln Loeb sack
DeFazio Lofgren, Zoe
DeGette Lowey
Delahunt Lynch
DeLauro Mahoney (FL)
Diaz-Balart, L. Maloney (NY)
Diaz-Balart, M. Markey
Dicks Matheson
Dingell Matsui
Doggett McCarthy (NY)
Donnelly McCollum (MN)
Doyle McCotter
Edwards McDermott
Ellison McGovern
Ellsworth McHugh
Emanuel McNerney
Emerson McNulty
Engel Meek (FL)
English (PA) Meeks (NY)
Eshoo Melancon
Etheridge Michaud
Farr Miller (MI)
Fattah Miller (NC)
Ferguson Miller, George
Fossella Mitchell
Frank (MA) Mollohan
Gerlach Moore (KS)
Giffords Moore (WI)

Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
 T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman

□ 1659

Mr. KIRK changed his vote from
“no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Chairman, on rollcall
No. 674, had I been present, I would have
voted “no.”

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall
No. 674, I was on official business outside the
National Capital region in my capacity as
chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted
“no.”

Mr. MCINTYRE. Madam Chairman, during
rollcall vote No. 674 on H.R. 3043, I mistake-
fully recorded my vote as “aye” when I should
have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMP OF
MICHIGAN

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The text of the amendment is as fol-
lows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAMP of Michi-
gan:

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

TITLE VI

ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. None of the funds made available
in this Act may be used to implement any
policy prohibiting a Medicare beneficiary
from electing during a coverage election pe-
riod described in section 1851(e) of the Social
Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-21(e)) to receive
health care benefits under title XVIII of such
Act through enrollment in a Medicare Ad-
vantage plan under part C of such title.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has
been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 192, noes 228,
not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 675]

AYES—192

Aderholt Barrett (SC)
Akin Bartlett (MD)
Alexander Barton (TX)
Bachmann Biggert
Bachus Bilbray
Baker Bilirakis

Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman

Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
 E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
 Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce

Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—228

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen

Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseht Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Insee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos

Larsen (WA)	Neal (MA)	Sires	[Roll No. 676]	Hinchey	McNerney	Schakowsky
Larson (CT)	Norton	Skelton		Hinojosa	McNulty	Schiff
Lee	Oberstar	Slaughter	AYES—191	Hirono	Meek (FL)	Schwartz
Levin	Obey	Smith (WA)		Hodes	Meeks (NY)	Scott (GA)
Lewis (GA)	Ortiz	Snyder		Holden	Michaud	Scott (VA)
Lipinski	Pallone	Solis		Holt	Miller (NC)	Serrano
Loeb sack	Pascrell	Space		Honda	Miller, George	Sestak
Lofgren, Zoe	Pastor	Spratt		Hooley	Mollohan	Shays
Lowey	Payne	Stark		Hoyer	Moore (KS)	Shea-Porter
Lynch	Perlmutter	Stupak		Insee	Moore (WI)	Sherman
Maloney (NY)	Peterson (MN)	Sutton		Israel	Moran (VA)	Sires
Markey	Pomeroy	Tanner		Jackson (IL)	Murphy (CT)	Slaughter
Matheson	Price (NC)	Tauscher		Jackson-Lee	Murphy, Patrick	Smith (NJ)
Matsui	Rahall	Taylor		(TX)	Murphy, Tim	Smith (WA)
McCarthy (NY)	Rangel	Thompson (CA)		Jefferson	Murtha	Snyder
McCollum (MN)	Renzi	Thompson (MS)		Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Solis
McDermott	Reyes	Tierney		Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Spratt
McGovern	Rodriguez	Towns		Jones (OH)	Neal (MA)	Stark
McIntyre	Ross	Udall (CO)		Kagen	Norton	Stupak
McNerney	Rothman	Udall (NM)		Kanjorski	Oberstar	Sutton
McNulty	Roybal-Allard	Van Hollen		Kaptur	Obey	Tauscher
Meek (FL)	Ruppersberger	Velázquez		Kennedy	Olver	Thompson (CA)
Meeks (NY)	Rush	Visclosky		Kildee	Ortiz	Thompson (MS)
Melancon	Ryan (OH)	Walz (MN)		Kilpatrick	Pallone	Tierney
Michaud	Salazar	Wasserman		Kind	Pascrell	Towns
Miller (NC)	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz		Kirk	Pastor	Udall (CO)
Miller, George	T.	Waters		Klein (FL)	Payne	Udall (NM)
Mitchell	Sanchez, Loretta	Watson		Kucinich	Pearce	Van Hollen
Mollohan	Sarbanes	Watt		LaHood	Perlmutter	Velázquez
Moore (KS)	Schakowsky	Waxman		Lampson	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Moore (WI)	Schiff	Weiner		Langevin	Pomeroy	Walden (OR)
Moran (KS)	Schwartz	Welch (VT)		Lantos	Price (NC)	Walz (MN)
Moran (VA)	Scott (GA)	Wexler		Larsen (WA)	Pryce (OH)	Wasserman
Murphy (CT)	Scott (VA)	Wilson (OH)		Larson (CT)	Rahall	Waters
Murphy, Patrick	Serrano	Woolsey		Lee	Rangel	Schultz
Murphy, Tim	Sestak	Wu		Levin	Reichert	Watt
Murtha	Shea-Porter	Wynn		Lewis (GA)	Renzi	Watson
Nadler	Sherman	Yarmuth		Lipinski	Reyes	Watt
Napolitano	Shuler	Young (AK)		Loeb sack	Rodriguez	Waxman
				Lofgren, Zoe	Ros-Lehtinen	Weiner
				Lowey	Rothman	Welch (VT)
				Lynch	Roybal-Allard	Weller
				Mahoney (FL)	Ruppersberger	Wexler
				Maloney (NY)	Rush	Wilson (NM)
				Markey	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (OH)
				Matsui	Salazar	Wolf
				McCarthy (NY)	Sánchez, Linda	Woolsey
				McCollum (MN)	T.	Wu
				McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta	Wynn
				McGovern	Sarbanes	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Berkley	Faleomavaega	Olver
Bono	Filner	Paul
Bordallo	Harman	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown, Corrine	Jindal	Tancredo
Cubin	Kaptur	
Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains on the vote.

□ 1703

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 675 I inadvertently voted “no” but intended to vote “aye.”

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 675, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WESTMORELAND

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 233, not voting 12, as follows:

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Mitchell
Akin	Gallegly	Moran (KS)
Alexander	Garrett (NJ)	Musgrave
Altmire	Gerlach	Myrick
Bachmann	Gingrey	Neugebauer
Bachus	Gohmert	Nunes
Baird	Goode	Pence
Baker	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Barrett (SC)	Gordon	Petri
Barrow	Granger	Pickering
Bartlett (MD)	Graves	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Hall (TX)	Platts
Bilbray	Hastert	Poe
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Porter
Bishop (UT)	Hayes	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Heller	Putnam
Blunt	Hensarling	Radanovich
Boehner	Herger	Ramstad
Bonner	Hill	Regula
Boozman	Hobson	Rehberg
Boren	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Boustany	Hulshof	Rogers (AL)
Boyd (KS)	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Brown (SC)	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Brown-Waite,	Issa	Rohrabacher
Ginny	Johnson (IL)	Roskam
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Burgess	Jones (NC)	Royce
Burton (IN)	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Buyer	Keller	Sali
Calvert	King (IA)	Saxton
Camp (MI)	King (NY)	Schmidt
Campbell (CA)	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Kline (MN)	Sessions
Cantor	Knollenberg	Shadegg
Carney	Kuhl (NY)	Shimkus
Carter	Lamborn	Shuler
Chabot	Latham	Shuster
Coble	LaTourette	Simpson
Cole (OK)	Lewis (CA)	Skelton
Conaway	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NE)
Costa	Linder	Smith (TX)
Cramer	LoBiondo	Souder
Crenshaw	Lucas	Space
Culberson	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Davis (KY)	E.	Sullivan
Davis, David	Mack	Tanner
Davis, Lincoln	Manzullo	Taylor
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Terry
Dent	Matheson	Thornberry
Doolittle	McCarthy (CA)	Tiahrt
Drake	McCaul (TX)	Tiberi
Dreier	McCotter	Turner
Duncan	McCrery	Upton
Ellsworth	McHenry	Walberg
Emerson	McHugh	Walsh (NY)
Everett	McIntyre	Wamp
Fallin	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Feeney	McMorris	Westmoreland
Flake	Rodgers	Whitfield
Forbes	Melancon	Wicker
Fortenberry	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Fossella	Miller (FL)	Young (AK)
Fox	Miller (MI)	Young (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	

NOES—233

Abercrombie	Castle	Donnelly
Ackerman	Castor	Doyle
Allen	Chandler	Edwards
Andrews	Christensen	Ehlers
Arcuri	Clarke	Ellison
Baca	Clay	Emanuel
Baldwin	Cleaver	Engel
Bean	Clyburn	English (PA)
Becerra	Cohen	Eshoo
Berkley	Conyers	Etheridge
Berman	Cooper	Farr
Berry	Costello	Fattah
Biggert	Courtney	Ferguson
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Fortuño
Bishop (NY)	Cuellar	Frank (MA)
Blumenauer	Cummings	Giffords
Boswell	Davis (AL)	Gilchrest
Boucher	Davis (CA)	Gillibrand
Boyd (FL)	Davis (IL)	Gillmor
Brady (PA)	Davis, Tom	Gonzalez
Brady (TX)	DeFazio	Green, Al
Braley (IA)	DeGette	Green, Gene
Butterfield	Delahunt	Grijalva
Capito	DeLauro	Gutierrez
Capps	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hall (NY)
Capuano	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hare
Cardoza	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Carnahan	Dingell	Herseth Sandlin
Carson	Doggett	Higgins

Hirono	McNerney	Schakowsky
Hodes	McNulty	Schiff
Holden	Meek (FL)	Schwartz
Holt	Meeks (NY)	Scott (GA)
Honda	Michaud	Scott (VA)
Hooley	Miller (NC)	Serrano
Hoyer	Miller, George	Sestak
Insee	Mollohan	Shays
Israel	Moore (KS)	Shea-Porter
Jackson (IL)	Moore (WI)	Sherman
Jackson-Lee	Moran (VA)	Sires
(TX)	Murphy (CT)	Slaughter
Jefferson	Murphy, Patrick	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (GA)	Murphy, Tim	Smith (WA)
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	Snyder
Jones (OH)	Nadler	Solis
Kagen	Napolitano	Spratt
Kanjorski	Neal (MA)	Stark
Kaptur	Norton	Stupak
Kennedy	Oberstar	Sutton
Kildee	Obey	Tauscher
Kilpatrick	Olver	Thompson (CA)
Kind	Ortiz	Thompson (MS)
Kirk	Pallone	Tierney
Klein (FL)	Pascrell	Towns
Kucinich	Pastor	Udall (CO)
LaHood	Payne	Udall (NM)
Lampson	Pearce	Van Hollen
Langevin	Perlmutter	Velázquez
Lantos	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Larsen (WA)	Pomeroy	Walden (OR)
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Walz (MN)
Lee	Pryce (OH)	Wasserman
Levin	Rahall	Waters
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Schultz
Lipinski	Reichert	Watt
Loeb sack	Renzi	Watson
Lofgren, Zoe	Reyes	Watt
Lowey	Rodriguez	Waxman
Lynch	Ros-Lehtinen	Weiner
Mahoney (FL)	Rothman	Welch (VT)
Maloney (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Weller
Markey	Ruppersberger	Wexler
Matsui	Rush	Wilson (NM)
McCarthy (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (OH)
McCollum (MN)	Salazar	Wolf
McDermott	Sánchez, Linda	Woolsey
McGovern	T.	Wu
	Sanchez, Loretta	Wynn
	Sarbanes	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Bono	Davis, Jo Ann	Jindal
Bordallo	Faleomavaega	Marshall
Brown, Corrine	Filner	Paul
Cubin	Harman	Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1707

Mrs. MALONEY of New York changed her vote from “aye” to “no.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 676, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 412, noes 12, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 677]

AYES—412

Abercrombie	Davis (AL)	Hunter
Ackerman	Davis (CA)	Inglis (SC)
Aderholt	Davis (IL)	Inslee
Akin	Davis (KY)	Israel
Alexander	Davis, David	Issa
Allen	Davis, Lincoln	Jackson (IL)
Altmire	Davis, Tom	Jackson-Lee
Andrews	DeFazio	(TX)
Arcuri	DeGette	Jefferson
Baca	Delahunt	Johnson (GA)
Bachmann	DeLauro	Johnson (IL)
Bachus	Dent	Johnson, E. B.
Baird	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson, Sam
Baker	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jones (NC)
Baldwin	Dicks	Jones (OH)
Barrett (SC)	Dingell	Jordan
Barrow	Doggett	Kagen
Bartlett (MD)	Donnelly	Kanjorski
Bean	Doolittle	Kaptur
Becerra	Doyle	Keller
Berkley	Drake	Kennedy
Berman	Dreier	Kildee
Berry	Duncan	Kilpatrick
Biggert	Edwards	Kind
Bilbray	Ehlers	King (NY)
Bilirakis	Ellison	Kingston
Bishop (GA)	Ellsworth	Kirk
Bishop (NY)	Emanuel	Klein (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Emerson	Kline (MN)
Blackburn	Engel	Knollenberg
Blumenauer	English (PA)	Kucinich
Blunt	Eshoo	Kuhl (NY)
Boehner	Etheridge	LaHood
Bonner	Everett	Lamborn
Boozman	Fallin	Lampson
Boren	Farr	Langevin
Boswell	Fattah	Lantos
Boucher	Feeney	Larsen (WA)
Boustany	Ferguson	Larson (CT)
Boyd (FL)	Forbes	Latham
Boyd (KS)	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Brady (PA)	Fortuno	Lee
Brady (TX)	Fossella	Levin
Braley (IA)	Fox	Lewis (GA)
Brown (SC)	Frank (MA)	Lewis (KY)
Brown-Waite,	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Ginny	Gallely	LoBiondo
Buchanan	Garrett (NJ)	Loeb
Burgess	Gerlach	Lofgren, Zoe
Burton (IN)	Giffords	Lowe
Butterfield	Gilchrest	Lucas
Buyer	Gillibrand	Lungren, Daniel
Calvert	Gillmor	E.
Camp (MI)	Gingrey	Lynch
Cannon	Gohmert	Mack
Cantor	Gonzalez	Mahoney (FL)
Capito	Goode	Maloney (NY)
Capps	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Capuano	Gordon	Marchant
Cardoza	Granger	Markey
Carnahan	Graves	Matheson
Carney	Green, Al	Matsui
Carson	Green, Gene	McCarthy (CA)
Carter	Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)
Castle	Gutierrez	McCaul (TX)
Castor	Hall (NY)	McCollum (MN)
Chabot	Hall (TX)	McCotter
Chandler	Hare	McDermott
Christensen	Hastings (FL)	McGovern
Clarke	Hastings (WA)	McHenry
Clay	Hayes	McHugh
Cleaver	Heller	McIntyre
Clyburn	Hensarling	McKeon
Coble	Herger	McMorris
Cohen	Herseth Sandlin	Rodgers
Cole (OK)	Higgins	McNerney
Conaway	Hill	McNulty
Conyers	Hinchee	Meek (FL)
Cooper	Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)
Costa	Hirono	Melancon
Costello	Hobson	Mica
Courtney	Hodes	Michaud
Cramer	Holden	Miller (FL)
Crenshaw	Holt	Miller (MI)
Crowley	Honda	Miller (NC)
Cuellar	Hoolley	Miller, Gary
Culberson	Hoyer	Miller, George
Cummings	Hulshof	Mitchell

Mollohan	Rogers (AL)	Stupak
Moore (KS)	Rogers (KY)	Sullivan
Moore (WI)	Rogers (MI)	Sutton
Moran (KS)	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Moran (VA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauscher
Murphy (CT)	Roskam	Taylor
Murphy, Patrick	Ross	Terry
Murphy, Tim	Rothman	Thompson (CA)
Murtha	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)
Musgrave	Royce	Thornberry
Myrick	Ruppersberger	Tiahrt
Nadler	Rush	Tiberi
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Tierney
Neal (MA)	Ryan (WI)	Towns
Neugebauer	Salazar	Turner
Norton	Sali	Udall (CO)
Nunes	Sánchez, Linda	Udall (NM)
Oberstar	T.	Upton
Obey	Sanchez, Loretta	Van Hollen
Olver	Sarbanes	Velázquez
Ortiz	Saxton	Visclosky
Pallone	Schakowsky	Walberg
Pascarella	Schiff	Walden (OR)
Pastor	Schmidt	Walden (NY)
Payne	Schwartz	Walsh (MN)
Pearce	Scott (GA)	Wamp
Pence	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Perlmutter	Sensenbrenner	Schultz
Peterson (MN)	Serrano	Waters
Peterson (PA)	Sessions	Watson
Petri	Sestak	Watt
Pickering	Shays	Waxman
Pitts	Shea-Porter	Weiner
Platts	Sherman	Welch (VT)
Poe	Shimkus	Weldon (FL)
Pomeroy	Shuler	Weller
Porter	Shuster	Westmoreland
Price (GA)	Simpson	Sires
Price (NC)	Sires	Wexler
Pryce (OH)	Skelton	Whitfield
Putnam	Slaughter	Wicker
Radanovich	Smith (NE)	Wilson (NM)
Rahall	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (OH)
Ramstad	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Regula	Snyder	Woolsey
Rehberg	Solis	Wu
Reichert	Souder	Wynn
Renzi	Space	Yarmuth
Reyes	Spratt	Young (AK)
Reynolds	Stark	Young (FL)
Rodriguez	Stearns	

NOES—12

Barton (TX)	Frank (AZ)	Lewis (CA)
Campbell (CA)	Hastert	Linder
Deal (GA)	Hoekstra	McCrery
Flake	King (IA)	Shadegg

NOT VOTING—12

Bono	Davis, Jo Ann	Jindal
Bordallo	Faleomavaega	Marshall
Brown, Corrine	Filner	Paul
Cubin	Harman	Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains on the vote.

