

Whereas subsequent to receiving a request for an additional day of hearings by members of the minority party pursuant to rule XI, Representative SENSENBRENNER scheduled such hearing on less than 48 hours notice;

Whereas such hearing occurred on Representative SENSENBRENNER's directive at 8:30 a.m., on Friday, June 10, 2005, a date when the House was not in session and votes were not scheduled;

Whereas Representative SENSENBRENNER directed his staff to require that the witnesses' written testimony be made available on less than 18 hours notice;

Whereas, during the course of the hearing, Representative SENSENBRENNER made several false and disparaging comments about members of the minority party in violation of rule XVII;

Whereas, Representative SENSENBRENNER failed to allow members of the committee to question each witness for a period of 5 minutes in violation of rule XI;

Whereas Representative SENSENBRENNER refused on numerous and repeated occasions throughout the hearing to recognize members of the minority party attempting to raise points of order;

□ 1130

Whereas when Representative NADLER and Representative JACKSON-Lee sought recognition to raise a point of order, Representative SENSENBRENNER refused to recognize Representative NADLER or Representative JACKSON-Lee, and intentionally and wrongfully adjourned the committee without obtaining or seeking either unanimous consent or a vote of the committee members present in violation of rule XVI;

Whereas subsequent to Representative SENSENBRENNER's improper adjournment of the hearing, his staff turned off the microphones and the electronic transmission of the proceedings and instructed the court reporter to stop taking transcription, even though the committee hearing had not been properly adjourned, and members of the minority party had invited witnesses to continue to speak; and

Whereas Representative SENSENBRENNER willfully trampled the right of the minority to meaningfully hold an additional day of hearings in violation of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and brought discredit upon the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That

(1) the House strongly condemns the manner in which Representative SENSENBRENNER has responded to the minority party's request for an additional day of oversight hearings on the reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act, and the manner in which such hearing was conducted; and

(2) the House instructs Representative SENSENBRENNER, in consultation

with Representative CONYERS, to schedule a further day of hearings with witnesses requested by members of the minority party concerning the reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from New York will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2862, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 314 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2862.

□ 1134

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to begin consideration of H.R. 2862, making appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for Science, the Departments of State,

Justice, Commerce, and related agencies. This bill provides funding for programs whose impact ranges from the safety of people in their homes and communities to the conduct of diplomacy around the world, to the farthest reaches of space exploration.

The bill before the House today reflects a delicate balance of needs and requirements. We have drafted what I consider a responsible bill for fiscal year 2006 spending levels for the departments and agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction. We have had to carefully prioritize funding in the bill and make hard choices about how to spend scarce resources.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) for supporting us with a fair allocation and helping us to move the bill forward. I also would like to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), who has been very effective and a valued partner and colleague on this bill. I appreciate his principled commitment and understanding of the programs in the bill.

Also I wanted to thank all members of the subcommittee for their help and assistance; the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ALEXANDER), the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), who used to be the ranking member on the committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), and also the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, I also want at the outset to thank the members of the staff who have worked incredibly hard, as I am sure all subcommittee staff on this committee do on appropriations, but particularly want to thank them publicly. Mike Ringler, the clerk of the subcommittee, who has led the subcommittee through the House appropriations process. Also I want to thank Christine Kojac, John Martens, Anne Marie Goldsmith, Joel Kaplan and Celia Aloavado for their tireless efforts. Their work is very much appreciated. They have done an outstanding job.

In my personal office, I want to thank Dan Scandling, Janet Shaffron, J.T. Griffin, Samantha Stockman and Courtney Schlieter for their efforts and work with the subcommittee.

From the minority staff, I want to thank David Pomerantz, Michelle Burkett, Rob Nabors, Sally Moorhead and Julie Aaronson for their insight and input on the bill.

It has been a good bipartisan effort. Sometimes those things are said, but sometimes there is not a lot of reality to them. But this has been a good bipartisan effort. As in past years, we

have worked in a bipartisan manner to draft this legislation, and I look forward to continuing forward in that spirit.