□ 1712

Mr. CAMPBELL of California changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. LARSEN of Washington changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER, Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 677, I was on official business outside the National Capital region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) on which further proceedings

were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 108, noes 316, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 678]

AYES—108

Akin	Franks (AZ)	Myrick
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Neugebauer
Barrett (SC)	Gerlach	Nunes
Biggert	Gingrey	Pearce
Bilbray	Gohmert	Pence
Bilirakis	Goode	Petri
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Pitts
Blackburn	Granger	Platts
Brown-Waite,	Graves	Poe
Ginny	Hastert	Price (GA)
Buchanan	Hastings (WA)	Putnam
Buyer	Heller	Radanovich
Campbell (CA)	Hensarling	Reichert
Cannon	Hoekstra	Rogers (MI)
Cantor	Hulshof	Roskam
Carter	Inglis (SC)	Ryan (WI)
Castle	Issa	Sali
Chabot	Jordan	Schmidt
Coble	Keller	Sensenbrenner
Cole (OK)	King (IA)	Sessions
Conaway	Kingston	Shadegg
Cooper	Kirk	Shimkus
Crenshaw	Kline (MN)	Shuster
Culberson	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Davis (KY)	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Daniel	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (TX)
Davis, Tom	E.	Stearns
Deal (GA)	Mack	Sullivan
Dent	Manzullo	Terry
Duncan	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Ehlers	McCaul (TX)	Walberg
Fallin	McHenry	Walden (OR)
Feeney	McMorris	Weldon (FL)
Flake	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Forbes	Mica	Wilson (NM)
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Musgrave	Wolf

NOES—316

Abercrombie	Brown (SC)	Diaz-Balart, L.
Ackerman	Burgess	Diaz-Balart, M.
Aderholt	Burton (IN)	Dicks
Alexander	Butterfield	Dingell
Allen	Calvert	Doggett
Altmire	Camp (MI)	Donnelly
Andrews	Capito	Doolittle
Arcuri	Capps	Doyle
Baca	Capuano	Drake
Bachus	Cardoza	Dreier
Baird	Carnahan	Edwards
Baker	Carney	Ellison
Baldwin	Carson	Ellsworth
Barrow	Castor	Emanuel
Bartlett (MD)	Chandler	Emerson
Barton (TX)	Christensen	Engel
Bean	Clarke	English (PA)
Becerra	Clay	Eshoo
Berkley	Cleaver	Etheridge
Berman	Clyburn	Everett
Berry	Cohen	Farr
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Fattah
Bishop (NY)	Costa	Ferguson
Blumenauer	Costello	Fortuno
Blunt	Courtney	Fossella
Boehner	Cramer	Frank (MA)
Bonner	Crowley	Frelinghuysen
Boozman	Cuellar	Gallely
Boren	Cummings	Gingrey
Boswell	Davis (AL)	Gilchrest
Boucher	Davis (CA)	Gillibrand
Boustany	Davis (IL)	Gillmor
Boyd (FL)	Davis, Lincoln	Gonzalez
Boyd (KS)	DeFazio	Gordon
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Green, Al
Brady (TX)	Delahunt	Green, Gene
Braley (IA)	DeLauro	Grijalva

Gutierrez Matsui Salazar
 Hall (NY) McCarthy (NY) Sánchez, Linda
 Hall (TX) McCollum (MN) T.
 Hare McCotter Sanchez, Loretta
 Hastings (FL) McCreery Sarbanes
 Hayes McDermott Saxton
 Herger McGovern Schakowsky
 Herseth Sandlin McHugh Schiff
 Higgins McIntyre Schwartz
 Hill McKeon Scott (GA)
 Hinchey McNeerney Scott (VA)
 Hinojosa McNulty Serrano
 Hirono Meek (FL) Sestak
 Hobson Meeks (NY) Shays
 Hodes Melancon Shea-Porter
 Holden Michaud Sherman
 Holt Miller (MI) Shuler
 Honda Miller (NC) Simpson
 Hooley Miller, Gary Sires
 Hoyer Miller, George Skelton
 Hunter Mitchell Slaughter
 Insole Mollohan Smith (WA)
 Israel Moore (KS) Snyder
 Jackson (IL) Moore (WI) Solis
 Jackson-Lee Moran (KS) Souder
 (TX) Moran (VA) Space
 Jefferson Murphy (CT) Spratt
 Johnson (GA) Murphy, Patrick Stark
 Johnson (IL) Murphy, Tim Stupak
 Johnson, E. B. Murtha Stupak
 Johnson, Sam Nadler Sutton
 Jones (NC) Napolitano Tanner
 Jones (OH) Neal (MA) Tauscher
 Kagen Norton Taylor
 Kanjorski Oberstar Thompson (CA)
 Kaptur Obey Thompson (MS)
 Kennedy Oliver Tiahrt
 Kildee Ortiz Tierney
 Kilpatrick Pallone Towns
 Kind Pascrell Turner
 King (NY) Pastor Udall (CO)
 Klein (FL) Payne Udall (NM)
 Knollenberg Perlmutter Upton
 Kucinich Peterson (MN) Van Hollen
 Kuhl (NY) Peterson (PA) Velázquez
 LaHood Pickering Visclosky
 Lampson Pomeroy Walsh (NY)
 Langevin Porter Walz (MN)
 Lantos Price (NC) Wamp
 Larsen (WA) Pryce (OH) Wasserman
 Larson (CT) Rahall Schultz
 LaTourette Ramstad
 Lee Rangel Waters
 Levin Regula Watson
 Lewis (CA) Rehberg Watt
 Lewis (GA) Renzi Waxman
 Lewis (KY) Reyes Weiner
 Linder Reynolds Welch (VT)
 Lipinski Rodriguez Weller
 LoBiondo Rogers (AL) Wexler
 Loeb sack Rogers (KY) Whitfield
 Lofgren, Zoe Rohrabacher Wicker
 Lowey Ros-Lehtinen Wilson (OH)
 Lucas Ross Woolsey
 Lynch Rothman Wu
 Mahoney (FL) Roybal-Allard Wynn
 Mahoney (NY) Royce Yarmuth
 Marchant Ruppertsberger Young (AK)
 Markey Rush Young (FL)
 Matheson Ryan (OH)

NOT VOTING—12

Bono Davis, Jo Ann Jindal
 Bordallo Faleomavaega Marshall
 Brown, Corrine Filner Paul
 Cubin Harman Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1717

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 678, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 96, noes 327, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 679]

AYES—96

Akin Flake Neugebauer
 Bachmann Fossella Nunes
 Barrett (SC) Franks (AZ) Pearce
 Barrow Gallegly Pence
 Bartlett (MD) Garrett (NJ) Petri
 Barton (TX) Gingrey Pitts
 Bilbray Gohmert Platts
 Bilirakis Granger Poe
 Bishop (UT) Hall (TX) Price (GA)
 Blackburn Hastert Putnam
 Boehner Heller Ramstad
 Boozman Hensarling Rohrabacher
 Brady (TX) Herger Roskam
 Brown-Waite, Inglis (SC) Royce
 Ginny Issa Ryan (WI)
 Buchanan Johnson, Sam Sali
 Burton (IN) Jordan Schmidt
 Buyer Keller Sensenbrenner
 Camp (MI) King (IA) Sessions
 Campbell (CA) Kingston Shadegg
 Cannon Kline (MN) Shimkus
 Cantor Linder Shuster
 Castle Lungren, Daniel Smith (NE)
 Chabot E. Stearns
 Coble Mack Sullivan
 Conaway Marchant Terry
 Cooper McCarthy (CA) Thornberry
 Davis (KY) McCaul (TX) Upton
 Davis, David McHenry Waldberg
 Deal (GA) Mica Welton (FL)
 Duncan Miller (FL) Westmoreland
 Ehlers Musgrave Wilson (SC)
 Feeney Myrick

NOES—327

Abercrombie Capps Diaz-Balart, M.
 Ackerman Capuano Dicks
 Aderholt Cardoza Dingell
 Alexander Carnahan Doggett
 Allen Carney Donnelly
 Altmire Carson Doolittle
 Andrews Carter Doyle
 Arcuri Castor Drake
 Baca Chandler Dreier
 Bachus Christensen Edwards
 Baird Clarke Ellison
 Baker Clay Ellsworth
 Baldwin Cleaver Emanuel
 Bean Clyburn Emerson
 Becerra Cohen Engel
 Berkley Cole (OK) English (PA)
 Berman Conyers Eshoo
 Berry Costa Etheridge
 Biggert Costello Everett
 Bishop (GA) Courtney Fallin
 Bishop (NY) Cramer Farr
 Blumenauer Crenshaw Fattah
 Blunt Crowley Ferguson
 Bonner Cuellar Forbes
 Boren Culberson Fortenberry
 Boswell Cummings Fortuño
 Boucher Davis (AL) Foxx
 Boustany Davis (CA) Frank (MA)
 Boyd (FL) Davis (IL) Frelinghuysen
 Boyda (KS) Davis, Lincoln Gerlach
 Brady (PA) Davis, Tom Giffords
 Braley (IA) DeFazio Gilchrest
 Brown (SC) DeGette Gillibrand
 Burgess Delahunt Gillmor
 Butterfield DeLauro Gonzalez
 Calvert Dent Goode
 Capito Diaz-Balart, L. Goodlatte

Gordon Markey Salazar
 Graves Matheson Sánchez, Linda
 Green, Al Matsui T.
 Green, Gene McCarthy (NY) Sanchez, Loretta
 Grijalva McCollum (MN) Sarbanes
 Gutierrez McCotter Saxton
 Hall (NY) McCreery Schakowsky
 Hare McDermott Schiff
 Hastings (FL) McGovern Schwartz
 Hastings (WA) McHugh Scott (GA)
 Hayes McIntyre Scott (VA)
 Herseth Sandlin McKeon Serrano
 Higgins McMorris Sestak
 Hill Rodgers Shays
 Hinchey McNeerney Shea-Porter
 Hinojosa McNulty Sherman
 Hirono Meek (FL) Shuler
 Hobson Meeks (NY) Simpson
 Hodes Melancon Sires
 Hoekstra Michaud Skelton
 Holden Miller (MI) Slaughter
 Holt Miller (NC) Smith (NJ)
 Honda Miller, Gary Smith (TX)
 Hooley Miller, George Smith (WA)
 Hoyer Mitchell Snyder
 Hulshof Mollohan Solis
 Hunter Moore (KS) Souder
 Insole Moore (WI) Space
 Israel Moran (KS) Spratt
 Jackson (IL) Moran (VA) Stark
 Jackson-Lee Murphy (CT) Stupak
 (TX) Murphy, Patrick Sutton
 Jefferson Murphy, Tim Tanner
 Johnson (GA) Murtha Tauscher
 Johnson (IL) Nadler Taylor
 Johnson, E. B. Napolitano Thompson (CA)
 Johnson, Sam Neal (MA) Thompson (MS)
 Jones (NC) Norton Tiahrt
 Jones (OH) Oberstar Tiberi
 Kagen Obey Tierney
 Kanjorski Kaptur Oliver
 Kaptur Kennedy Ortiz Towns
 Kildee Pallone Turner
 Kilpatrick Pascrell Udall (CO)
 Kind Pastor Udall (NM)
 King (NY) Payne Van Hollen
 Klein (FL) Perlmutter Velázquez
 Knollenberg Peterson (MN) Visclosky
 Knollenberg Peterson (PA) Walden (OR)
 Kucinich Pickering Walsh (NY)
 Kuhl (NY) Pomeroy Walz (MN)
 LaHood Porter Wamp
 LaHood Price (NC) Wasserman
 Langevin Pryce (OH) Schultz
 Lantos Radanovich Waters
 Larsen (WA) Rahall Watson
 Larson (CT) Rangel Watt
 LaTourette Regula Waxman
 Lee Rehberg Weiner
 Levin Reichert Welch (VT)
 Lewis (CA) Renzi Weller
 Lewis (GA) Reyes Wexler
 Lewis (KY) Reynolds Whitfield
 Lipinski Rodriguez Wicker
 LoBiondo Rogers (AL) Wilson (NM)
 Loeb sack Rogers (KY) Wilson (OH)
 Lofgren, Zoe Rogers (MI) Wolf
 Lowey Ross Woolsey
 Lucas Rothman Wu
 Lynch Roybal-Allard Wynn
 Mahoney (FL) Ruppertsberger Yarmuth
 Mahoney (NY) Rush Young (AK)
 Manzullo Ryan (OH) Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Bono Faleomavaega Marshall
 Bordallo Filner Paul
 Brown, Corrine Harman Tancredo
 Cubin Jindal
 Davis, Jo Ann Lamborn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1720

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 679, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 136, noes 288, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 680]

AYES—136

Akin	Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)
Bachmann	Gallegly	Miller, Gary
Bachus	Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)
Barrett (SC)	Gillmor	Musgrave
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Myrick
Biggert	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Bilbray	Goode	Nunes
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Pearce
Blackburn	Granger	Pence
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Petri
Boehner	Hastert	Pickering
Bonner	Hastings (WA)	Pitts
Boozman	Hayes	Poe
Brady (TX)	Heller	Price (GA)
Brown (SC)	Hensarling	Putnam
Brown-Waite,	Herger	Radanovich
Ginny	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Burgess	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Burton (IN)	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Buyer	Issa	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp (MI)	Jones (NC)	Roskam
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Royce
Cannon	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	King (IA)	Sali
Carter	Kingston	Schmidt
Chabot	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Lamborn	Sessions
Cole (OK)	Lewis (KY)	Shadegg
Conaway	Linder	Shimkus
Crenshaw	Lucas	Shuler
Culberson	Lungren, Daniel	Shuster
Davis (KY)	E.	Smith (NE)
Davis, David	Mack	Smith (TX)
Deal (GA)	Mahoney (FL)	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	McCarthy (CA)
Drake	McCaul (TX)	Taylor
Dreier	McCotter	Terry
Duncan	McCrery	Thornberry
Fallin	McHenry	Tiahrt
Feeney	McKeon	Walberg
Flake	McMorris	Wamp
Forbes	Rodgers	Weldon (FL)
Fortuño	Mica	Westmoreland
Fossella	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Foxx		

NOES—288

Abercrombie	Berkley	Butterfield
Ackerman	Berman	Capito
Aderholt	Berry	Capps
Alexander	Bilirakis	Capuano
Allen	Bishop (GA)	Cardoza
Altmire	Bishop (NY)	Carnahan
Andrews	Blumenauer	Carney
Arcuri	Boren	Carson
Baca	Boswell	Castle
Baird	Boucher	Castor
Baker	Boustany	Chandler
Baldwin	Boyd (FL)	Christensen
Barrow	Boyd (KS)	Clarke
Barton (TX)	Brady (PA)	Clay
Bean	Braley (IA)	Cleaver
Becerra	Buchanan	Clyburn

Cohen	Kagen	Regula
Conyers	Kanjorski	Rehberg
Cooper	Kaptur	Reichert
Costa	Kennedy	Renzi
Costello	Kildee	Reyes
Courtney	Kilpatrick	Rodriguez
Cramer	Kind	Rogers (AL)
Crowley	King (NY)	Ross
Cuellar	Kirk	Rothman
Cummings	Klein (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Davis (AL)	Knollenberg	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Rush
Davis (IL)	Kuhl (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Davis, Lincoln	LaHood	Salazar
Davis, Tom	Lampson	Sanchez, Linda
DeFazio	Langevin	T.
DeGette	Lantos	Sanchez, Loretta
Delahunt	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Saxton
Dent	Latham	Schakowsky
Dicks	LaTourette	Schiff
Dingell	Lee	Schwartz
Doggett	Levin	Scott (GA)
Donnelly	Lewis (CA)	Scott (VA)
Doolittle	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Doyle	Lipinski	Sestak
Edwards	LoBiondo	Shays
Ehlers	Loeback	Shea-Porter
Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe	Sherman
Ellsworth	Lowe	Simpson
Emanuel	Lynch	Sires
Emerson	Maloney (NY)	Skelton
Engel	Markey	Slaughter
English (PA)	Matheson	Smith (NJ)
Eshoo	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Etheridge	McCarthy (NY)	Snyder
Everett	McCollum (MN)	Solis
Farr	McDermott	Souder
Fattah	McGovern	Space
Ferguson	McHugh	Spratt
Fortenberry	McIntyre	Stark
Frank (MA)	McNerney	Stupak
Frelinghuysen	McNulty	Sutton
Gerlach	Meek (FL)	Tanner
Giffords	Meeke (NY)	Tauscher
Gilchrest	Melancon	Thompson (CA)
Gillibrand	Michaud	Thompson (MS)
Gonzalez	Miller (NC)	Tiberi
Gordon	Miller, George	Tierney
Graves	Mitchell	Towns
Green, Al	Mollohan	Turner
Green, Gene	Moore (KS)	Udall (CO)
Grijalva	Moore (WI)	Udall (NM)
Gutierrez	Moran (VA)	Upton
Hall (NY)	Murphy (CT)	Van Hollen
Hare	Murphy, Patrick	Velázquez
Hastings (FL)	Murphy, Tim	Visclosky
Herseht Sandlin	Murtha	Walden (OR)
Higgins	Nadler	Walsh (NY)
Hill	Napolitano	Walz (MN)
Hinchee	Neal (MA)	Wasserman
Hinojosa	Norton	Schultz
Hirono	Oberstar	Waters
Hobson	Obey	Watson
Hodes	Olver	Watt
Holden	Ortiz	Waxman
Holt	Pallone	Weiner
Honda	Pascrell	Welch (VT)
Hookey	Pastor	Weller
Hoyer	Payne	Wexler
Hulshof	Perlmutter	Whitfield
Inslie	Peterson (MN)	Wicker
Israel	Peterson (PA)	Wilson (NM)
Jackson (IL)	Platts	Wilson (OH)
Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy	Wolf
(TX)	Porter	Woolsey
Jefferson	Price (NC)	Wu
Johnson (GA)	Pryce (OH)	Wynn
Johnson (IL)	Rahall	Yarmuth
Johnson, E. B.	Ramstad	Young (AK)
Jones (OH)	Rangel	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Bono	Davis, Jo Ann	Jindal
Bordallo	Faleomavaega	Marshall
Brown, Corrine	Filner	Paul
Cubin	Harman	Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1725

Messrs. RUSH, HOLDEN and BUCHANAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 680, I was on official business outside the national capital region in my capacity as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

the CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 256, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 681]

AYES—165

Akin	Fossella	Miller, Gary
Altmire	Foxx	Mitchell
Bachmann	Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)
Bachus	Gallegly	Musgrave
Baker	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Barrett (SC)	Gillmor	Neugebauer
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Nunes
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Pearce
Bean	Goode	Pence
Biggert	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Bilbray	Granger	Petri
Bilirakis	Graves	Pickering
Bishop (UT)	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Blackburn	Hastert	Poe
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Boehner	Hayes	Pryce (OH)
Bonner	Heller	Putnam
Boozman	Hensarling	Radanovich
Brady (TX)	Herger	Reynolds
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Rogers (AL)
Brown-Waite,	Hulshof	Rogers (KY)
Ginny	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Inglis (SC)	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Buyer	Jones (NC)	Royce
Calvert	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Camp (MI)	Keller	Sali
Campbell (CA)	King (IA)	Schmidt
Cannon	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Sessions
Carney	Knollenberg	Shadegg
Carter	Lamborn	Shimkus
Castle	Lampson	Shuler
Chabot	Latham	Shuster
Coble	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NE)
Cole (OK)	Linder	Smith (TX)
Conaway	Lucas	Souder
Crenshaw	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Culberson	E.	Sullivan
Davis (KY)	Mack	Tanner
Davis, David	Mahoney (FL)	Taylor
Davis, Tom	Manzullo	Terry
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, L.	Matheson	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Donnelly	McCaul (TX)	Upton
Drake	McCotter	Walberg
Dreier	McCrery	Walden (OR)
Duncan	McHenry	Wamp
English (PA)	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Fallin	McMorris	Westmoreland
Feeney	Rodgers	Whitfield
Flake	Mica	Wicker
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Fortuño	Miller (MI)	Young (FL)

NOES—256

Abercrombie Green, Gene
Ackerman Grijalva
Aderholt Gutierrez
Alexander Hall (NY)
Allen Hare
Andrews Hastings (FL)
Arcuri Herseth Sandlin
Baca Higgins
Baird Hill
Baldwin Hinchey
Barrow Hinojosa
Becerra Hirono
Berkley Hobson
Berman Hodes
Berry Holden
Bishop (GA) Holt
Bishop (NY) Honda
Blumenauer Jackson-Lee
Boren Hooley
Boswell Hoyer
Boucher Inslee
Boustany Israel
Boyd (FL) Jackson (IL)
Boyd (KS) Jackson-Lee
Brady (PA) (TX)
Braley (IA) Jefferson
Butterfield Johnson (GA)
Capito Johnson (IL)
Capps Johnson, E. B.
Capuano Jones (OH)
Cardoza Kagen
Carnahan Kanjorski
Carson Kaptur
Castor Kennedy
Chandler Kildee
Christensen Kilpatrick
Clarke Kind
Clay King (NY)
Cleaver Kirk
Clyburn Klein (FL)
Cohen Kucinich
Conyers Kuhl (NY)
Cooper LaHood
Costa Langevin
Costello Lantos
Courtney Larsen (WA)
Cramer Larson (CT)
Crowley LaTourette
Cuellar Lee
Cummings Levin
Davis (AL) Lewis (CA)
Davis (CA) Lewis (GA)
Davis (IL) Lipinski
Davis, Lincoln LoBiondo
DeFazio Loeb sack
DeGette Lowey
Delahunt Lynch
DeLauro Maloney (NY)
Dent Markey
Dicks Matsui
Dingell McCarthy (NY)
Doggett McCollum (MN)
Doolittle McDermott
Doyle McGovern
Edwards McHugh
Ehlers McIntyre
Ellison McNerney
Ellsworth McNulty
Emanuel Meek (FL)
Emerson Meeks (NY)
Engel Melancon
Eshoo Michaud
Etheridge Miller (NC)
Everett Mollohan
Farr Moore (KS)
Fattah Moore (WI)
Ferguson Moran (VA)
Fortenberry Murphy (CT)
Frank (MA) Murphy, Patrick
Frelinghuysen Murphy, Tim
Gerlach Murtha
Giffords Nadler
Gilchrest Napolitano
Gillibrand Neal (MA)
Gonzalez Norton
Gordon Oberstar
Green, Al Obey
Oliver

NOT VOTING—15

Bono Faleomavaega
Bordallo Filner
Brown, Corrine Harman
Cubin Jindal
Davis, Jo Ann Lofgren, Zoe
Marshall
Miller, George
Paul
Space
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1728

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 681, I was on official business outside the national capital region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MRS.

MUSGRAVE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 245, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 682]

AYES—177

Aderholt Donnelly
Akin Drake
Altmire Dreier
Bachmann Duncan
Bachus Ellsworth
Baker English (PA)
Barrett (SC) Fallin
Bartlett (MD) Feeney
Barton (TX) Flake
Bean Forbes
Biggert Fortenberry
Bilbray Fortuno
Bilirakis Fossella
Bishop (UT) Foxx
Blackburn Franks (AZ)
Blunt Frelinghuysen
Boehner Gallegly
Bonner Garrett (NJ)
Boozman Giffords
Brady (TX) Gillmor
Brown (SC) Gingrey
Brown-Waite, Gohmert
Ginny Goode
Buchanan Goodlatte
Burgess Granger
Burton (IN) Graves
Buyer Hall (TX)
Calvert Hastert
Camp (MI) Hastings (WA)
Campbell (CA) Hayes
Cannon Heller
Cantor Hensarling
Carney Herger
Carter Hill
Castle Hobson
Chabot Hoekstra
Coble Hulshof
Cole (OK) Hunter
Conaway Inglis (SC)
Crenshaw Issa
Culberson Johnson, Sam
Davis (KY) Jones (NC)
Davis, David Jordan
Davis, Tom Keller
Deal (GA) King (IA)
Diaz-Balart, L. Kingston
Diaz-Balart, M. Kirk

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg

Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry

NOES—245

Abercrombie Grijalva
Ackerman Gutierrez
Alexander Hall (NY)
Allen Hare
Andrews Hastings (FL)
Arcuri Herseth Sandlin
Baca Higgins
Baird Hinchey
Baldwin Hinojosa
Barrow Hirono
Becerra Hodes
Berkley Holden
Berman Holt
Berry Honda
Bishop (GA) Hooley
Bishop (NY) Hoyer
Blumenauer Inslee
Boren Israel
Boswell Jackson (IL)
Boucher Jackson-Lee
Boustany (TX)
Boyd (FL) Jefferson
Boyd (KS) Johnson (GA)
Brady (PA) Johnson (IL)
Braley (IA) Johnson, E. B.
Butterfield Jones (OH)
Capito Kagen
Capps Kanjorski
Capuano Kaptur
Cardoza Kennedy
Carnahan Kildee
Carson Kilpatrick
Castor Kind
Chandler King (NY)
Christensen Scott (GA)
Clarke Klein (FL)
Clay Kucinich
Cleaver Kuhl (NY)
Clyburn LaHood
Cohen Langevin
Conyers Lantos
Cooper Larsen (WA)
Costa Larson (CT)
Costello LaTourette
Courtney Lee
Cramer Levin
Crowley Lewis (CA)
Cuellar Lewis (GA)
Cummings Lipinski
Davis (AL) LoBiondo
Davis (CA) Loeb sack
Davis, Lincoln Lowey
DeFazio Lynch
DeGette Maloney (NY)
Delahunt Markey
Dent Matsui
Dicks McCarthy (NY)
Dingell McCollum (MN)
Doggett McDermott
Doolittle McGovern
Doyle McHugh
Edwards McIntyre
Ehlers McNerney
Ellison McNulty
Ellsworth Meek (FL)
Emanuel Meeks (NY)
Emerson Melancon
Engel Michaud
Eshoo Miller (NC)
Etheridge Mollohan
Everett Moore (KS)
Farr Moore (WI)
Fattah Moran (VA)
Ferguson Murphy (CT)
Fortenberry Murphy, Patrick
Frank (MA) Murphy, Tim
Frelinghuysen Murtha
Gerlach Nadler
Giffords Napolitano
Gilchrest Neal (MA)
Gillibrand Norton
Gonzalez Oberstar
Gordon Obey
Green, Al Oliver
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rotman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Vislosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Bono Faleomavaega Marshall
 Bordallo Filner Miller, George
 Brown, Corrine Harman Paul
 Cubin Jindal Tancredó
 Davis, Jo Ann Lofgren, Zoe

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1732

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.
 Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall
 No. 682, I was on official business outside the
 national capital region in my capacity as
 Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.
 Had I been present, I would have voted
 "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL
 OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has
 been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 177, noes 245,
 not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 683]

AYES—177

Aderholt Culberson Herger
 Akin Davis (KY) Hill
 Altmire Davis, David Hoekstra
 Bachmann Davis, Tom Hulshof
 Bachus Deal (GA) Hunter
 Baker Diaz-Balart, L. Inglis (SC)
 Barrett (SC) Diaz-Balart, M. Issa
 Bartlett (MD) Donnelly Johnson, Sam
 Barton (TX) Drake Jones (NC)
 Bean Dreier Jordan
 Biggert Duncan Keller
 Bilbray Ellsworth King (IA)
 Bilirakis Emerson Kingston
 Bishop (UT) English (PA) Kirk
 Blackburn Fallin Kline (MN)
 Blunt Feeney Knollenberg
 Boehner Flake Lamborn
 Bonner Forbes Lampson
 Boozman Fortenberry Latham
 Brady (TX) Fortuño Lewis (KY)
 Brown (SC) Fossella Linder
 Brown-Waite, Fossella Lucas
 Ginny Franks (AZ) Lungren, Daniel
 Buchanan Frelinghuysen E.
 Burgess Gallegly Mack
 Burton (IN) Garrett (NJ) Mahoney (FL)
 Buyer Giffords Manzullo
 Calvert Gillmor Marchant
 Camp (MI) Gingrey Matheson
 Campbell (CA) Gohmert McCarthy (CA)
 Cannon Goode McCaul (TX)
 Cantor Goodlatte McCotter
 Carney Granger McCrery
 Carter Graves McHenry
 Castle Hall (TX) McKeon
 Chabot Hastert McMorris
 Coble Hastings (WA) Rodgers
 Cole (OK) Hayes McNerney
 Conaway Heller Mica
 Crenshaw Hensarling Miller (FL)

Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Mitchell
 Moran (KS)
 Musgrave
 Myrick
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Pearce
 Pence
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Poe
 Price (GA)
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Radanovich
 Reynolds

Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Alexander
 Allen
 Andrews
 Arcuri
 Baca
 Baird
 Baldwin
 Barrow
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Boren
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boustany
 Boyd (FL)
 Boyda (KS)
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Butterfield
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carson
 Castor
 Chandler
 Christensen
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis, Lincoln
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doolittle
 Doyle
 Edwards
 Ehlers
 Ellison
 Emanuel
 Engel
 Esho
 Etheridge
 Everett
 Farr
 Fattah
 Ferguson
 Frank (MA)
 Gerlach
 Gilchrist

NOES—245

Gillibrand
 Gonzalez
 Gordon
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Hall (NY)
 Hare
 Hastings (FL)
 Herseth Sandlin
 Higgins
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hobson
 Hodes
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hooley
 Hoyer
 Inslee
 Israel
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (OH)
 Kagen
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind
 King (NY)
 Klein (FL)
 Kucinich
 Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 LaTourette
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb
 Loebsack
 Lowey
 Lynch
 Maloney (NY)
 Markey
 Matsui
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum (MN)
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHugh
 McIntyre
 McNulty
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Michaud
 Miller (NC)
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (VA)

Stearns
 Sullivan
 Tanner
 Taylor
 Terry
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Upton
 Walberg
 Walden (OR)
 Wamp
 Weldon (FL)
 Weller
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Young (FL)

Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt

Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch (VT)
 Wexler
 Wilson (NM)
 Wilson (OH)

Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn
 Yarmuth
 Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Bono Faleomavaega Marshall
 Bordallo Filner Miller, George
 Brown, Corrine Harman Paul
 Cubin Jindal Tancredó
 Davis, Jo Ann Lofgren, Zoe

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1736

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.
 Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall
 No. 683, I was on official business outside the
 national capital region in my capacity as
 Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.
 Had I been present, I would have voted
 "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) on
 which further proceedings were post-
 poned and on which the noes prevailed
 by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has
 been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 189, noes 231,
 not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 684]

AYES—189

Aderholt Conaway Goodlatte
 Akin Costello Graves
 Alexander Crenshaw Hall (TX)
 Bachmann Culberson Hastert
 Bachus Davis (KY) Hastings (WA)
 Baker Davis, David Hayes
 Barrett (SC) Davis, Lincoln Heller
 Bartlett (MD) Deal (GA) Hensarling
 Barton (TX) Diaz-Balart, L. Herger
 Bilbray Diaz-Balart, M. Hoekstra
 Bilirakis Donnelly Hulshof
 Bishop (UT) Doolittle Hunter
 Blackburn Drake Inglis (SC)
 Blunt Dreier Issa
 Boehner Duncan Johnson (IL)
 Bonner Ehlers Johnson, Sam
 Boozman Ellsworth Jones (NC)
 Boren Emerson Jordan
 Boustany English (PA) Keller
 Brady (TX) Fallin King (IA)
 Brown (SC) Feeney King (NY)
 Buchanan Ferguson Kingston
 Burgess Flake Kline (MN)
 Burton (IN) Forbes Knollenberg
 Buyer Fortenberry Kuhl (NY)
 Calvert Fortuño LaHood
 Camp (MI) Fossella Lamborn
 Campbell (CA) Fossella Latham
 Cannon Franks (AZ) LaTourette
 Cantor Gallegly Lewis (KY)
 Carter Garrett (NJ) Linder
 Chabot Gillmor Lipinski
 Coble Gingrey LoBiondo
 Cole (OK) Goode Lucas

Lungren, Daniel E.	Peterson (MN)	Shimkus	Solis	Udall (CO)	Watt
Mack	Peterson (PA)	Shuler	Space	Udall (NM)	Waxman
Manzullo	Petri	Simpson	Spratt	Upton	Weiner
Marchant	Pickering	Skelton	Stark	Van Hollen	Welch (VT)
McCarthy (CA)	Pitts	Smith (NE)	Stupak	Velázquez	Wexler
McCaul (TX)	Platts	Smith (NJ)	Sutton	Visclosky	Wilson (NM)
McCotter	Poe	Smith (TX)	Tanner	Walden (OR)	Woolsey
McCrery	Porter	Souder	Tauscher	Walz (MN)	Wu
McHenry	Price (GA)	Stearns	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman	Wynn
McHugh	Putnam	Sullivan	Thompson (MS)	Schultz	Yarmuth
McIntyre	Radanovich	Taylor	Tierney	Waters	
McKeon	Rahall	Terry	Towns	Watson	
McMorris	Regula	Thornberry			
Rodgers	Rehberg	Tiahrt			
Melancon	Reichert	Tiberi	Bono	Filner	Miller, George
Mica	Renzi	Turner	Bordallo	Gohmert	Paul
Miller (FL)	Rogers (AL)	Walberg	Brown, Corrine	Harman	Shuster
Miller (MI)	Rogers (KY)	Walsh (NY)	Cubin	Jindal	Tancredo
Miller, Gary	Rogers (MI)	Wamp	Davis, Jo Ann	Lofgren, Zoe	
Mollohan	Rohrabacher	Weldon (FL)	Faleomavaega	Marshall	
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Weiler			
Murphy, Tim	Roskam	Westmoreland			
Musgrave	Royce	Whitfield			
Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Wicker			
Neugebauer	Sali	Wilson (OH)			
Nunes	Saxton	Wilson (SC)			
Ortiz	Schmidt	Wolf			
Pearce	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)			
Pence	Sessions	Young (FL)			
	Shadegg				

NOT VOTING—16

Bono	Filner	Miller, George
Bordallo	Gohmert	Paul
Brown, Corrine	Harman	Shuster
Cubin	Jindal	Tancredo
Davis, Jo Ann	Lofgren, Zoe	
Faleomavaega	Marshall	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1739

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 684, I was on official business outside the National Capital region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3043, the FY 2008 Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations bill. Let me first commend my dignified colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative DAVID OBEY, for his tenacity and strong leadership in steering this important piece of legislation. Among many things, this bill will provide the support and additional resources in areas where our Nation is currently facing scarcity—health care, social security, medical research, skilled workers and job training, community services, as well as the quality, accessibility and affordability of higher education and education for the disabled.

Madam Chairman, I must certainly agree with the rationale behind this bill—"we cannot continue to disinvest in our Nation's future." Over the past several years, the previous Republican-led Congress significantly cut investments for the Labor-HHS-Education bill, and our 43rd United States President has once again proposed drastic cuts—\$7.6 billion below FY 2007. As a Representative of the people of the United States, I am committed to reversing this trend of disinvestment. Our Nation's future is dependent on quality health care, job opportunities for our citizens, decent education, improvement of life-saving technologies, and national security. With \$151.7 billion of projected discretionary spending in FY 2008, this bill will provide a modest increase of \$4.3 billion (or 3 percent) over 2007, after adjusting for inflation and population. Although this bill will not completely rectify the problem, it is indeed a step towards a positive direction.

This bill promises to make college more affordable because its provisions include an increase in the maximum Pell Grant of \$390, which is in addition to the \$260 enacted in February 2007 by this Democratic-led Congress. This measure will benefit the more than 5.5 million low-and middle-income students across America's higher education system. In addition,

this bill provides an increase of 4.8 percent for the TRIO programs, educational opportunity outreach programs designed to motivate and support students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Madam Chairman, this bill is of significant importance to my constituents. For the past twelve years, I have served as a Representative of the 18th Congressional District of Texas. In the heart of my district are several community colleges and three major universities—the University of Houston, the University of Houston—Downtown, as well as one of our nations leading Historically Black College/University, Texas Southern University. In the heart of my district are also three ABA-approved law schools—the University of Houston Law Center, Thurgood Marshall School of Law, and South Texas College of Law. With the rising cost of college education, many of these students in my district are reliant on Federal financial aid to complete their education. Because investment in education system today yields high returns for the individual, as well as society, I support this measure to make college more affordable and accessible.

Madam Chairman, quality health care is close to non-existent in this great nation that we call America. As a nation of abundant natural resources and high productivity, it is humiliating to know that 46.6 million citizens are without health insurance. If current policy plans are to continue, by 2013, the number of uninsured Americans will increase by 11 million. This is simply an unacceptable national problem and must be rectified. H.R. 3043 will expand access to health care for the uninsured by providing access for more than 2 million uninsured Americans. Funds will be directed to community health centers, which will enable them to serve an additional 1 million uninsured Americans. The bill also includes a \$50 million initiative to assist states in providing high-risk insurance pools, thereby supporting affordable insurance for almost 200,000 medically high-risk people. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill, which invests in initiatives that will provide new access to health care for more than 2 million uninsured Americans.

H.R. 3043 invests in life-saving medical research by reversing the previous Republican disinvestment plans and providing an increase for National Institute of Health of \$750 million. As once stated by Senator JOE LIEBERMAN, "by expanding our knowledge of human diseases, we can help reduce health care costs by discovering more effective treatments and learning how to prevent onset of serious illnesses. Biomedical research is a fundamental component of a preventive care approach to health care reform." Medical research at NIH offers optimism to millions of American families—with groundbreaking research into diseases such as cancer, AIDS, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, and many more. This bill provides an increase of \$750 million, which in essence allows for NIH to support another 545 new and competing research grants. Expanding and funding life-saving medical research programs must become a top priority if the United States hopes to combat the inefficiencies and inequities in our health care system.