The bill contains \$57.45 billion in discretionary spending. At a time of fiscal constraint, we have developed a bill that preserves critical domestic and international programs, while living within our allocation. Program increases are focused on the most critical areas, including counterterrorism, law enforcement, security of government employees overseas, as well as science and space programs.

As we know, the budget resolution upon which our allocation is based actually reduces nondefense discretionary funding from last year's level by 0.8 percent. As a result, we have had to make some difficult choices to focus limited resources on programs that are most critical to the Nation.

The bill continues the progress we have made in the fight against terrorism and crime. We have tried our best to establish strong funding levels for NASA and the National Service Foundation (NSF), the agencies that are new to our jurisdiction. At the same time, the bill also reflects our commitment to responsible stewardship of public funds.

For the Department of Justice, the bill includes \$21.45 billion, \$1.1 billion above the request, to restore needed funds for State and local crime-fighting to keep our streets safe. The bill also includes significant increases for Federal law enforcement for both terrorism prevention and traditional law enforcement and drug enforcement.

The bill focuses funding on fighting the growth of gangs and reducing gang violence. We have continued and enhanced FBI and ATF antigang programs and restored funding to the gang resistance training programs. In addition, we have created a new \$60 million gang program that will allow each U.S. Attorney's office, working with local officials, to fund antigang strategies in cooperation with those in State and local government.

The bill also includes \$5.76 billion for the FBI to provide enhanced training and information technology management, and to provide additional agents, analysts and translators to improve counterterrorism and counterintelligence capabilities, while continuing the fight on white-collar crime and gang violence.

We maintained the commitment to fighting illegal drug activities with \$1.7 billion for the DEA, slightly above the request, to restore proposed reductions in assistance to State and local law enforcement, Mobile Enforcement Teams and Demand Reduction, and to fully fund the effort to combat heroin production in Afghanistan.

The bill also includes \$2.59 billion for improving State and local law enforcement crime-fighting programs, restoring \$1 billion above the request to the highest-priority programs. We have restored \$1 billion.

I heard the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) talking earlier during debate on the rule, and I agree with what the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) said. Why would the administration have ever zeroed this out? But we have restored \$1 billion above the request for the highest-priority programs, including SCAAP, Justice Assistance Grants and Juvenile Justice programs, all which the administration proposed to eliminate or drastically reduce.

For the Department of Commerce and related trade agencies, the bill includes \$5.83 billion, a decrease of \$831 million below 2005. We have not adopted the President's proposal for a new consolidated community development program, which explains why we are so far below the request for Commerce.

As we did last year, the overall funding levels for the trade agencies, USTR, ITA and ITC, is above the request; it is higher than the administration asked for.

I just cannot understand why this administration is not bringing an intellectual property case with regard to China. We gave them all of the resources last year and are giving them all of the resources this year. If they do not move this year, I do not know what we can do. Hopefully, with Rob Portman down there, they will move.

This will empower them to negotiate, verify and enforce trade agreements that are free and fair, and ensure an even playing field for American businesses.

For NIST, we have provided \$19 million above the current year level for the core science programs, focusing on national security standards and nanomanufacturing.

To further bolster our manufacturing sector, the bill includes \$106 million for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program, an increase of \$59 million. Members from both sides of the aisle spoke to us on numerous occasions about that.

The bill makes some cuts for the NOAA budget, eliminating lower-priority programs and projects. The critical function of the National Weather Service and NOAA's satellite programs are funded above the request, and funding is continued for critical ocean and fisheries programs.

The bill includes \$1.7 billion, a 10 percent increase, for the PTO, and equal to the amount they expect to collect in fees. A strong patent and trademark system is essential to protect our intellectual property and maintain innovation in the economy.

Finally under Commerce, we provide an increase of \$87 million to support the ramp-up to the 2010 decennial census, including full funding for the American Community Survey.