Madam Chairman, it is time that we take a new course of action in investing in our Nation's future. I strongly believe that H.R. 3043 is this new course. Forty-one low priority programs were cut or eliminated, saving \$1.1 billion below 2007. Through passage of this bill,

NOES—231

Abercrombie	Emanuel	Mahoney (FL)
Ackerman	Engel	Maloney (NY)
Allen	Eshoo	Markley
Altmore	Etheridge	Matheson
Andrews	Everett	Matsui
Arcuri	Farr	McCarthy (NY)
Baca	Fattah	McCullum (MN)
Baird	Frank (MA)	McDermott
Baldwin	Frelinghuysen	McGovern
Barrow	Gerlach	McNerney
Bean	Giffords	McNulty
Becerra	Gilchrest	Meek (FL)
Berkley	Gillibrand	Meeks (NY)
Berman	Gonzalez	Michaud
Berry	Gordon	Miller (NC)
Biggert	Granger	Mitchell
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Moore (KS)
Bishop (NY)	Green, Gene	Moore (WI)
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Moran (VA)
Boswell	Gutierrez	Murphy (CT)
Boucher	Hall (NY)	Murphy, Patrick
Boyd (FL)	Hare	Murtha
Boyd (KS)	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Brady (PA)	Herseth Sandlin	Napolitano
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Neal (MA)
Brown-Waite,	Hill	Norton
Ginny	Hinchev	Oberstar
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Obey
Capito	Hirono	Olver
Capps	Hobson	Pallone
Capuano	Hodes	Pascrell
Cardoza	Holden	Pastor
Carnahan	Holt	Payne
Carney	Honda	Perlmutter
Carson	Hooley	Pomeroy
Castle	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Castor	Inslee	Pryce (OH)
Chandler	Israel	Ramstad
Christensen	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Clarke	Jackson-Lee	Reyes
Clay	(TX)	Reynolds
Cleaver	Jefferson	Rodriguez
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Ross
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman
Conyers	Jones (OH)	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kagen	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kanjorski	Rush
Courtney	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Cramer	Kennedy	Salazar
Crowley	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Cuellar	Kilpatrick	T.
Cummings	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (AL)	Kirk	Sarbanes
Davis (CA)	Klein (FL)	Schakowsky
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Schiff
Davis, Tom	Lampson	Schwartz
DeFazio	Langevin	Scott (GA)
DeGette	Lantos	Scott (VA)
Delahunt	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Sestak
Dent	Lee	Shays
Dicks	Levin	Shea-Porter
Dingell	Lewis (CA)	Sherman
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Doyle	Loeb sack	Slaughter
Edwards	Lowe y	Smith (WA)
Ellison	Lynch	Snyder

our Nation will benefit from the increase in quality, accessibility and affordability of higher education with the \$3.3 billion directed to student financial aid. The academic performance of our American children will be improved through the \$1 billion allocation for No Child Left Behind Programs. Our citizens, especially the uninsured, will have the opportunity to receive quality health care, through the \$1.3 billion being directed to the Health Resources and Services Administration. This bill also allows for an investment in the skills and training of America's workers and the workforce through additional funding to programs similar to Job Corps, as well as community services initiatives, such as the Community Services Block Grant. Our disabled citizens will be cared for through federal contributions for special education for children with disabilities through the funding of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Madam Chairman, I am a strong believer that our children are our future. Family is the backbone to the success of any child, as well as the success of our Nation. For this reason, all members of society must be granted access to quality health care, education, and job skills training. It is students like my current Congressional Black Caucus Foundation Intern, Daria Awusah, that gives me strong faith that our future is in good hands. As my constituent, as well as a student at the University of Houston (which is in my district), she has worked tirelessly and endlessly to finance the past three years of her college education. It is her testimony that although not enough, financial aid has been an instrumental element in financing her education. Let us continue to support students like Ms. Awusah.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support H.R. 3043. Once again, I thank you, Congressman OBEY, for your leadership in this endeavor. Our country's future is dependent on the role that we take as Members of Congress through the policies that we choose to implement. Let us begin with the reinvestment in our country's future by passing H.R. 3043.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chairman, the Act of August 25th, 1916, more commonly referred to as the National Park Service Organic Act, states that, "there is hereby created in the Department of the Interior a service to be called the National Park Service, which shall be under the charge of a director, who shall be appointed by the President."

Since 1916, the National Park Service created by the Organic Act has grown to include 22,000 people, conserving and interpreting 391 units in a National Park System that will welcome more than 270 million visitors this year. Our National Parks are a source of enormous pride for millions of Americans and examples for the world regarding the conservation of places and resources which make a Nation and a people unique. And of course, Madam Chairman, much of the credit for the tremendous success of the National Park idea is due to the professionalism, commitment and expertise of the men and women working for the NPS.

As the centennial of the Organic Act approaches, there is consensus—among policymakers and the American people—that this 100th anniversary must be viewed as an opportunity to recommit ourselves to building a stronger, more diverse, better trained and better equipped National Park Service. In February, the Bush Administration proposed legis-

lation to increase funding for the NPS over the next decade in recognition of this milestone. Two of my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee—full committee Ranking Member DON YOUNG and subcommittee Ranking Member ROB BISHOP—have introduced that legislation, by request, as H.R. 2959.

Today, with the support of Natural Resources Committee Chairman NICK RAHALL, I am honored to introduce H.R. 3094, legislation we believe will best commemorate this 100th anniversary while also preparing the National Parks and the National Park Service for another 100 years. H.R. 3094 authorizes mandatory spending expected to total \$100 million a year for ten years. The bill creates a process whereby the Executive Branch will coordinate annual proposals for how best to spend this new funding and the Congress, through the Interior Appropriations bill, will allocate the funds.

In contrast to the Administration's proposal, H.R. 3094 identifies six specific program areas within which this increased funding is to be spent. These areas include education in the parks, diversity programs, an environmental leadership initiative, professional development, resource protection and construction. This mix of funding priorities—investing in natural resources, bricks and mortar and human capital—will insure our parks and park employees can meet the challenge of the next 100 years successfully.

Also in contrast to the legislation proposed by the Administration, H.R. 3094 provides this new spending without requiring private matching funds. While we recognize the critical role private giving has played in creating and sustaining the National Park System, we remain concerned regarding the ever-increasing reliance on private funds. H.R. 3094 encourages private giving but makes absolutely certain that NPS spending priorities are determined by the Congress and the Administration without regard to which projects might, or might not, be most attractive to private donors.

And finally, Madam Chairman, H.R. 3094 differs from the Administration's proposal in that all of the spending in our bill is paid for—meaning this bill addresses the stringent PAYGO requirements instituted by the Democratic majority. The Administration's failure to identify a source for the mandatory expenditures in H.R. 2959 makes that proposal simply unrealistic.

Madam Chairman, the American people treasure their national parks and care deeply about their future. The funding levels we provide for the National Park Service, at this critical milestone in its history, should reflect that. The initiatives funded through this legislation—especially those which will use our national parks as classrooms for young people—will create new generations of stewards to safeguard our national parks for the next 100 years.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Chairman, I have always said that the working men and women of Michigan are my top priority. I believe that every working family deserves access to a quality education, strong healthcare, jobs that are safe for its workers and secure retirement plans. Today the House will consider the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations bill, H.R. 3043, which will fund programs families need and rely on. I rise in support of this legislation because I believe it will provide our families with healthy

and secure environment in which to raise their children.

By 2014, nearly half of nation's growing occupations will require higher education. If we want to help families succeed and help children prepare for work in the global marketplace, then we must help them earn a college degree. H.R. 3043 will provide the Department of Education with \$61.7 billion, which is \$4.2 billion or 7.4 percent above 2007 funding. In addition, this legislation will provide \$2 billion, a 14.6 percent increase above 2007, in funding for Pell Grants to raise the maximum Pell grant by \$390 to \$4,700, benefiting over 5.5 million students.

This legislation will also help prepare our students for college by providing \$2 billion for No Child Left Behind, an 8.4 percent increase above 2007. Specifically, \$1.9 billion will go towards Title I grants, which benefit nearly 55,000 disadvantaged students in preschool, elementary and secondary levels. This funding will also provide reading and math instruction for 161,000 low-income students. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B grants will receive \$174.5 million, ending the previous Congress's habit of declining Federal contributions for special education.

We also must focus on preparing workers, many of whom who have been displaced due to layoffs or company closings, for second career opportunities. H.R. 3043 will increase funding for the Department of Labor, including a \$227.4 million increase for employment, training and worker protection programs. This funding will greatly help our great state of Michigan because \$1.2 billion will be used to provide state grants that training and supportive services, such as rapid-response assistance to help workers affected by mass layoffs and plant closures.

H.R. 3043 will also provide for the health and well-being of our families. Currently over 44 million Americans do not have health insurance; by 2013, the number of uninsured Americans will grow by 11 million. Universal health care has always been one of my top priorities, and I believe this legislation reflects a strong commitment to improving health care in our country.

Democrats took the first step towards helping the uninsured by passing a \$207 million increase in funding for community health centers in the FY2007 Continuing Resolution, benefiting an additional 1.2 million people. The legislation before us today will provide an additional \$200 million for community health centers. This bill also includes \$50 million to assist states in providing affordable insurance for almost 200,000 people who are considered medically high risk and are not able to obtain health insurance in the commercial market. Lastly, H.R. 3043 will provide \$45 million for health insurance counseling to assist 45 million Medicare beneficiaries to understand and fully utilize the benefits to which they are entitled.

This legislation will go farther than just providing health care to the uninsured; it will also provide much needed funding to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and emergency responders who served during 9/11. While the administration proposed reducing funding for the Federal government's public health activities by \$159 million, this bill will provide a \$255 million increase for a total of \$6.5 billion. This funding will be dedicated to programs that focus on childhood immunization, state and local public health emergency

preparedness, and efforts to combat chronic diseases such as diabetes and heart disease and emerging infectious diseases. In the aftermath of 9/11, many first responders were exposed to dust and other harmful debris at the World Trade Center site. H.R. 3043 provides \$50 million to improve the health monitoring and treatment of the World Trade Center emergency responders. It will also require that the Administration develop a comprehensive plan for how they will address the current health needs of these first responders.

The Labor-HHS Appropriations bill will also help families keep warm. The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) has helped over 500,000 families in Michigan heat their homes during Michigan's tough winters. This year it will see a critical increase of \$500 million, 23.2 percent above 2008, to provide energy assistance to nearly 1 million more low-income seniors and families. The Community Services Block Grant, which provides funding to States to expand services such as housing, home weatherization, parenting education, adult literacy classes, and emergency food assistance will see a \$30 million increase to \$660 million. In order to help improve processing time for Social Security disability claims and hearings, the Social Security Administration (SSA) will receive \$9.7 billion, \$401 million above 2007. Over the years, disability claims and hearings have increased, creating a backlog in casework. This funding will help to reduce the backlog and allow the SSA to continue providing monthly cash benefits to nearly 55 million Americans each year.

Our Founding Fathers trusted Congress with the task of funding the Federal government through the annual appropriations process. While this process is never easy, it is one of the most important duties we have to the American people. Not only has President Bush threatened to veto this legislation, but he also proposed cutting funding for these programs \$7.6 billion below last year. This bill invests in families and their health, the workforce and their job training, and students and their education. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and show the American people Congress is dedicated to improving their quality of life.

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Chairman, Congress created the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation program in the FY 2001 Defense Authorization Act. This program compensates workers who were exposed to nuclear radiation while on the job within the Department of Energy and who later developed cancer and other illnesses.

While the program was a step toward righting the wrongs that these hard-working Americans had to suffer, there have been many problems since the enactment of this program. Many DOE workers have had difficulty proving that their cancer was directly caused by the radiation they were exposed to in the line of duty. The years-long process that the program requires workers to go through to prove they deserve compensation is intrusive and drawn-out.

This is an issue that directly affects my constituents. The Nevada Test site is an area larger than the State of Rhode Island, located about 65 miles north of Las Vegas. After years of exposure to nuclear radiation, many DOE workers who were employed at the Nevada Test Site during Cold War nuclear testing are

now battling several forms of cancer, and many have already passed away. Unfortunately, many of these workers have also been turned away from Federal compensation.

However, there is an alternative for workers to qualify for Federal compensation. Workers at other Energy Department facilities across the country have been designated as part of the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC). Workers at these locations qualify for EEOIC benefits without going through an arduous and bureaucratic process. Since the creation of the program, Nevada Test Site workers have petitioned to be included in the SEC, but have only succeeded in part. Currently, only NTS workers who worked at the site between 1951 and 1962 are part of the Cohort and therefore automatically qualify for benefits. This only accounts for one third of all NTS claimants, leaving a large group of former Federal employees who are awaiting the compensation they deserve.

Madam Chairman, I understand this appropriations bill is not the time to designate Special Exposure Cohorts. However, it is imperative that we as a Congress act on this issue before it's too late: before the victims of nuclear radiation are gone. Before their families are left behind without their loved ones. This is long overdue and we must act now.

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Madam Chairman, in recent years, the GOP-led Congress significantly cut investments for priorities in the Labor-HHS-Education bill. This year, the President has once again proposed significant cuts to programs of \$7.6 billion below 2007 levels. This is the wrong message and the wrong policy for America.

My colleagues and I are determined to reverse the funding cuts put forth over the past several years. This bill rejects most of the President's damaging cuts and provides an increase of \$4.3 billion (or 3 percent) over the 2007 funding levels. The bill makes college more affordable—including increasing the maximum Pell Grant by \$390. The bill helps raise the achievement levels of America's students, providing \$2 billion increase above 2007 and \$1 billion above the President's request for No Child Left Behind programs.

H.R. 3043 expands access to health care for the uninsured by investing in initiatives that will provide for new and innovative ways to reduce costs while expanding coverage. This legislation provides \$200 million for community health centers, enabling these centers to serve an additional 1 million uninsured Americans. The bill provides \$75 million for a new initiative of state health access grants, providing start-up grants to states that are ready with plans to expand health care coverage to targeted groups. It also includes \$50 million for an initiative to assist states in providing insurance pools to support affordable insurance for almost 200,000 people who are medically high-risk.

H.R. 3043 meets the domestic healthcare and education needs of our Nation. For too long, Congress has ignored the needs of the American people. Today, I will move with my colleagues in a new direction to fully fund the vital healthcare and education programs utilized by the American people.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Chair, I rise for two reasons.

First, this has been a long and very difficult bill on the floor. I think the House should recognize the fabulous

work of both Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin and my colleague from New York (Mr. WALSH). They endured all this. Congratulations for a good job.

Further, I believe we ought to extend our appreciation to the Chairwoman who has done a wonderful job and a fair job in the process, Mrs. TAUSCHER of California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008".

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mrs. TAUSCHER, 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. 3043) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 547, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LEWIS of California. In its present form I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lewis of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3043 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly with an amendment providing that funds made available to any child welfare agency, private or public elementary school, private or public secondary school, local educational agency, or State educational agency under titles II or III of the bill may be used to pay for any fees charged under the Schools Safely Acquiring Faculty Excellence Act of 2006 for

conducting background checks authorized by law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk's reading essentially explained what my motion to recommit is all about. Essentially for the House's better understanding, we provide simply discretionary flexibility to school districts to use funding in these titles to make certain that they know well the backgrounds of those people who will be working with and around children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) because he spent a good deal of time in this arena, and his district is adjacent to mine in the beautiful downtown Nevada. We understand some of the same difficulties we are facing.

□ 1745

Mr. PORTER. I would like to ask this body to take 2 minutes and listen to something very compelling. This bill does not matter on its face if our children are not safe. This body, with an amendment that I passed last year, has helped protect 27 million more children across this country by providing for school districts that could not in the past do criminal background checks. In this session alone, we passed additional legislation to help kids that are in Head Start by giving them additional protection for 1 million children who did not have that before.

An example of what is happening in this epidemic nationwide is we have teachers, we have professionals, we have individuals that are predators, sexual predators following our children. We need to make sure we add one additional tool, and that eliminates barrier to help fund these programs that we passed last session and this session. Head Start alone, one particular program had 660 teachers; of that, they were not inspected for 5 years. They discovered, out of 660 teachers, 100 teachers and support staff had criminal backgrounds. Of that, 50 had serious offenses from first-degree murder to child predator to domestic violence.

What I am asking this body to do is to use common sense, allow for these school districts to eliminate one more barrier to help them pay for these backgrounds checks. It is common sense. It is a way to provide protection. It is something that we can do to ensure and add one additional guarantee for our families and our children that they will be safe within our schools.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, JON PORTER said it all. I urge your positive vote on this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if this issue were in fact the real problem, it can

easily be dealt with in conference by Mr. WALSH and myself and the rest of the committee, but in fact it is not a problem. The fact is that under the bill money in the Safe and Drug Free Schools account can already be used for exactly the same purpose.

I would also like to point out, however, that this is a program which was cut by the President to \$100 million, and the House has restored \$146 million above the President's figure to take care of problems just such as this.

But the membership should also understand that this recommit kills the bill. It is dressed up in language on fees, but in fact it calls for the bill to be referred to the committee and reported back promptly, not forthwith. And, as Members know, that is a device that kills the bill.

We have endured over the last 3 days filibusters by amendment. We have had 25 hours of amendments, sometimes repetitious amendments. We have spent twice as much time on this bill as was spent the last time that the bill was considered by the Congress.

And I would make one other point. The sponsors of this proposal could have used it to do anything they wanted to do with the bill. They could have cut the bill, they could have changed the priorities. They didn't. And the fact that they didn't, in my view, is an admission that, in terms of policy, this is a good bill. It is a backhanded admission that this bill ought to pass as is.

So I would ask Members to vote "no" on the motion and vote "yes" on passage. They can then go home having done good things for America's children, for Americans who need help to get health care, and for American workers.

Let me also take just a second to thank the House for its indulgence over the last 3 days. I know that it has often been tiresome, but I appreciate the fact that they understood that the committee was just trying to do its job.

I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This motion will be defeated because it kills the bill. If the gentleman from Nevada were serious about this motion, he would have asked that it be forthwith. That would have passed his amendment. This is not a serious amendment, I tell my friend. This is, unfortunately, however, why the American public is so upset with the Congress of the United States: because what they see, they say that Congress is not getting its work done, and they are right. And they are right because obstructionism is occurring on this floor and on the floor across the hall. And if it were in the name of serious legislating, perhaps they would understand. But this is not serious legislating, A, because the money can be spent for that now; and, B, because it kills a bill that is for the education and the health care of our people.

Reject this specious motion. Pass this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank Members of both parties who have helped through the process. I urge a "no" vote on this motion and a bipartisan "yes" vote on final passage.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that if indeed this motion passed, this bill could be reported back to the respective committee through which it was designated, and that the bill could be reported back to the House the very next legislative day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unlike the case of a motion to recommit with instructions to report back forthwith, the adoption of which occasions an immediate report on the floor, the adoption of a motion to recommit with instructions to report back promptly sends the bill to committee, whose eventual report, if any, would not be immediately before the House. This is illuminated in Deschler's Precedents, volume 7, chapter 23, section 32.25.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Is it not true that this bill could be reported back the next legislative day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A re-committed bill may be reported from committee again.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Is it untoward for me or someone to ask for unanimous consent that this vote be a 2-minute vote rather than a more extended vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain that request under the current circumstances.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 206, nays 213, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 685]

YEAS—206

Aderholt Frelinghuysen
Akin Gallegly
Alexander Garrett (NJ)
Altmire Gerlach
Bachmann Gilchrest
Bachus Gillmor
Baker Gingrey
Barrett (SC) Gohmert
Barrow Goode
Bartlett (MD) Goodlatte
Barton (TX) Granger
Bean Graves
Biggert Hall (TX)
Bilbray Hastert
Bilirakis Hastings (WA)
Bishop (UT) Hayes
Blackburn Heller
Blunt Hensarling
Boehner Herger
Bonner Hobson
Boozman Hoekstra
Boustany Hulshof
Brady (TX) Hunter
Brown (SC) Inglis (SC)
Brown-Waite, Issa
Ginny Johnson (IL)
Buchanan Johnson, Sam
Burgess Jones (NC)
Burton (IN) Jordan
Buyer Keller
Calvert King (IA)
Camp (MI) King (NY)
Campbell (CA) Kingston
Cannon Kirk
Cantor Kline (MN)
Capito Knollenberg
Carney Kuhl (NY)
Carter LaHood
Castle Lamborn
Chabot Lampson
Coble Latham
Cole (OK) LaTourette
Conaway Lewis (CA)
Crenshaw Lewis (KY)
Cuellar Linder
Culberson LoBiondo
Davis (KY) Lucas
Davis, David Lungren, Daniel
Davis, Tom E.
Deal (GA) Mack
Dent Manzano
Diaz-Balart, L. Marchant
Diaz-Balart, M. Matheson
Doolittle McCarthy (CA)
Drake McCaul (TX)
Dreier McCotter
Duncan McCrery
Ehlers McHenry
Emerson McHugh
English (PA) McKeon
Everett McMorris
Fallin Rodgers
Feeney McNeerney
Ferguson Mica
Flake Miller (FL)
Forbes Miller (MI)
Fortenberry Miller, Gary
Fossella Mitchell
Foxy Moran (KS)
Franks (AZ) Murphy, Patrick

NAYS—213

Abercrombie Capuano
Ackerman Cardoza
Allen Carnahan
Andrews Carson
Arcuri Castor
Baca Chandler
Baird Clarke
Baldwin Clay
Beccerra Cleaver
Berkley Clyburn
Berman Cohen
Berry Conyers
Bishop (GA) Cooper
Bishop (NY) Costa
Blumenauer Costello
Boren Courtney
Boswell Cramer
Boucher Crowley
Boyd (FL) Cummings
Boyd (KS) Davis (AL)
Brady (PA) Davis (CA)
Braley (IA) Davis (IL)
Butterfield Davis, Lincoln
Capps DeFazio

Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hereth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoolley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Ginny
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lowe
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)

NOT VOTING—12

Bono
Brown, Corrine
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Filner
Harman
Jindal
Lofgren, Zoe
Marshall
Miller, George
Paul
Tancredo

□ 1809

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 685, I was on official business outside the national capital region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 276, nays 140, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 686]

YEAS—276

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Beccerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capito
Capps

Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta

Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Ullman
Velázquez
Viscosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—140

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gillmor

Gingrey	Lungren, Daniel	Rohrabacher
Gohmert	E.	Ros-Lehtinen
Goode	Mack	Roskam
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Royce
Granger	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Hall (TX)	McCarthy (CA)	Sali
Hastert	McCaul (TX)	Schmidt
Hastings (WA)	McCotter	Sensenbrenner
Heller	McCrery	Sessions
Hensarling	McHenry	Shadegg
Herger	McMorris	Shimkus
Hoekstra	Rodgers	Shuster
Hunter	Mica	Smith (NE)
Inglis (SC)	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)
Issa	Moran (KS)	Souder
Johnson, Sam	Musgrave	Stearns
Jones (NC)	Myrick	Sullivan
Jordan	Neugebauer	Terry
King (IA)	Nunes	Thornberry
King (NY)	Pearce	Tiahrt
Kingston	Pence	Tiberi
Kline (MN)	Petri	Walberg
Knollenberg	Pitts	Walden (OR)
Kuhl (NY)	Poe	Wamp
Lamborn	Price (GA)	Westmoreland
Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Whitfield
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Wicker
Linder	Reynolds	Wilson (SC)
Lucas	Rogers (KY)	

agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2116

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2116, the Freight Rail Infrastructure Capacity Expansion Act of 2007.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend the majority leader for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning business and noon for legislative business, with votes rolled until 6:30 p.m. In addition to several bills under suspension of the rules, and a list of these bills, of course, will be announced by the end of the week, we expect to begin consideration of the fiscal year 2008 Transportation-HUD appropriations bill.

Let me reiterate that because that will require a vote on the rule, there will be a substantive, and perhaps more substantive, votes on Monday. So Members cannot be assured that there will not be controversies on the floor on Monday night. Usually we do only suspension bills.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour business and 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. In addition to completing consideration of the Transportation-HUD bill, we have one additional fiscal year 2008 appropriations bill, the Commerce-Justice-Science, as well as the farm program reauthorization.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

I notice there is no listing at this point of an Iraq bill on next week's schedule. I also notice that FISA modernization has not been scheduled. I wonder if the gentleman has any information about the potential for either of those two issues to be on the schedule for next week.

Mr. HOYER. FISA legislation, as the gentleman knows, is being worked on by the Intelligence Committee now. I don't have a specific answer for you. I am hopeful that we will perhaps be able to address some very important issues before we leave here.

On the other, I think it is possible that we will have some legislation

dealing with Iraq, but that decision has not been made. Obviously, there is still ongoing discussion both in the Senate and in this body on that subject. But whether there will be legislation next week is still in discussion.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that and, of course, just to ask when that decision is made, the quicker we could be told what that decision is and get a sense of the schedule on that issue, the better.

Also, I have one question the gentleman might have information on. In the conference on the 9/11 bill earlier this week, it appeared that the protection that the House had added for liability in what was called the John Doe action, where if you suggest someone you think is pursuing a dangerous course of action, you turn them in, then you are personally held liable, we had some protections added to our bill on that. I am told that the chairman of the conference, a member of the other body, has now said that he believes those protections would be germane, and if they are germane, we would hope that we would continue to see an argument in favor of that. But I wonder if the leader has any information on that.

Mr. HOYER. I tell my friend that I do not have any immediate information on that particular issue. I know the issue, but where it is, I am not sure. So I don't have specific information on that.

Mr. BLUNT. Let me ask one other question about conferences, and that would be unless this proceeds into another area.

Mr. HOYER. I can say with respect to conferences, we have every intent of doing the 9/11 conference, as the gentleman knows, and passing that before we leave for the August break.

Mr. BLUNT. I would ask on conferences, in a press report this week there was a suggestion, as a matter of fact, I think it was today, that the ethics bill might come to the House under an extraordinary procedure that didn't actually involve a conference. I think the House changed its rules this year to be much more stringent on requiring a conference, and I am wondering if that report has any merit to it that the gentleman would be aware of.

Mr. HOYER. I understand press reports, but there is no decision that has been made on that.

Mr. BLUNT. I just would suggest to the gentleman that we have changed the rules in a way that, while that particular messaging between the two Houses has seldom been used, I think it is even harder to do in light of the House rules changes, and we would hope that these bills are done in conference and, of course, hope they are done in conference in accordance with the rules that this Congress has proposed for conferences.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will my friend yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. We are very, very hopeful that the lobbying disclosure conference can proceed. As the gentleman

NOT VOTING—15

Bono	Filner	McKeon
Brown, Corrine	Harman	Miller, Gary
Calvert	Jindal	Miller, George
Cubin	Lofgren, Zoe	Paul
Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall	Tancredo

□ 1817

Mr. HOBSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 686, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will be necessarily absent from voting today as I will be on official business in my district, hosting a Cabinet Secretary.

Had I been present to vote, I would have voted "aye" on the amendment offered by Representatives LEWIS, WELCH and WELLER to prevent CMS from making deep cuts in hospital payments for one year.

As a former Board Member of Planned Parenthood Los Angeles, I would have voted "no" on Representative PENCE's amendment to prohibit funds for Planned Parenthood.

I would have also voted for the bill's final passage.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3074, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-242) on the resolution (H. Res. 558) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3074) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related

knows, we have not gotten clearance on the other side to do so, so we are very concerned about that. This House passed the lobbying disclosure bill overwhelmingly. Our view is it will pass overwhelmingly in the Senate when that happens. But, unfortunately, it has not yet gone to conference.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for his comments. And I also understand frustrations with the Senate process as he does and hope that we can work that out in a way that we go through the regular process.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
JULY 23, 2007

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL
EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO
THE FORMER LIBERIAN REGIME
OF CHARLES TAYLOR—MESSAGE
FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-
48)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the Federal Register for publication, stating that the national emergency and related measures dealing with the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor are to continue in effect beyond July 22, 2007.

The actions and policies of former Liberian President Charles Taylor and other persons, in particular their unlawful depletion of Liberian resources, their trafficking of illegal arms, and their formation of irregular militia, continue to undermine Liberia's transition to democracy and the orderly development of its political, administrative, and economic institutions and resources. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor.

GEORGE W. BUSH,
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 19, 2007.

CALLING FOR REDEPLOYMENT OF
THE TROOPS FROM IRAQ

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have heard this week in publicized reports of the activities that are going on around the world with respect to al Qaeda. The National Intelligence Estimate has indicated publicly, nonclassified information, that this group is franchising. It means that they are able to spread without leadership around the world. And those who have followed the Iraq war recognize that it is a training ground for those terrorists who would then leave and spread their viciousness around the world.

We heard this week Prime Minister Maliki indicating that our soldiers could leave. He ultimately said he was misinterpreted. But, frankly, I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is time for our soldiers to be redeployed out of Iraq and that an appropriate and directed decision needs to move all of our soldiers home to America.

□ 1830

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLISON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

33RD ANNIVERSARY OF INVASION
OF CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only as a Member of this body, but particularly as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and as cochair on the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues.

I stand before you today to recall an anniversary that has racked the Cypriot and Hellenic communities for the past 33 years. Mr. Speaker, even though the tragic events of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus took place so long ago, the pain and suffering of this tragic occasion still ripples throughout the Greek and Cypriot communities.

This anniversary is a time for America to solemnly remember the Turkish military invasion of the Island of Cyprus, to mourn those who lost their lives, and to condemn the continued occupation.

On July 20, 1974, in blatant violation of international law, Turkey violently invaded Cyprus and captured the northern part of the island. As a result of the invasion, approximately 5,000 Cypriots were killed and more than 1,400 Greek Cypriots, including four Americans of Cypriot descent, are still missing.

Since the invasion, Turkey has established a heavily armed military occupation that continues to control nearly 40 percent of Cyprus. Forced expulsions of Greek Cypriots on the occupied land have left more than 160,000 displaced persons.

Another tragic result of this 33-year occupation is the division of the Greek and Turkish Cypriots who since have forcibly left their homes. This cracking of the Cypriot Nation is a crime against society and the people of Cyprus that can only be resolved by ending this occupation.

Since the invasion, international governing bodies and human rights groups have condemned Turkey's flagrant abuse of international law and violation of Cyprus's national sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker, 33 years is just too long. The international community has helped shepherd a peace process and settlement that will unite the island, its people, institutions and economy. The United Nations Security Council, the European Union and the United States have all played key roles in trying to bring a practical and fair resolution of this 33-year nightmare.

On the occasion of this anniversary, America needs to take a long and hard look at its own commitment toward helping the Turkish Cypriot crisis reach a lasting and enduring peace, free from occupation, division and oppression.

As a new member of the European Union, the Republic of Cyprus has proven a committed and influential partner in Europe. Despite having a large portion of its land illegally occupied, Cyprus's successful social and economic integration into the European Community is a testament to its

focus and dedication to democratic values and regional cooperation.

The Republic of Cyprus has also worked alongside its European neighbors to bring about a stronger integration of Turkish and Greek Cypriot interests for the good of the island. This has included a partial lifting on restriction of movement across the ceasefire line that continues to forcibly divide Cyprus. As a result, since April of 2003, more than 13 million Greek and Turkish Cypriots have crossed without incident. Incredible. Additionally, the per capita income of Turkish Cypriots has nearly tripled in the last 3 years because of an aggressive integration policy by the Republic of Cyprus and its European neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that because of this continued integration between Turkish and Greek Cypriots, and the economic and political successes that the Republic of Cyprus so readily wants to share with its neighbors, it is possible to bring closure to this 33-year occupation.

Indeed, on July 8, 2006, the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Tassos Papadopoulos, and Turkish Cypriot leader Mehmet Ali Talat agreed to formally begin consultations with the ultimate aim of a peaceful reunification and an end to Turkey's military occupation.

Despite the early successes of what has since been known as the "July 8th Agreement" and the best efforts of the Cyprus government, the Turkish Cypriots have not followed through on their commitment to continue this dialogue and a path to peace.

Let's resolve this issue, Mr. Speaker. Thirty-three years is too long.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, only last week, President Papadopoulos attempted to jumpstart the Island's reunification efforts and resume the July 8 Agreement process. Though he initially accepted this gesture, Turkish Cypriot leader Talat ended up cancelling the proposed meeting.

Mr. Speaker, the United States, and this Congress, should demonstrate its commitment and support for the July 8 Agreement as a way toward ending the Turkish-Cypriot divide on the Island of Cyprus. I have introduced legislation, H. Res. 405, which expresses strong support for the implementation of the July 8 Agreement.

I urge all of my colleagues to act and help this body put our own stamp of support on the July 8 process by supporting this resolution.

Cyprus has long been a strong and faithful ally of the United States. It continues to work with us in the Global War on Terrorism and has supported our efforts in both Afghanistan and Iraq.

Aside from providing overflight rights and port access, the government of Cyprus has joined only a handful of nations who have acted on their commitment to cancel Iraq's outstanding debt.

Mr. Speaker, 33 years is long enough. It is not impossible to conceive one-day having a Cyprus that is unified under bizonal, bi-communal federation with a single sovereignty, single international personality and single citizenship with respect for human rights, and fundamental freedoms for all Cypriots.

America, a friend of the Cypriot people, owes it to them to do everything in their power to support peace and an end to this illegal occupation.

33RD ANNIVERSARY OF INVASION OF CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 33rd year since the invasion and subsequent occupation of the Island of Cyprus.

Since 1974, Turkish military forces have illegally occupied the northern part of the island, forcibly dividing communities, and depriving a nation of its cultural heritage and peaceful existence.

The Turkish invasion of Cyprus physically separated the Greek Cypriot community and Turkish Cypriot community along ethnic lines for the first time in the island nation's history. The unlawful occupation of 37 percent of the territory of Cyprus continues unabated to this day. There are currently 43,000 Turkish troops garrisoned in the occupied areas, and Turkey has resettled nearly 100,000 mainland Turkish citizens into those areas.

The continued Turkish occupation of Cyprus stops the Greek and Cypriot communities from building national institutions, from building intercommunal trust, and from promoting the diversity and uniqueness of a truly Cypriot culture. In short, because of Turkey's continued occupation and division of the island nation, the people of Cyprus are prohibited from reclaiming a true Cypriot national identity.

Furthermore, thousands of Cypriots continue to be refugees in their own land, blocked from the homes and the communities they inhabited for generations. Some have been marooned in tiny enclaves, trapped by the occupation forces, cut off from the outside world and basic human rights. A new generation of Cypriots has inherited the terrible dislocation that military occupation brings.

In the face of all this, the Greek Cypriot inhabitants of the Republic of Cyprus have struggled and succeeded in building a strong society, one whose economic progress, development of democratic institutions and capable governance has led to membership in the European Union in May 2004. Sadly, until there is an end to the occupation, the reunification of the island under a bi-communal, bi-zonal federation will be impossible, and the occupied areas of Cyprus will be denied the full benefits of EU membership.

For the United States, there is a clear imperative to resolve the situation in Cyprus as a matter of justice and the rule of law, principles we hold dear. But beyond that, achieving reunification of the island is critical to the strategic interests of the United States.

The Cyprus problem pits American allies against one another. The strategic interest in facilitating a negotiated settlement is significant for the region, but also for the world. Cyprus can either fester as a potential flashpoint, or become a starting point for reconciliation.

Today, we have a new opportunity. The opportunity for reconciliation is real. Since Cyprus' entry into the EU, the borders between the occupied areas have been partially opened, and there have been more than 12 million crossings of Greek and Turkish Cypriots without serious incident. Turkish Cypriots cross into the Republic of Cyprus every day to go to work. Approximately 35,000 Turkish Cypriots have applied for and received passports from the Republic of Cyprus.

The people of the island want reunification to occur. The Turkish government now must demonstrate a legitimate will to participate with good faith in U.S. and U.N. mediated efforts to resolve this conflict. Perpetuating the status quo hurts not only Greek and Turkish Cypriots, but the nation of Turkey and its relation to the United States and to the world.

Mr. Speaker, we have in place, brokered by the U.N., a workable framework for reunification. The so-called "July 8 Agreement" reached in 2006 calls for an immediate initiation of comprehensive negotiations on two different levels; one that addresses everyday issues to build confidence and momentum, and the other addressing more serious disputes over territorial and power-sharing arrangements in the prospective federal state.

This agreement is a real way forward to the reunification of Cyprus within a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation. But a year has passed, and the process as laid out by the U.N. has yet to be meaningfully engaged by the Turkish representatives. It should not stall any longer.

As my colleague, Mr. BILIRAKIS, has urged through legislation introduced earlier this year, the United States can and should play a powerful role in moving forward and pushing for immediate implementation of these U.N.-backed negotiations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PRESCRIPTION DRUG USER FEE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the Prescription Drug User Fee

Act, better known as PDUFA, and to express my concern about the path this Congress took to reauthorize it for the next 5 years.

As we all know, this is an important law affecting millions of Americans and their health every day. We have an obligation to examine it closely and debate it in great depth. Yet, by considering the bill under suspension, this Congress has neither explored nor understood its full ramifications.

As we move ahead with PDUFA, this reauthorization clearly offers powerful reforms and poses still greater challenges. There is a lot to be proud of in the bill, adding new transparency, providing new resources to ensure the safety of the drugs and devices that we count on every day to fight disease and to stay healthy.

To be sure, it is certainly stronger than the bill that passed on the Senate side, and that is a good thing. This bill expands the FDA's ability to monitor the safety of drugs and medical devices after they have been approved and marketed, and increasing by \$225 million over 5 years the user fees the agency can use for post-market safety monitoring. The FDA would be required to revisit the drug several years later for further analysis. And for riskier drugs, there would be regulation limiting prescribing authority to trained physicians.

In addition, by providing funds for the active analysis of large medical databases, this bill will also help us quickly detect drugs with major short and long-term safety problems. However, there are significant improvements we could have made to the bill if it were taken up under regular order and amendments were debated.

This bill, for example, does not provide any mandatory recall authority for the FDA to immediately pull products off the shelves after they have been found to be dangerous. I do not need to remind my colleagues that many of the high-profile drugs recently taken off the market had to be removed voluntarily, and that was only after significant damage had already been done.

So Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to look at this bill a little closer. You will get an idea of just how much influence the drug industry has on this Congress.

Indeed, there were a number of very strong provisions in the original subcommittee draft bill that were unjustifiably weakened during the markup process. For instance, this bill creates a new risk evaluation and mitigation strategy for new drugs that would create specific requirements and criteria for each drug. Under the original draft, drug or device companies would have been subjected to a \$20 million maximum fine for a single violation, and a \$100 million maximum fine for several violations. These figures were reduced, however, to \$250,000 and \$1 million as the bill moved forward. As you know, this is mere pocket change

for drug companies, and provides virtually no deterrent to companies that choose to ignore the new process.

In addition, the original draft would have granted the FDA discretion to ban direct consumer advertising for a new drug for up to 3 years, yet this provision was weakened as well, making it completely voluntary, while giving the FDA zero authority to require changes.

Worse still, if a drug company chooses to volunteer for the review system and pays a fee, it can run its advertisements regardless, rendering the system utterly useless.

And finally, when it comes to addressing significant conflicts of interest at the FDA, the language here is actually weaker than what the FDA itself proposed earlier this year. The agency, in fact, would have prevented any Members with conflicts of interest from voting on an advisory panel, and would have prevented any Member with more than \$5,000 worth of investments from even serving on the panel. This bill, however, allows the FDA to grant waivers overriding its already lenient current conflict-of-interest rules.

Today the pharmaceutical industry argues that interaction between drug companies and doctors who serve on these advisory committees are beneficial. Well, we know it is beneficial to the drug companies. It is time to end the influence drug companies have in our doctors' offices and at the FDA.