For NASA, the bill ensures that the President's vision for space exploration is adequately funded at \$3.1 billion, while at the same time restoring the aeronautics research program to the enacted level of \$906 million, and pro-

viding \$40 million over the request to partially restore NASA's science programs.

The space shuttle program is funded at the request to ensure that all shuttle safety issues are being fully funded. In coordination with the Committee on Science and the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT), new legislative language is included in the bill directing the President to develop a national aeronautics policy to be submitted with the fiscal year 2007 budget.

Boeing is dropped in production and share of the market. Ten years ago they had 65 percent of the market, now they are down to 48 to 49. Frankly, without an aeronautical policy, that will continue to drop. That language, working with the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), is in here.

For the NSF, we are providing an increase of \$171 million over last year, \$38 million above the request. People say we are falling behind in math, science, physics, chemistry and biology, and we are trying to do everything we can to reverse that. Also I have sent a letter to the administration asking that they triple the funding next year, taking from other areas, but triple the funding on R&D so this country does not lose its competitive edge.

This includes a 3.7 percent increase for basic research funding, \$44 million above the request. And for science education we have included \$807 million, which is \$70 million above the request. Science is the engine of our competitiveness, and I have encouraged the President to substantially increase our investment in basic research and science education in the 2007 budget.

For the State Department and Broadcasting Board of Governors, the bill includes \$9.53 billion, a decrease of \$1.1 billion below 2005, and \$273 million below the request.

Within this total we are providing \$1.5 billion, the full request, for worldwide security improvements and replacement of vulnerable facilities and funding to support 55 new positions to support security readiness.

Look at the security that this Capitol Building has. Look at the security that many other Federal buildings have. To say that we are going to send Federal employees abroad and not protect them, we remember the bombing in Tanzania and the bombing in Kenya, so we fully make sure that is funded.

We are providing 100 new positions for high-priority diplomatic requirements, including in the areas of fighting terrorist financing, nonproliferation of WMD and for new critical language needs related to the Global War on Terror.

We continue to strongly support public diplomacy improvements, including significant increases for information programs, international broadcasting and international exchange programs, particularly with the Arab and Muslim world.

□ 1145

We have included the requested funds for international peacekeeping to pay

the assessed costs for missions in Sudan. I think this administration has done a good job in Sudan. More should be done in Darfur, and Under Secretary Zoellick has been to Darfur now twice. But this money for peacekeeping in Sudan will have a major impact on what is taking place in Darfur; also, in Haiti, Liberia and elsewhere.

We have attached to this funding new language requiring notification to the committee that prevention and prosecution measures are in place to ensure zero tolerance of sexual abuse in peacekeeping missions. If you read the report on the peacekeeping abuses, sexual abuse by U.N. peacekeepers in the Congo, it will make you sick. So this language deals with notification to the committee, and prevention and prosecution measures are in place for the zero, zero tolerance of sexual abuse in peacekeeping missions.

We also include new language supporting the maintenance of a flat U.N. budget. We also require the State De-

partment to keep the committee informed of any changes in the U.N. budget.

There is a lot of interest, Mr. Chairman, in the U.N. and, as many of my colleagues know, last year in our bill, we created a United Nations Task Force to make recommendations for U.S. Government action to reform the U.N. and ensure the U.N. fulfills its charter purposes. The task force is chaired by Senator Mitchell and Speaker Gingrich. Their recommendations are coming to the committee later this week, and we will look closely at their recommendations and do everything we can to advance them, and we would urge the administration and everyone in Congress to do everything that they can to advance their recommendations made by Speaker Gingrich and Majority Leader Mitchell.

The bill again fully funds the Federal Trade Commission Do-Not-Call program, and fully funds the request for the SEC to protect American investors.

For the SBA, the bill provides full requested funding for Small Business Development Centers. We restored \$11 million for the Microloan program, which the President proposed to terminate. For business loan programs, the bill allows for \$16.5 billion in general business loans, an unprecedented program level, while requiring no appropriation.