By providing additional resources and boosting the FDA's post-market surveillance activity, this bill takes us in the right direction. But we got here the wrong way, under suspension of the rules. As a result, with no debate and no amendments, the final legislation serves the American people poorly.

It is no surprise that drug companies are always working to improve their bottom line. They are big businesses with stockholders to please. But we have an even bigger responsibility to meet. We have a tremendous obligation to protect the public health and to ensure a safe America for everyone.

□ 1845

OUR HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last week this House voted to end the occupation of Iraq. Some of those who opposed that action argued that bringing our troops home out of Iraq will increase the violence there and perhaps even lead to a humanitarian catastrophe. But what they forget, or choose to ignore, is that a humanitarian catastrophe has already occurred in Iraq. It is getting worse every day. That catastrophe includes the refugee crisis in that devastated nation.

Last week the United States Committee for Refugees reported that the

number of refugees in the world rose last year to its highest level since 2001. One of the main reasons was the great exodus from Iraq. All told, more than 2 million Iraqis have been forced to flee their country. Close to 2 million more have been displaced internally. That is a total, Mr. Speaker, of 4 million refugees, 50 percent of whom are children, and tens of thousands more are leaving every single month.

Many of the refugees are in dire straits. Recently United Nations inspectors visited one refugee camp and found more than 2,000 people living in tents. They had no clothes except for the clothes on their backs. They had no medical care. They had no drinkable water. They had no toilets. Many of the children had typhoid and other illnesses and were living among snakes and scorpions.

Sweden, to its great credit, is accepting more than 1,000 refugees every month. The population of Sweden is only 9 million people. The United States, with a population of 300 million, accepted only 202 last year. Not 202,000, but 202. We have accepted only somewhere around 700 since our occupation of Iraq began.

That is a disgraceful record. Every Member of this House should feel ashamed. That goes for all of us; those who support the war and those who oppose it. We may disagree about policy, but surely we can agree that we have a moral obligation to do more about a terrible refugee problem that our occupation has created. After all, many of the refugees have had to flee because they cooperated with our troops in the first place, or they cooperated with American contractors. We can't turn our backs on them now.

That is why I am urging all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2265, the Responsibility to Iraq Refugees Act of 2007, sponsored by Representative BLUMENAUER along with Representative SHAYS and Representative SCHAKOWSKY.

I especially challenge those Members who want our occupation of Iraq to continue to support this bill. Don't just warn us about a humanitarian crisis. Do something about the one that already exists.

The bill would provide special immigrant status to 15,000 Iraqis every year for 4 years. The bill would also provide a safe haven for at least 20,000 more Iraqis, including children, who have been left all alone in the world. Giving these young people a chance in life is not only honorable, it is smart because these impoverished children could become prime targets for recruitment by terrorists.

To me, this bill represents the true heart of America, the good and caring heart that has compassion for the people of the world. But our leaders do not seem to share this compassion. Recently, for example, former U.N. Ambassador John Bolton denied that the United States has any responsibility

for the refugee crisis. He said, "Our obligation was to give the Iraqis new institutions and provide security. We have fulfilled that obligation. I don't think we have an obligation to compensate for the hardships of war."

This is the kind of arrogance, Mr. Speaker, that has destroyed America's reputation and credibility around the world. We must reclaim our moral leadership. We can start by helping the Iraqi refugees. It's the right thing to do. It's the right thing to do as we bring our troops home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ON IRAQ, WE NEED LEADERSHIP, NOT INEFFECTIVE COMPROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, Americans are aching for our leadership to end the war in Iraq. Instead, they find the President and his enablers in the House and Senate doing everything they can to block legislation that would require him to bring the troops home by a date certain. Each day seems to bring some new proposal that purports to be progress.

Upon examination, however, they leave the President free to pursue his discredited policies and serve his diversionary tactics by politicians searching for cover. One proposal calls for the President to submit a plan by mid-October to narrow the use of U.S. troops in Iraq to fighting terrorists and securing borders and U.S. interests. It won't bring home a single American serviceman or woman.

Another proposal seeks to "change the mission" of American forces, but doesn't guarantee when or even if their redeployment will begin. Supporters of "changing the mission" claim it would result in troop reductions, but they offer no evidence of that. Americans will remain the targets of violence, and U.S. policy will continue to sow resentment in the Muslim world. In my opinion, "changing the mission" is the war supporters' latest excuse to avoid decisive action to bring the war to a conclusion.

This is not the leadership the American people expect and that our national security demands. The failure of the President's surge strategy means he has lost the ability to shape events in Iraq in a positive direction. Only by redeploying our forces from Iraq can we rebuild our depleted military, restore our global reputation and redirect resources to fight al Qaeda.

Just last week, the National Counterterrorism Center reported that al Qaeda has regrouped in the Afghanistan-Pakistan border region, enabled by the President's diversion of resources to Iraq.

I opposed the Iraq war from the start and take no comfort in the fact that many of my most ominous predictions have proven true. In a September 6, 2002, op-ed in the Portland Press Herald, I predicted that the war would be fought "in city streets filled with civilians, making precision bombs useless and casualties high. It will cost billions to wage the war and billions more to rebuild."

America has suffered nearly 30,000 casualties, including more than 3,600 combat deaths. The war has cost half a trillion dollars, resulting in huge deficits that will burden our children's future.

On October 8, 2002, during the House debate on the war resolution, I said, "If the U.S. acts unilaterally or with just a few other nations, there is a far higher risk of fueling resentment in Arab and Muslim nations and swelling the ranks of the anti-U.S. terrorists." Unfortunately, this is exactly what has happened.

I voted against the war and have been an outspoken critic of the case made to justify it, the mismanagement of the occupation and the failure to hold the administration accountable for its so many mistakes.

More than 18 months ago, I called for a deadline to redeploy our forces. A firm deadline was, and is, the best way to end the U.S. involvement in Iraq and force the Iraqis to assume responsibility for their own security. As former Maine Senator George Mitchell demonstrated in his Northern Ireland diplomacy, a firm deadline can be a very effective way to get parties in conflict to compromise their differences.

Nothing but the force of law will move President Bush to alter his stay-the-course strategy. Nonbinding resolutions are not sufficient to compel a real change in policy and get us out of

Iraq. This President is stubbornly determined to delay the inevitable at the cost of additional precious American lives. More than 600 of our troops have died since the surge began.

The other costs include greater hatred of the U.S. in the Islamic world, more terrorists inspired by that hatred and, with our Armed Forces stretched to the breaking point, great insecurity for our Nation.

Unless Members of Congress who supported President Bush's war policy steadfastly for 5 years stop looking for cover and do the right thing, the President will prevail and our troops will remain in Iraq.

Our Armed Forces have done all that we asked of them and have performed their mission with great skill and courage. President Bush will keep our troops in the crossfire of the Iraqi civil war until Congress sets binding dates for their redeployment. That action represents the leadership needed to bring our troops safely home.

CLEANING UP FEMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on the 3rd of July in my hometown of Memphis, Tennessee, I discovered there was ice being disposed of by being dumped on a driveway, more or less, at Spottswood and East Parkway. What that was about was FEMA dropping and disposing of ice.

FEMA had purchased thousands and thousands and thousands of pounds of ice after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita when they didn't have enough ice. To try to compensate, they bought way, way, way too much ice.

I have discovered that FEMA spent in purchasing, in transporting and in storing ice in 23 different American cities, Mr. Speaker, \$67 million of our taxpayers' money, and FEMA is now spending nearly \$4 million to dispose of that ice over a period of 11 months. That means over \$70 million of American taxpayer dollars going down the drain. That is not the way an American government or any government should work, any business should work, or what Americans should expect of their government.

Fortunately, this Democratic Congress is doing what legislative branches are supposed to do; oversight. We have lacked oversight for the last 6 years, Mr. Speaker, and faults of the administration have gone unnoticed. But as I deal on the subcommittee that deals with FEMA, I will see to it on August 29th when that subcommittee meets in New Orleans on the second anniversary of that horrendous event, Hurricane Katrina, that we will ask the director of FEMA and the others about their programs, of why they buy excess commodities and excess ice, of why they spent \$70 million of American taxpayers' money on an ice folly, and why

they didn't try to dispose of that ice during the period of time when it had a useful shelf life and give it to 501(c)(3) charities, Federal, State or county institutions, so it could be used and utilized by American people who could have used that ice to save some money.

The same thing happens with commodities. Chairman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the chairman of that subcommittee, had a hearing on food distribution of commodities where FEMA had wasted other precious commodities and dollars.

Mr. Speaker, this needs to stop. Our tax dollars are valuable and people expect their government to do right with their tax dollars. I will not stand by. When I see incompetence, when I see inefficiencies, when I see ineffective use of tax dollars, I will speak up. I am fortunate to be on the subcommittee to ask the questions on August 29th of FEMA.

It seems like the horrendous events that we had when Brownie didn't know what he was doing and the people in New Orleans were left in a tragic circumstance are replicating themselves. FEMA has not been cleaned up.

We will try to see that FEMA spends our money properly and responds properly. They haven't responded to the American people and they haven't responded to Congress. This is a wrong that needs to be righted.

□ 1900

PEAK OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

MR. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, just in the last couple of days a very important report that was asked for by the Energy Department has been made public. This is the fourth entity that has been asked to study this subject. One of these entities, SAIC, the large prestigious international corporation, has submitted really three reports but they are just one organization. They are called the Hirsch reports. Later this evening I will note some quotes from the Hirsch Report. This was in February 2005.

In September 2005, the Corps of Engineers in response to a request by the Army issued a report, *Energy Trends and Their Implication For U.S. Army Installations*. When you read that report, you might substitute the "United States" or "world" instead of "the Army" and it would be just as applicable. Clearly our Army is a microcosm of the United States and the world.

And then there was a third study which came out in March of this year and this was a study done by the Government Accountability Office. Through my position on the Science Committee I asked for this study and it was completed and it was made public March 29, 2007.

All three of these studies had the same message. A little later we will look at some of those messages. Well, I have one here from the Hirsch Report. "World Oil Peaking is Going to Happen. The world has never faced a problem like this. Without massive mitigation, more than a decade before the fact, the problem will be pervasive and will not be temporary. Previous energy transitions, wood to coal and coal to oil were gradual and evolutionary. Oil peaking will be abrupt and revolutionary."

In common, everyday English what these three studies have indicated is that peaking of oil is imminent, present or imminent, with potentially devastating consequences.

Just in the last couple of days there has been a fourth entity that has published a report, this one requested by the Department of Energy, as was the first one, the Hirsch Report. This one was by the National Petroleum Council. The National Petroleum Council has done a very large study involving a lot of experts in the world. They have just issued their report.

Today I was very pleased that several of the key members of this study came to my office and we had a very productive discussion of their report. My concern was that although one could not argue with any specific sentence in the report, that the report certainly was not in my view, and I think the view of any casual reader, was not the clarion call for action that the other reports were. But we will have a chance this evening to look a little more at that report.

There was a talk given 50 years ago, the 14th day of last month, by the father of our nuclear submarine, Hyman Rickover. He gave this talk to a group of physicians in St. Paul, Minnesota. You can do a Google search and just ask for "Rickover" and "energy" and this talk will come up. It is called "Energy Resources and Our Future" and it was on May 14, 1957, a little more than 50 years and one month ago.

There is nothing man can do to rebuild exhausted fossil fuel reserves, he says. They were created by solar energy 500 million years ago and took eons to grow to their present volume. In the face of the basic fact that fossil fuel reserves are finite, the exact length of time these reserves will last is important in only one respect: The longer they last, the more time we have to invent ways of living off renewable or substitute energy sources.

There have been a number of interesting articles in the public media in the last few weeks. One of them was in the New York Times on June 30. "Oil Giants See Some Strains in the System." This is Mr. Mulva who is the chairman and chief executive officer of ConocoPhillips, one of our large oil companies.

The question he was asked was: According to the Department of Energy, the United States will consume 28 percent more oil and 19 percent more nat-

ural gas in 2030 than it did in 2005. Where will we find all that oil and gas?

And this is his answer. "I question whether the supply will be developed to meet these demand expectations. I believe demand is going to be constrained by supply."

What he is saying is the future is not going to be like the past because in the past we always have been able to find additional production when we needed it. There was only one time when that was not true for a little while and that was in the 1970s when the OPEC oil-producing companies were limiting their exports to us, and that created not only in this country but worldwide a recession as a result of that temporary restriction in providing the full amount of oil that the world's economies would like to use.

On March 25 in the Washington Post there was a very interesting article. It was entitled "Corn Can't Solve Our Problem." You know there has been a lot of interest in corn ethanol, E-85 and putting 10 percent in our gasoline and so forth. They made the observation that if we took all of our 70 million acres of corn and planted and used that corn to produce ethanol, and recognize the fact that there is a big fossil fuel impact into producing the ethanol, and if you discounted the energy contribution from the ethanol by the fossil fuels it took to produce it, it would displace 2.4 percent of our gasoline. And they wryly noted in the article that if you tuned up your car and put air in the tires, you could save as much gas.

I believe it is in the same article that they talk about what we might do with non-corn land in planting, and they thought there was maybe 60 million acres of that in the conservation reserve. This is not as good of land as we are planting now. It is land that is kind of marginal for crop production, and so with some incentives from the government, our farmers have put that in what is called conservation reserve. If we took that out of conservation reserve and planted it to a mixture of grasses, they estimated this might produce as much ethanol by cellulosic ethanol production as we would get from our corn. Because there would be less fossil fuel input to this, the net might be greater. It might be as much as 10 percent or so. But I don't know if they looked at the sustainability of this because if you look at a patch of weeds, to at least some extent and in places to a very large extent, this year's weeds are growing because last year's weeds died and are fertilizing them.

We see this dynamic really exhibited in our rainforests which one would suspect would represent the product of really good soils because there is so much growing in our rainforests. But when you take all of the trees, vines and so forth that are growing in the rainforest away, you've taken almost all the nutrients away and you have very thin soils in many places that bake hard in the sun. They are called

laterite soils. This reflects the fact that in the rainforest almost all the nutrients are in the process of sprouting and growing and dying and rotting so that the plants that are now sprouting and growing are fed by those plants that have reached their maturity and are now decaying. So almost all of these nutrients are in this cycle.

This is true even in our grasslands. We are not pouring fertilizers on them, and grasses continue to grow. But at least to some extent this year's grasses are growing because last year's grasses died and are fertilizing them.

There has been a lot of interest in some incredibly large potential reserves of oil-like deposits that we have in our west which we call oil shales and a study was done by RAND Corporation, "Oil Shale Development in the United States: Prospects and Policies Issues," and they say that currently no organization with the management, technical and financial wherewithal to develop oil shale resources has announced its intent to build commercial-style production facilities. A firm decision to commit funds to such a venture is at least 6 years away, and consequently at least 12 and possibly more years will elapse before oil shale development will reach the production growth phase. This is after the 6 years to make a decision, it will be another 6 years in building the facilities.

We are going to run through some slides now, some charts, and it will put some of the things that I have been talking about, and all of this is current, by the way. Also of considerable interest to me is both of the leader hours, one of which I am occupying this evening, both the Democrat and Republican hour here on the floor, were filled with discussions of energy, primarily a discussion of oil and liquid fuels and the fact that oil was and is \$75 a barrel and gasoline is \$3 a gallon.

Let's turn to our first chart here. This is an interesting little cartoon here. The fellow is at the pump and he asks, "Just why is gas so expensive?" I think you can see the labels here. The pump is labeled "supply" and it is pretty small; and his SUV is labeled "demand" and it is really big. Of course the reason oil is \$75 a barrel and gas is \$3 a gallon is because the demand is exceeding one of the readily available supply.

One of my colleagues said that one of his constituents had called him and asked what can you do to reduce the price of gasoline. I told him to tell your constituent to drive less. You see the reason that gasoline is \$3 a gallon is because we would like to use more gasoline that is readily available. And in our supply-and-demand economy, what this means is when the supply is constrained and the demand is large, that the price goes up. And of course the price of oil is going up.

The next chart is a very interesting one, and this next chart takes a look at what the world would look like if the size of the countries was relative to the amount of oil reserves that they have.

Just a little word of caution here, we don't really know how much oil Libya and Nigeria and Saudi Arabia and Iraq and Kuwait have because they won't let us in to look at the books. These are OPEC countries, and they have a cartel and when oil was \$10 a barrel and they would like to have it higher, they wanted to constrain production so the price of oil would rise, and so they would permit their constituent countries to pump oil as a proportion of their reserves.

□ 1915

So there was a temptation for these countries simply to state bigger reserves so that they could pump more oil and get more revenues for their country. But if you assume that those are the reserves and, relatively, this is what the world would look like, you see that Saudi Arabia has almost a fourth of all the oil reserves in the world. Little Kuwait, which Saddam Hussein thought looked like a little province down there in the corner of Iraq, has either the second or third largest oil reserves in the world. Iran is huge, you see there. Iraq is very large. Venezuela, Venezuela dwarfs the United States up here.

These colors are how much oil you use. Nobody uses oil quite like the United States, and so we are the only ones who are colored yellow here. But notice how small the United States is compared to these other countries, and yet we use a fourth of all the oil in the world.

Something which I think gives me pause for sure and I think it ought to give everybody pause is look at China and India over here. China and India together, about 2.3 billion people, more than a third of the world's population, and they collectively have less oil than we. Of course, China's getting most of its energy from coal. It has pretty good coal reserves and gets most of its energy from coal, which is very polluting, which is one of the current problems which they have.

Well, the President very correctly noted in his State of the Union message a couple of years ago that we're forced to get oil from some countries that don't even like us, in his words, and you can look at the names of these countries, and not all of them don't like us, but many of them are in very unstable parts of the world, and who knows what tomorrow will bring.

The next chart is a quote from one of the studies that I mentioned. This was a study September of 2005 by the Army Corps of Engineers, and they very correctly noted that oil is the most important form of energy in the world today. And they note that, historically, no other energy source equals oil's intrinsic quality of extractability, transportability, versatility and cost. The qualities that enabled oil to take over from coal as the front line energy source for the industrialized world in the middle of the 20th century are as relevant today as they were then.

And every time we look at any alternative that would take the place of oil that obviously cannot be here forever, we must compare them with the qualities that oil has, and as this study very correctly noted, historically no other energy source equals oil's intrinsic qualities of extractability, transportability, versatility and cost.

Gasoline at \$3 a gallon is still cheaper than water in the grocery stores. Think about it. That little bottle of water you buy in the grocery store, pour enough of those into a jug to make a gallon, and you will have put in far more than \$3 worth of water.

The next chart contains some statistics which caused a couple of years or so ago 30 of our prominent Americans to write a letter to the President saying, Mr. President, the fact that we have only 2 percent of the world's reserves of oil and use 25 percent of the world's oil, import two-thirds of what we use is a totally unacceptable national security risk. We really have to do something about that.

This is what the President mentioned in his speech when he said we are hooked on oil and that we needed to develop alternatives to free ourselves from our exorbitant dependence on foreign oil.

A couple of more interesting figures here. We're less than 5 percent of the world's population. One person out of 22, and we use a fourth of the world's oil, but a really interesting figure here is this 8 percent. We have only 2 percent of the known reserves, yet we're producing 8 percent of the oil. What that means of course is that we're pretty good at pumping our oil fields. We ought to be. We've drilled more oil wells than all the rest of the world put together, and so we are now extracting our oil pretty rapidly.

The next chart is some figures, and I'm sorry that we can't draw as many men as Hyman Rickover had. "With high energy consumption goes a high standard of living. Thus the enormous fossil fuel which we in this country control feeds machines which make each of us master of an Army of mechanical slaves." This was 50 years ago Hyman Rickover said this. We're now 50 years later, and what he said then is even more true today.

He said that each of us represents 35 watts of electricity or about 1/20 of a horsepower. Looking at that, by the way, when you're looking at replacements for fossil fuels and the energy that's in fossil fuel, when you think of what 1 gallon of gasoline or diesel does, I drive a Prius. It will carry my Prius about 50 miles, and a pick-up truck loaded heavy, maybe it will carry it 17 miles or so. How long would it take me to pull my Prius 50 miles? And that's the energy in just 1 gallon of gasoline.

Another statistic which indicates the incredible energy density in these fossil fuels is the amount of work that electricity can do. If a grown man works really hard all day in his yard, his wife can get more work out of an

electric motor for less than 25 cents worth of electricity. Now, it may be humbling to see that we're worth less than 25 cents a day in terms of fossil fuel energy; but that's the reality, and even 50 years ago Hyman Rickover pointed this out.

He said that the household appliances that help the average housewife, 50 years ago, the vacuum cleaners, the refrigerators and so forth, they didn't have microwaves then, that this would represent the equivalent of 33 faithful household servants is the way he phrased it.

And then we did some manufacturing, and he said that the man working in the factory that the energy available to him in the machinery that helped him to produce his product would represent the equivalent of 244 men. The automobile of 50 years ago, by the way it got less fuel efficiency than we get today. We're doing better, not as good as we could, but better. He said that the automobile used the energy equivalent of 2,000 men. When you're going 70 miles down the road, it's the equivalent of having 2,000 men push your car down the road. A locomotive, he said, represented the work output of 100,000 men, and the jet airplane 700,000 men.

Each barrel of oil has the energy equivalent of 12 men working all year, 25,000 man-hours of labor. When I first heard that I had a little trouble believing it, but then when I thought about how far that gallon of gasoline carries my car and how much work I can get out of 25 cents' worth of electricity, I can understand the enormous amount of energy in this oil.

The next chart, and Hyman Rickover referred to this in his really interesting talk, he noted that in 8,000 years of recorded history that the age of oil would represent but a blip in the history of man. When he gave his talk 50 years ago, we were about 100 years into the age of oil. Today, we're about 150 years into the age of oil. I believe that you will agree with me and many other observers that we're about halfway through the age of oil. The second half will see oil ever higher in cost and ever more difficult to get. But that means in 8,000 years of recorded history, the age of oil would have occupied about 300 years. That truly is just but a blip, isn't it, in 8,000 years.

And what we see here is this doesn't go back 8,000 years, it goes back 400 years is all. We see here how little energy was used up until we came to the Industrial Revolution, and that started with wood, the steam engine and so forth, the brown line here. And then we found coal. Boy, it grew, but it took off when we found the gas and oil and learned how to exploit the energy in gas and oil.

Notice that little blip at the top up there. That's the 1970 oil price spike shock and the worldwide recession. If we hadn't had that, and since then we've been really quite efficient, your refrigerator today maybe uses a third

as much as your refrigerator did in 1970. If we kept going up that curve, we'd be in really big trouble today.

Through the Carter years, every decade we used as much oil as we had used in all of previous history. What that means, of course, is you're going to use half the world's oil, at the present use rate you'd have another 10 years left. Of course you couldn't get it that quickly, and you would get less and less over a longer and longer period. But very fortunately for us we've slowed down now.

The next chart is another quote from this really interesting speech by Hyman Rickover, and I hope you will get that speech and read it. I think you will find it, as I did, one of the most interesting speeches you've ever read.

High-energy consumption has always been a prerequisite of political power. Ultimately, the Nation which controls the largest energy resource will become dominant. Boy, I read that, and then I reflected on the chart that we're going to see in just a couple of minutes.

China is going around the world buying up oil, and I thought of his statement here: ultimately, the Nation which controls the largest energy resources will become dominant. If we act wisely and in time to conserve what we have, we have not acted wisely nor in time I might add, if we act wisely and in time to conserve what we have and prepare well for necessary future changes we shall ensure this dominant position for our country.

Now we face a real challenge. I believe America is up to the challenge, but we face a real challenge. We need real leadership to face this challenge.

The next chart is another quote from Hyman Rickover and this is an interesting. Whether this golden age will continue depends entirely upon our ability to keep energy supplies in balance with the needs of our growing population. And he notes that a reduction of per capita energy consumption has always in the past led to a decline in civilization and a reversion to a more primitive way of life.

Now, we have a lot of knowledge that these cultures before us didn't have, and so I hope as less and less fossil fuel energy becomes available to us that we can avoid following this typical response.

The next chart is what I referred to a couple of moments ago. It shows what China is doing around the world and all of the symbols like this, you can see them all over the world. This is where China in Canada, they were going to buy Unocal. This yellow is here. They were going to buy Unocal in our country, but they are now buying up oil reserves all over the world.

The next chart, this is a chart of the production of oil in the United States. Now, in 1956 at this point right here, 1956, a shell oil geologist by the name of M. King Hubbert gave a speech which I think within a couple of years will be recognized as the most impor-

tant speech given in the last century. It was given 51 years ago, the 8th day of March in San Antonio, Texas, to a group of oil geologists and company officials.

The United States was then king of oil. Every year we produced more and more and more oil, and he told them that within 14 years we were going to reach our maximum production of oil; and after that, no matter what we did the production of oil would fall off.

He became a legend in his own time when his prediction became true because, sure enough, in 1970, we reached the peak.

□ 1930

Now he had not included Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico in his prediction. The next chart shows this breakout. This is the same chart. By the way, if you simply change the scale on the ordinate in the abscissa you can make these curves spread out or sharper. This is a little sharper curve than the one we saw in Alaska. We have compressed a little of the abscissa here.

This is an interesting one because it shows Hyman Rickover's prediction, and he predicted it would follow owe those yellow symbols. It actually followed the greenish ones here.

This is from CERA, Cambridge Energy Research Associates, and they use this graph to try to convince you that you shouldn't have any confidence in Hyman Rickover, because he really wasn't a very good prognosticator. The statistician may see some reason to believe that, but I think the average person, when they see that, says, gee, that greenish line is not very far from the yellow line. The most important thing, it did peak in 1970, and has fallen off ever since.

Now, this additional peak here, of the total U.S. production, that now includes Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico. That's because of the Alaska contribution there. The next chart shows a prediction by this same organization, CERA, as to what will happen in the future.

Several Congresses ago, I was a chair of the Energy Subcommittee on Science, and I wanted to find the dimensions of the problem. So we had a hearing on oil reserves. We have the world's experts come in to tell us how much oil they thought, recoverable oil, was in the world.

There was a fairly unanimous agreement. I was surprised at how small the range was. They believe, most of them believed, that we had found about 2 trillion barrels of recoverable oil, and that we had pumped about 1 trillion barrels of recoverable oil, so that 1 trillion barrels remain.

By the way they use a strange term here. They use gigabarrels instead of million barrels, because in England, I understand, a billion is a million million. In our country a billion is a thousand million. So to avoid this controversy, if you are talking international, use giga, and 1,000 gigabarrels is 1,000 billion barrels.

This chart shows several projected scenarios for the future. If there is about 2 trillion barrels total, that would be this line. CERA acknowledges it's that amount of oil roughly, roughly 2 trillion barrels available, roughly 1.92, they have it, that they are peaking about now.

If we found another amount of oil equal to all the recoverable oil that we have now, then you would extend the peak only out to this time.

They are projecting here that we may have some unconventional oil. We will talk in a few minutes about this unconventional oil. This is like the tar sands in Canada, the oil shales in our West that we read about in one of these recent articles. This is conjecture about how much we might get from that. It's anybody's guess how much we might get from that.

The next chart repeats some of these data in a way that's maybe a little more understandable. Here is the curve that we have seen several times now, and this is the production of oils going up, and then the recession in the 1970s and the slower growth rate now.

They believe that we will find as much more oil as all the oil that is in the ground and believed to be recoverable for today. If that happens, then they push the peak out to 2016.

The point I am making is that whether you believe that we found most of the oil that we will ultimately find, whether you will believe we will find a whole lot more oil, this exponential growth really eats up that oil very quickly.

After Albert Einstein discovered nuclear energy, he was asked, Dr. Einstein, what will be the next great energy force in the universe? His response was the most powerful force in the universe is the power of compound interest.

Very few people understand compound growth. If you had only 2 percent, that doesn't sound like much, does it, 2 percent a year, \$1.02. That doesn't sound like very much growth, not a very good interest rate. But if it grows only 2 percent a year, it doubled in 35 years. It's four times bigger in 70 years. It's eight times bigger in 105 years. It's 16 times bigger in 140 years. That's why Albert Einstein said that the power of compound interest is the most powerful force in the universe.

This little dotted line, just very quickly, if you used enhanced oil recovery and get it out now, you won't have it later. Notice what happens if you work really hard and move the peak over a little bit, you get less and less out very quickly later on.

The next chart, if I had only one chart to show about the energy situation, oil and gasoline and so forth, this would be the chart. This is a really great chart from what's called the oil chart. If you go on your Web site, you can look up the Web site for the oil chart, and you can buy one of these.

This is a little insert in it, has an enormous amount of information, has

almost like a textbook and a chart. This shows two things that are of considerable interest. One is when we discovered the oil. You can see here when we discovered it, way back in the 1940s, 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. But look what's happened since about the 1970s on.

On the average, less and less and less every year. Now, that's in spite of the fact that we have ever better and better techniques for discovering where oil is, computer modeling and 3-D seismic and so forth.

The heavy black line here, here, we have seen this several times before. This is the 1970s oil price hike spike in the recession. It's the slower growth now. The slower growth now is this slope and is really nowhere as steep as this slope. We are really much more efficient now than we were then, or we would be in bigger trouble sooner.

Well, since about 1980 here, we have been using more oil than we found, because we have been using this much, and we found only this much. So now we have been eating into these reserves back here. Some of these reserves are gone.

How much more will we find in the future?

Of course, that's anybody's guess, but if you were extrapolating from what we have been finding, I would come out a little less than they say. The shaded area over there is the future. Of course, it's not going to be that smooth, of course, it will be on the up and down. On average, you wouldn't expect it to be a whole lot different than that.

So in the future we are going to be using these reserves, because what we want to use is very much larger than what we will find that year to use, so we will have to be using oil that we found in past years. Now, if you draw a curve over this discovery curve, and we have seen that a couple of times, we will see it in just a moment on the next chart, if you draw a curve over the discovery curve, the area under that curve represents the volume of oil you found. That's obviously true. That's just adding up all of these little bar graphs, isn't it.

Adding up all of these bars, that used to be the volume you found. The area under the consumption curve will be the amount of oil you have consumed. It's very obvious you can't pump oil you haven't found.

So how much oil do you think we will pump in the future?

Well, that depends on how much oil you think we will find in the future, because we know what the current acknowledged reserves are. Now, we may find ways of getting more oil out of the ground. So what we think is a current reserve may end up being a somewhat bigger reserve. By the way, when we have probably gotten all of what we call recoverable oil out of the ground, there will probably be half of what was originally there that we won't get, because the cost of getting it will simply exceed any value that we get from the oil. That's why we are talking about recoverable oil.

The next chart, I just want you to note the big peak here and the smaller one here, because we see this on this discovery chart. This is what we see on the chart. You see the big peak here and the smaller one there. This is the discovery chart. That kind of smoothes out that previous bar graph we have seen.

This is a projection by our Energy Information Agency about how much oil we will find in the future. They believed, when they published this, that what we would find would be along what we call the main. We don't have time this evening to go into a very interesting transition here from fraction to probability, but the actual data points you see are following what they said was a 95 percent probability in statistics. Obviously, 95 percent probable is more probable than 50 percent probable.

But they believed that we would find, in much of their projections, and all of their projections in the future, in our Energy Information Agency are predicated on finding a lot more oil. They thought we would be finding oil along this green curve. That would mean a reversal of what's been going on for 30 years.

The next chart is a statement by one of the giants in this area, Laherrare, and he made a statement saying the USGS estimate implies a five-fold increase in discovery rate and reserve addition for which no evidence is presented. Such an improvement in performance is in fact utterly plausible given the great technological achievements over the past 20 years, the worldwide search and the deliberate effort to find the largest remaining prospects. Now, you may not think that that is improbable, that this is his view.

The next chart is a schematic. Here, this is the same peak that we have been seeing, but here we have spread out the abscissa and compressed the ordinate a little so we have a little flatter curve. I wanted to show you this one, because this shows a 2 percent increase rate in use. That's about what we have been doing, about 2 percent. That doubles in 35 years.

This point is half of that point on the ordinate scale. So that yellow area represents 35 years. What you see there is that the shortages which drives gas to \$3 a gallon, and then oil to \$75 a barrel, the shortages begin a bit before the peak. Now, everybody is focused on trying to fill that gap.

I think that a more rational thing would be to determine how we can live better on what we have got and hope, and hope that we can provide enough alternative sources to maintain this level of energy production for the future.

Now, the next chart, and, again, this is from the big Hirsch Report, and it says, world oil peaking is going to happen. There is no question. Obviously it's going to happen. The world isn't made out of oil. Obviously, the amount

of oil in the Earth is finite, it will not last forever.

The only question is, when will it peak? Oil peaking presents a unique challenge. The world has never faced a problem like this. This is no precedent in the past to prepare us for what will happen with oil. You know, when will it occur?

The next chart references, from A to U, that's most of our alphabet, a lot of different experts in the area, some of them really aren't very definitive when they think it will occur. This source believes, J, believes it could occur as early as, what, about 2013 or could occur beyond 2100, very indecisive when it might occur.

But notice that most of these have fairly narrower ranges, and almost all of them believe that it will or could occur fairly soon. Look how many of them believe that peaking will occur before 2020. That's just around the corner, this is 2007, right? Thirteen years from now most of them believe that peaking will have occurred 13 years from now.

The next chart points out something for which we ought to be very thankful. I have referred to it several times this evening, that is how efficient we have become. This lavender-shaped area there represents the amount of energy we haven't had to use because we have increased our efficiency. That's really good. I think a little later we will have a chart or two that shows us something about that efficiency.

The next chart, and I wish it was in living color so it was a little more sexy, but its message is really an interesting message.

On the ordinate here we have how satisfied you are with life, how good do you feel about what's happening in your world?

On the abscissa here we have how much energy you use. Well, guess where we are? I think most Americans feel pretty good about their lives, and we use more energy than anybody else in the world. So look way over there on the right. Here we are, way up here on the right.

But notice if you draw a line at our level of satisfaction, there are 20-some countries that use less energy than we who are happier with their station in life than we are. So you don't have to use as much energy as we use to be happy with your station in life.

It's interesting here that if you have very little energy, it's hard to be happy about life. Look at these poor folk here, Bulgaria, Romania, Lithuania, Georgia, these are some of the poorer states of the former Soviet Union. But as soon as you get up to about, what, a fourth of the energy we use? People start feeling pretty good about their station in life, which really points out that we can use less energy and still feel pretty good.

The next chart is an interesting one. I understand that today it may be even better than that, because this is 2000 and they were just starting that improvement.

□ 1945

The average citizen in California, I am told, today uses only half as much electricity as the average person in the rest of the country. That would be really hard to argue they don't live as well in California as we live here, and they are using half as much electricity. This shows about 65 percent and this was 7 years ago, and I am told today it is 50 percent. They are doing that because they have very stringent regulations for efficiency.

The next chart is a really interesting one, just one little example of efficiency. Several months ago there was a picture on the front of Time magazine that showed a little screw-in fluorescent bulb and a big pile of coal, it was 500 pounds of coal. And what they said was that if you use that little screw-in bulb compared to the incandescent, you will save 500 pounds of coal for the electricity it would have taken to make the same amount of light from the incandescent bulb.

Here is our incandescent bulb. It is not a very good light source; it is a really good heater. When I am incubating little chickens, I use an electric light bulb because 90 percent of all the energy that comes out of the bulb is heat. Just try to take one out just after you have turned it off; it is really hot. Well, if you use fluorescent, you know that is much cooler. And this is the same amount of light. This is the light and the dark blue is the heat.

Now, the really efficient one is the light-emitting diode. Months ago I, got a little light-emitting diode flashlight. I haven't changed the battery yet. You will forget when you put the battery in, because almost all of the energy from the light-emitting diode goes into light. Very little of it goes into heat.

The next chart introduces us to the subject that I wanted to spend most of my time on this evening, and obviously we won't be able to do that because most of it doesn't remain, but at least I want to start talking about this and next time promise to spend most of the time talking about what we have a right to expect from the alternatives.

I hope we have made the point that, in all probability, there will be peaking of oil, and there is a huge challenge. And we are starting to do that. We were talking about hydrogen, we were talking about corn ethanol, we were talking about and still are talking about soy diesel and switch grass and cellulosic ethanol and we are talking about a lot of things that we might use to replace the fossil fuels that we are now using.

By the way, I might note that there are three major groups that have common cause in wanting to do the same thing; that is, use less fossil fuels and depend more on sustainable alternatives. One of those groups is the national security people who are really concerned, and I am concerned. We use 25 percent of the world's oil, we have only 2 percent of the world's oil and import almost two-thirds of what we

use. That really is a prescription for disaster. And so what you need to do to fix that problem is to use less oil and more of something else. So they want to move off of that.

Then there are the people who believe, and I also think they are probably more right than wrong. By the way, even if I thought they were wrong, I would want to lock arms with them because what they want to do is exactly what I want to do for the other two reasons, and these are the people who believe that our large use of fossil fuels releasing this carbon that has been sequestered now for a very long time, releasing it very quickly is producing global warming and climate change, and what they want to do is use less fossil fuels and more of something else; and I believe that that may be true. And whether it is true or not, I say I am going to lock arms with them. And, thank you, Al Gore, for leading this charge. I want to lock arms with them because what they want to do to solve that problem, even if it doesn't turn out to be a problem, is exactly the thing we need to do to solve the national security dilemma and to solve the dilemma of peak oil, because we have got to find something to replace these fossil fuels because obviously they cannot last forever.

What will we replace them with? In the transition period we have some finite resources that we can turn to. We can turn to the tar sands of Canada, the oil shales of our West, our coal, or we can use nuclear. Let me spend just a few moments talking about each of these.

We are now getting 1 million barrels a day from the tar sands of Canada. There is potentially at least 1½ trillion barrels of oil there. How much is recoverable? Who knows, because we don't know the techniques that will be developed when it can no longer be mined the way it is now. Now they have a shovel that picks up 100 tons, it is dropped in a truck that hauls 400 tons, and then they take it and cook it with natural gas which will soon run out, and they are talking about building a nuclear power plant there. They use lots of water, and they have a huge tailing pond they call it; it is really a lake full of nasty chemicals. And what they are doing there they know is not sustainable and they are producing 1 million barrels a day. It sounds like a lot, doesn't it? But it is just a little more than 1 percent of the world's oil.