In closing, this is a summary of the bill. It provides increases where needed to maintain and strengthen the operations of critical law enforcement and other agencies. It gives no ground in the fight against terrorism, crime, and drugs, and restores desperately needed resources for State and local law enforcement personnel.

It represents our best take on matching needs with scarce resources. We have tried very hard to produce the best bill we could within the resources that we had to work with, and I urge all Members to support the bill.

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
General Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	122,443	161,407	89,906	-32,537	-71,501
Office of Intelligence and Policy Review.....	---	---	37,050	+37,050	+37,050
Subtotal.....	122,443	161,407	126,956	+4,513	-34,451
Joint automated booking system.....	19,915	---	---	-19,915	---
Automated Biometric Identification System-Integrated Identification system integration.....	4,987	---	---	-4,987	---
Justice information sharing technology.....	---	181,490	135,000	+135,000	-46,490
Legal activities office automation.....	39,969	---	---	-39,969	---
Narrowband communications.....	98,664	128,701	110,000	+11,336	-18,701
Administrative review and appeals.....	201,241	216,286	215,685	+14,444	-601
Detention trustee.....	874,160	1,222,000	1,222,000	+347,840	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	184,000	---	---	-184,000	---
Office of Inspector General.....	62,960	67,431	66,801	+3,841	-630
Total, General administration.....	1,608,339	1,977,315	1,876,442	+268,103	-100,873
United States Parole Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	10,496	11,300	11,200	+704	-100
Legal Activities					
General legal activities:					
Direct appropriation.....	625,722	679,661	665,821	+40,099	-13,840
Vaccine injury compensation trust fund (permanent)....	6,249	6,333	6,333	+84	---
Antitrust Division.....	138,259	144,451	144,451	+6,192	---
Offsetting fee collections - current year.....	-101,000	-116,000	-116,000	-15,000	---
Direct appropriation.....	37,259	28,451	28,451	-8,808	---
United States Attorneys					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,526,849	1,626,146	1,626,146	+99,297	---
United States Trustee System Fund.....	173,602	185,402	214,402	+40,800	+29,000
Offsetting fee collections.....	-168,602	-180,402	-209,402	-40,800	-29,000
Interest on U.S. securities.....	-5,000	-5,000	-5,000	---	---
Direct appropriation.....	---	---	---	---	---
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	1,203	1,270	1,220	+17	-50
United States Marshals Service:					
Salaries and expenses (non-CSE).....	741,941	790,255	800,255	+58,314	+10,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	11,935	---	---	-11,935	---
Construction.....	5,657	---	---	-5,657	---
Total, United States Marshals Service.....	759,533	790,255	800,255	+40,722	+10,000
Fees and expenses of witnesses.....	177,585	168,000	168,000	-9,585	---
Community Relations Service.....	9,535	9,759	9,659	+124	-100
Assets forfeiture fund.....	21,469	21,468	21,468	-1	---
Payment to radiation exposure compensation trust fund.....	27,429	---	---	-27,429	---
Total, Legal activities.....	3,192,833	3,331,343	3,327,353	+134,520	-3,990
Interagency Law Enforcement					
Interagency crime and drug enforcement.....	553,539	661,940	506,940	-46,599	-155,000

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal Bureau of Investigation					
Salaries and expenses.....	4,132,090	4,091,132	3,452,235	-679,855	-638,897
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	73,991	---	---	-73,991	---
Counterintelligence and national security.....	1,003,416	1,600,000	2,288,897	+1,285,481	+688,897
Direct appropriation.....	5,209,497	5,691,132	5,741,132	+531,635	+50,000
Construction.....	10,106	10,105	20,105	+9,999	+10,000
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	5,219,603	5,701,237	5,761,237	+541,634	+60,000
Drug Enforcement Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,785,398	1,892,722	1,907,846	+122,448	+15,124
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	7,648	---	---	-7,648	---
Diversion control fund.....	-154,216	-198,566	-201,673	-47,457	-3,107
Total, Drug Enforcement Administration.....	1,638,830	1,694,156	1,706,173	+67,343	+12,017
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms					
Salaries and expenses.....	878,465	803,613	923,613	+45,148	+120,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---
Legislative proposal.....	---	120,000	---	---	-120,000
Total, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms..	882,465	923,613	923,613	+41,148	---
Federal Prison System					
Salaries and expenses.....	4,565,884	4,895,649	4,895,649	+329,765	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	5,500	---	---	-5,500	---
Buildings and facilities.....	186,475	170,112	70,112	-116,363	-100,000
Rescission.....	---	-314,000	---	---	+314,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	18,600	---	---	-18,600	---
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (limitation on administrative expenses).....	3,366	3,365	3,365	-1	---
Total, Federal Prison System.....	4,779,825	4,755,126	4,969,126	+189,301	+214,000
Violence against women office.....	382,103	362,997	387,497	+5,394	+24,500
Office of Justice Programs					
Justice assistance.....	224,856	1,234,977	227,466	+2,610	-1,007,511
Rescission.....	---	-95,500	---	---	+95,500
Public safety officers benefits, death benefits...	---	64,000	---	---	-64,000
Total, Justice assistance.....	224,856	1,203,477	227,466	+2,610	-976,011
State and local law enforcement assistance:					
Justice assistance grants.....	625,531	---	348,466	-277,065	+348,466
Boys and Girls clubs (earmark).....	(83,865)	---	(85,000)	(+1,135)	(+85,000)
National Institute of Justice (earmark).....	(9,866)	---	(10,000)	(+134)	(+10,000)
USA FREEDOM corps (earmark).....	(2,467)	---	---	(-2,467)	---
Indian assistance.....	17,760	---	---	-17,760	---
Tribal prison construction.....	(4,933)	---	---	(-4,933)	---
Indian tribal courts program.....	(7,893)	---	---	(-7,893)	---
Indian grants.....	(4,933)	---	---	(-4,933)	---
State criminal alien assistance program.....	300,926	---	355,000	+54,074	+355,000
Southwest border prosecutors.....	29,599	---	30,000	+401	+30,000
Byrne grants (discretionary).....	167,756	---	110,000	-57,756	+110,000
Drug courts.....	39,466	---	40,000	+534	+40,000
Other crime control programs.....	5,903	---	871	-5,032	+871
Assistance for victims of trafficking.....	9,866	---	10,000	+134	+10,000
Prescription drug monitoring.....	9,866	---	10,000	+134	+10,000
Prison rape prevention.....	36,506	---	40,000	+3,494	+40,000
State prison drug treatment.....	24,666	---	25,000	+334	+25,000
Intelligence sharing.....	10,359	---	10,359	---	+10,359