We have at least as much potential oil in our oil shales, but nobody yet has developed the technology which is economically justified in producing it even when oil is \$75 a barrel. We will get some energies from both of those, and ultimately we will get a lot of energy from both of those, I think, because oil will go up and up in price, which will make it more and more attractive to get energy there. But no one that I talk to believes that we can develop that fast enough and in large enough quantities to meet the demand

produced by the tailing off of the production of conventional oil.

We will come to coal in a few moments. Let me just note briefly nuclear. There is fission and fusion. The only future scenario that gets us home free is fusion. And if you think we are going to solve our energy problems with fusion, you probably think you are going to solve your personal economic problems by winning the lottery, because I think the odds may be about the same. That doesn't keep me from enthusiastically supporting the \$250 million a year roughly that we spend on fusion research. That is like a controlled hydrogen bomb, is what the sun is doing, because if we get there, we are really home free.

We now use fission. France produces about 75 percent of their electricity with fission. But the light water reaction uses fissionable uranium, of which there is a finite supply in the world, but we can go to breeder reactors not now used for energy, have been used; we used them for producing nuclear weapons. You can produce energy with them. They create some problems, and it is a trade-off. Is solving other problems worth the energy you get from it? But we need to be taking a new look at fission. I note some very bright people have been opposed to nuclear in the past, but when they are contemplating a future where they may be without nuclear shivering in the dark, nuclear is not looking all that bad today.

I am going to put this down to the side here because I want to put it back up, and we are going to look at the next chart here. And this is looking at worldwide proven oil reserves. This is to help us have some sense as to how much confidence we ought to have that we are going to be getting the oil from the reserves that are out there. Even though they are there, they may not be available to us.

This is the worldwide proven oil reserves by political risk, and this is the number of barrels. You notice they add up to a bit more than 1 billion barrels. This is the number of barrels that are in areas of various risk. Only about one-third of the barrels of oil are in countries that have low political risk; the biggest chunk is in countries with high political risk, and roughly another one-third in countries with medium political risk. So most of the world's oils in these two categories where there is either medium or high political risk. These are called above-ground problems. There are underground problems: Can you drill deep enough? Can you get it? Will it flow? Do you have to put seawater in? Do you have to pump live steam down there?

The next chart shows another look at this, and this is worldwide proven oil reserves by investment risk. Now, obviously if there is high political risk, there is probably high investment risk. I don't know too many people that are interested to invest in oil production in Iran today, would you think? Well, it

says here that the biggest chunk of these countries have high investment risk. So it is not easy to get money to invest there to develop the oil. And the medium. And then the no foreign investment allowed in this sector. The low is here. So for most of it, for much of it this pie chart there is either high risk for investment, medium risk for investment, or they won't let you invest. So national oil, you can't invest at all. So who knows what will happen there because they have total control.

Let me put this chart back up for just a moment, and introduce us to what ultimately when we have lived another 150 years and are through the age of oil, we will then have sustainable renewable sources. Whether we like it or not, whether we plan for it or not, that is what we will have. And this is not an exhaustive list but a reasonable list of these renewable resources: solar and wind and geothermal and ocean energies and agricultural resources, soy diesel, ethanol, corn ethanol, methanol from wood, biomass, cellulosic ethanol, waste energy, hydrogen from renewables.

Just a word or two about a couple things here and then we will put the next chart up. Hydrogen from renewables. You are not hearing much talk about hydrogen today, and the reason for that is people have finally figured out hydrogen is not an energy source. Hydrogen is produced from another energy source, and it will always have less energy than the energy it took to produce it. So why are we talking about hydrogen? For two reasons. One is, when you finally burn it, it produces water. That is pretty clean; it is great. And the second is it is a great candidate for a fuel cell if we ever get a fuel cell that is economically supportable. But they are probably 20 years away before we get there. The waste energy, really a good idea. We ought to be using more of that.

Let's put the next chart up. Let's look at this whole chart.

Eighty-five percent of all of our energy comes from fossil fuels, only 15 percent from renewables, and most of that from nuclear, a bit more than half from nuclear. The 7 percent, which is true renewables and that is broken down this way: conventional hydro, we probably won't get more of that; we have dammed up about all the big rivers we can.

I will promise that when we come back again to talk about this that we kind of start here so that I can spend some time on realistic expectations for what we can get out of these alternatives.

We are the most creative, innovative society in the world. There is no exhilaration like the exhilaration of meeting and overcoming a big challenge. We have a huge challenge in preparing for this energy future. With proper leadership, I think the United States can really, really become a world leader in this, and Americans will feel better and better about who

we are and what we are doing because we are leading these developments.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SARBANES, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and July 24, 25, and 26.
Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, July 24, 25, and 26.
Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on July 18, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 556. To ensure national security while promoting foreign investment and the creation and maintenance of jobs, to reform the process by which such investments are examined for any effect they may have on national security, to establish the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 23, 2007, at 10:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2588. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pine Shoot Beetle; Additions to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0169] received June 21, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2589. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Black Stem Rust; Addition of Rust-

Resistant Varieties [Docket No. APHIS-2007-0072] received June 21, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2590. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Change in Reporting Requirements [Docket No. AMS-FV-07-0028; FV07-925-1 FR] received June 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2591. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Almonds Grown in California; Outgoing Quality Control Requirements; Correction [Docket No. AMS-FV-06-0169; FV06-981-1C] received June 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2592. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Late Payment and Interest Charges on Past Due Assessments Under the Nectarine and Peach Marketing Orders [Docket No. AMS-FV-07-0012; FV07-916/917-3 FR] received June 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2593. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazelnuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment of Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 2006-2007 Marketing Year [Docket No. AMS-FV-06-0175; FV07-982-1 FIR] received June 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2594. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Onions Grown in South Texas; Change in Regulatory Period [Docket No. AMS-FV-06-0214; FV07-959-1 IFR] received June 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2595. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Emerald Ash Border; Quarantined Areas; Maryland [Docket No. APHIS-2007-0028] received June 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2596. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Regulations Under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act (PACA) To Ensure Trust Protection for Produce Sellers When Using Electronic Invoicing or Other Billing Methods [Docket Number AMS-FV-07-0009; FV05-373] (RIN: 0581-AC53) received June 22, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2597. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 26 CFR 601.204: Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting. (Also Part 1.167, 1.168, 1.446, 1.481; 1.466-1, 1.481-1.) (Rev. Proc. 2007-48) received June 28, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2598. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 26 CFR 1.141-3: Definition of Private Business Use (Also: 103, 141, 145; 1.141-3, 1.145-2) (Rev. Proc. 2007-47) received June 28, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2599. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 411.—Minimum Vesting Standards 26 CFR 1.411(d)-2: Termination or partial

termination; discontinuance of contributions. (Rev. Rul. 2007-43) received June 28, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2600. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Requirement of Return and Time for Filing [TD 9334] (RIN: 1545-BG20) received July 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2601. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 26 CFR 601.202: Closing agreements. (Rev. Proc. 2007-49) received July 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2602. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 83.—Property Transferred in Connection With Performance of Services 26 CFR 1.83-3: Meaning and use of certain terms (Rev. Rul. 2007-49) received July 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2603. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Disclosure Requirements With Respect to Prohibited Tax Shelter Transactions [TD 9335] (RIN: 1545-BG19) received July 6, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MOLLOHAN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 3093. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANTOS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 2798. A bill to reauthorize the programs of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 558. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3074) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-242). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 3094. A bill to establish in the Treasury of the United States a fund which shall be known as the National Park Centennial Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Mr. RENZI):

H.R. 3095. A bill to amend the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 to modify a deadline relating to a certain elec-

tion by Indian tribes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SALI, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 3096. A bill to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 3097. A bill to condition the transfer of personnel and functions from Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, pursuant to the base closure process; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOREN (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Ms. FALLIN):

H.R. 3098. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide certain exemptions to drivers of intrastate commercial motor vehicles engaged in agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 3099. A bill to amend title 10, to permit members of the Selected Reserves and members of the reserve component to reenter their military service and receive chapter 1607 education benefits if that member has earned such benefit before originally separating from service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 3100. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Consumer Product Safety Act to increase the safety of food, toothpaste, and toys; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HODES, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 3101. A bill to amend the Biomass Research and Development Act of 2000 to include heating fuel produced from biomass in the definition of biobased fuel; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ALTIRE):

H.R. 3102. A bill to increase the authorization for the major medical facility project to consolidate the medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs at the University Drive and H. John Heinz III divisions, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. DRAKE:

H.R. 3103. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide partial payment for nursing home care to eligible veterans at a non-Department of Veterans Affairs nursing home of the veteran's choice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. FORTUÑO):

H.R. 3104. A bill to permit each of the territories of the United States to provide and furnish a statue honoring a citizen of the territory to be placed in Statuary Hall in the same manner as statues honoring citizens of the States are placed in Statuary Hall; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FALEOMAVEGA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. HIRONO):

H.R. 3105. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the credit for electricity produced from certain renewable resources and the investment energy credit to include ocean thermal energy conversion projects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. CARSON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BUYER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. VIS-CLOSKY):

H.R. 3106. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 805 Main Street in Ferdinand, Indiana, as the "Staff Sergeant David L. Nord Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HODES (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 3107. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for residential biomass fuel property expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 3108. A bill to require the Comptroller General to address certain questions in connection with the closure of Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, and the transfer of personnel, functions, and activities from Fort Monmouth to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 3109. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow reimbursement from flexible spending accounts for certain dental products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 3110. A bill to provide for the Secretary of Education to study and report on the marketing of foods and beverages in middle and high schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. CAPPs, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. LEE, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 3111. A bill to provide for the administration of Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 3112. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the provision of scientifically sound information and support services to patients receiving a positive test diagnosis for Down syndrome or other prenatally diagnosed conditions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 3113. A bill to clarify congressional intent with respect to the provision of affordable financial services by all types of Federal credit unions in underserved areas, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CARSON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. INSLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 3114. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a commemorative trail in connection with the Women's Rights National Historical Park to link properties that are historically and thematically associated with the struggle for women's suffrage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 3115. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide restrictions on the use of carbon monoxide in meat, poultry, and seafood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 3116. A bill to establish a permanent grant program to improve public safety communications and the interoperability of emergency communications equipment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3117. A bill to provide for the establishment of Federal fleet refueling centers; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3118. A bill to promote the production and use of ethanol; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 3119. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for military operations in Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MACK, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. CASTOR, and Mr. MAHONEY of Florida):

H.R. 3120. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Stranahan House in Broward County, Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 3121. A bill to restore the financial solvency of the national flood insurance program and to provide for such program to

make available multiperil coverage for damage resulting from windstorms and floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of California (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RENZI, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SALLI, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIREs, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H. Res. 557. A resolution strongly condemning the United Nations Human Rights Council for ignoring severe human rights abuses in various countries, while choosing to unfairly target Israel by including it as the only country permanently placed on the Council's agenda; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H. Res. 559. A resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 479) to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for enforcement of clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself,

Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MACK, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BUYER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. SHADEGG):

H. Res. 560. A resolution regarding the recent actions of Hugo Chavez and the Government of Venezuela; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SIREs, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STARK, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of

Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HODES, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. COHEN, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H. Res. 561. A resolution recognizing the 20th anniversary of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and the impact it has made on homelessness and endeavoring to continue working to eliminate homelessness in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

123. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 126 urging the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to enact the Military Death Benefits Improvement Act of 2005; to the Committee on Armed Services.

124. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to a Resolution expressing support of H.R. 392 to establish a quarter dollar coin to honor Puerto Rico and other territories of the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

125. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 85 urging the Congress of the United States to pass the Proposed Employee Free Choice Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

126. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 8011 requesting that the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States work together to raise authorized funding levels of the No Child Left Behind Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

127. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 61 commending the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States for passing the Federal Minimum Wage Act of 2007; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

128. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 127 urging the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to sign the Cameron Gulbransen Kids and Car Safety Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

129. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 07-004 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation preventing the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid from promulgating rules interfering with states' definitions of local units of government; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

130. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take a proactive role in assisting the communities of New Orleans East in protecting their health and safety and promoting economic development; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

131. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 87 urging the Congress of the United States to support efforts, programs, services, and advocacy of organizations, such as the American Stroke Association, that

work to enhance public awareness of childhood stroke; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

132. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 247 requesting that the issuance of visas for family reunification of immigrant relatives be expedited; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

133. Also, a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 5 urging the Congress of the United States to pass the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2007; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources.

134. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 141 urging the Congress of the United States to support legislation authorizing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate lower drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

135. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 11 encouraging the use of biomass in the production of energy in Nevada; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

136. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 119 memorializing the Congress of the United States to vote in favor of H.R. 1229, the "Non-Market Economy Trade Remedy Act of 2007"; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Rules.

137. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 136 urging the Congress of the United States to enact the United States National Health Insurance Act; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Natural Resources.

138. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 100 opposing the federal legislation entitled, "the Fairness in Asbestos Injury Resolution Act of 2005"; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Education and Labor.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 174: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 197: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 253: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 303: Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 333: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 346: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PENCE, Mr. REYES, Mr. WYNN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MURTHA, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 380: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 404: Ms. FOXX.
H.R. 418: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 549: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 552: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. YARMUTH,

Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. POMEROY, and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 601: Mr. SPACE.
H.R. 621: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. McINTYRE, and Mr. LOEBACK.
H.R. 623: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 624: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 643: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 690: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 719: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. SPACE.

H.R. 743: Mr. DREIER and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 820: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 864: Mr. LAHOOD and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 881: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 882: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 900: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 906: Mr. WU and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 969: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1022: Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 1064: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. BOYD of Florida.

H.R. 1070: Mr. SPACE.
H.R. 1076: Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 1077: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1078: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1113: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1125: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 1134: Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 1171: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1193: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1194: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.
H.R. 1211: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1232: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. FARR, Mr. PITTS, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 1237: Mr. ROSS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 1240: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
H.R. 1245: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 1275: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1280: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1282: Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1295: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1308: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1346: Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 1400: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. McNERNEY.

H.R. 1415: Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 1416: Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 1418: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 1419: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 1421: Mr. JINDAL.
H.R. 1459: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. FALLIN.

H.R. 1464: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 1474: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1514: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1524: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 1535: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 1537: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 1552: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 1560: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 1584: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1588: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 1610: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan.

- H.R. 1623: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 1644: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1647: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 1674: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 1713: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1752: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1781: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1783: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1801: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 1813: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 1819: Mr. FORTUÑO.
H.R. 1843: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1845: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 1884: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1927: Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 1933: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. HARE, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1940: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1947: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1967: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 2014: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2015: Mr. WATT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 2016: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2035: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 2045: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 2046: Mr. HONDA, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 2052: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2061: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2063: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2091: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 2110: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 2130: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 2131: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2138: Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 2205: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 2228: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 2231: Mr. McNULTY.
H.R. 2234: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2250: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 2280: Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 2287: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2289: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 2291: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2315: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 2347: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. RENZI, Mr. BARROW, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2365: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 2380: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 2387: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2405: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2407: Ms. CASTOR.
H.R. 2421: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 2473: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 2478: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2484: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2505: Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 2511: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.
H.R. 2522: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2523: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2531: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2564: Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 2566: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2567: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2583: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 2584: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 2585: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 2596: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WATSON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2606: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 2609: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 2620: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2639: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 2659: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 2666: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. STARK, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2677: Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 2698: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 2700: Ms. LEE, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2726: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2747: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 2749: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 2758: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2772: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 2807: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 2818: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. HARE.
H.R. 2819: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. CLAY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2821: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 2828: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. FORTUÑO, Ms. LEE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. WATERS, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 2832: Mr. FILNER and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2834: Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. DEFABIO.
H.R. 2846: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2860: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SPACE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 2868: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 2870: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2885: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 2895: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2902: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2905: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. REHBERG, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2910: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2914: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2925: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 2927: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2928: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 2929: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 2943: Mr. PAUL and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 2958: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2966: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 2991: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 2992: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 3008: Mr. FORTUÑO.
H.R. 3020: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 3024: Mr. COHEN and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 3025: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 3035: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SIREs, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. LEE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. TANNER, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 3046: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 3057: Mr. UPTON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. KIND, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. TANNER.
H.R. 3059: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
H.R. 3061: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3073: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 3077: Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 3086: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 3090: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. SPACE.
H.J. Res. 28: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. CLARKE.
H.J. Res. 39: Mr. KIRK.
H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, and Mr. SPRATT.
H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. UPTON and Mr. WYNN.
H. Con. Res. 138: Mr. MURTHA and Mr. MCHUGH.
H. Con. Res. 156: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RANGEL.
H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. ALEXANDER.
H. Con. Res. 176: Mr. BUYER.
H. Con. Res. 183: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. ISSA.
H. Con. Res. 187: Ms. BEAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PETRI, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
H. Res. 121: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H. Res. 143: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. DELAHUNT.
H. Res. 169: Ms. GIFFORDS.
H. Res. 231: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.
H. Res. 235: Mr. KIRK.
H. Res. 338: Ms. BERKLEY.
H. Res. 345: Mr. SHAYS.
H. Res. 443: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HODES, Mr. HARE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. PAUL, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RENZI, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. FLAKE.
H. Res. 504: Mr. COOPER.
H. Res. 508: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 510: Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 511: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H. Res. 525: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 528: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. HARE.

H. Res. 535: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H. Res. 541: Mr. ANDREWS.

H. Res. 549: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. DUNCAN.

H. Res. 550: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 553: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2116: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

99. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Town of Great Barrington, Massachusetts, relative to a Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to impeach President George W. Bush and Vice President Richard B. Cheney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

100. Also, a petition of the Commission of the City of Lauderhill, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 07R-05-131 urging the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to take any and all action necessary to amend United States Immigration Policy and the unfair treatment of immigrants caused by the current wet foot dry foot policy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

101. Also, a petition of the District Council of County Fermanagh, Northern Ireland, relative to a Notice of Motion supporting the Irish Lobby for Immigration Reform (ILIR) and its campaign to win legal status for the estimated 40,000 plus undocumented Irish living and working in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

102. Also, a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 216 requesting that the Congress of the United States pass S. 519 and H.R. 876, the Securing Adolescents From Exploitation-Online Act of 2207 or the SAFE Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

103. Also, a petition of the Town of Leyden, Massachusetts, relative to a Resolution calling on the Congress of the United States to investigate the charges and vote to impeach President George W. Bush and Richard B. Cheney as provided in the Constitution of

the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

104. Also, a petition of the Delaware County Democratic Committee, New York, relative to a Resolution to impeach President George W. Bush and Vice President Richard B. Cheney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

105. Also, a petition of Mr. Robert F. Zeigler, General Counsel, relative to petitioning the Congress of the United States for the need for a substantial salary for federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

106. Also, a petition of the Town of Stockbridge, Massachusetts, relative to a Resolution calling on the Impeachment of President George W. Bush and Vice President Richard B. Cheney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

107. Also, a petition of the Town of Colrain, Massachusetts, relative to a Resolution calling for the impeachment of President George W. Bush and Vice President Richard B. Cheney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

108. Also, a petition of the Town of Shutesbury, Massachusetts, relative to a petition to impeach President George W. Bush and Vice President Richard B. Cheney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.