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Cannabis eradication.....	---	---	11,600	+11,600	+11,600
Capital litigation.....	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Total, State and local law enforcement.....	1,278,204	---	1,001,296	-276,908	+1,001,296
Weed and seed program fund.....	61,172	---	50,000	-11,172	+50,000
Community oriented policing services:					
Hiring.....	9,866	---	---	-9,866	---
Training and technical assistance.....	14,800	7,000	---	-14,800	-7,000
Bullet proof vests.....	24,666	---	30,000	+5,334	+30,000
Tribal law enforcement.....	19,733	51,600	38,000	+18,267	-13,600
Meth hot spots.....	51,854	20,000	60,000	+8,146	+40,000
Police corps.....	14,800	---	---	-14,800	---
COPS technology.....	136,763	---	120,000	-16,763	+120,000
Interoperable communications.....	98,664	---	---	-98,664	---
Criminal records upgrade.....	24,666	---	25,000	+334	+25,000
DNA backlog/crime lab.....	108,531	---	177,057	+68,526	+177,057
Paul Coverdell forensics science.....	14,800	---	---	-14,800	---
Crime identification technology.....	28,070	---	---	-28,070	---
Offender reentry.....	9,866	---	10,000	+134	+10,000
Safe schools initiative.....	4,268	---	---	-4,268	---
Police integrity grants.....	7,400	10,000	---	-7,400	-10,000
Reduce gang violence.....	---	---	60,000	+60,000	+60,000
Management and administration.....	29,599	29,181	---	-29,599	-29,181
Rescission.....	---	-115,500	---	---	+115,500
Total, Community oriented policing services.....	598,346	2,281	520,057	-78,289	+517,776
Juvenile justice programs.....	379,045	---	333,712	-45,333	+333,712
Public safety officers benefits:					
Death benefits.....	63,054	---	64,000	+946	+64,000
Disability and education benefits.....	6,324	---	8,948	+2,624	+8,948
Total, Public safety officers benefits program..	69,378	---	72,948	+3,570	+72,948
Total, Office of Justice Programs.....	2,611,001	1,205,758	2,205,479	-405,522	+999,721
United States Attorneys (Sec. 107).....	14,800	---	---	-14,800	---
Assets forfeiture fund (sec. 109) (rescission).....	---	-62,000	---	---	+62,000
Total, title I, Department of Justice.....	20,893,834	20,562,785	21,675,060	+781,226	+1,112,275
Appropriations.....	(20,588,160)	(21,149,785)	(21,675,060)	(+1,086,900)	(+525,275)
Rescissions.....	---	(-587,000)	---	---	(+587,000)
Emergency appropriations.....	(305,674)	---	---	(-305,674)	---
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES					
TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT					
RELATED AGENCIES					
Office of the United States Trade Representative					
Salaries and expenses.....	40,997	38,779	44,779	+3,782	+6,000
National Intellectual Property Law Enforcement Coordinating Council					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,973	---	---	-1,973	---
International Trade Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	60,876	65,278	62,752	+1,876	-2,526
Total, Related agencies.....	103,846	104,057	107,531	+3,685	+3,474

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
International Trade Administration					
Operations and administration.....	396,257	408,925	406,925	+10,668	-2,000
Offsetting fee collections.....	-8,000	-13,000	-13,000	-5,000	---
Direct appropriation.....	388,257	395,925	393,925	+5,668	-2,000
Bureau of Industry and Security					
Operations and administration.....	60,376	77,000	62,233	+1,857	-14,767
CWC enforcement.....	7,104	---	14,767	+7,663	+14,767
Total, Bureau of Industry and Security.....	67,480	77,000	77,000	+9,520	---
Economic Development Administration					
Economic development assistance programs.....	253,985	---	200,985	-53,000	+200,985
Salaries and expenses.....	30,075	26,584	26,584	-3,491	---
Total, Economic Development Administration.....	284,060	26,584	227,569	-56,491	+200,985
Economic Development Challenge					
Strengthening America's Communities grant program (legislative proposal).....	---	3,710,000	---	---	-3,710,000
Minority Business Development Agency					
Minority business development.....	29,500	30,727	30,024	+524	-703
Total, Trade and Infrastructure Development.....	873,143	4,344,293	836,049	-37,094	-3,508,244
ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE					
Economic and Statistical Analysis					
Salaries and expenses.....	78,931	85,277	80,304	+1,373	-4,973
Bureau of the Census					
Salaries and expenses.....	196,110	220,029	208,029	+11,919	-12,000
Periodic censuses and programs.....	548,688	657,356	624,208	+75,520	-33,148
Total, Bureau of the Census.....	744,798	877,385	832,237	+87,439	-45,148
National Telecommunications and Information Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	17,200	21,450	17,716	+516	-3,734
Public telecommunications facilities, planning and construction.....	21,478	2,000	2,000	-19,478	---
Total, National Telecommunications and Information Administration.....	38,678	23,450	19,716	-18,962	-3,734
United States Patent and Trademark Office					
Current year fee funding.....	1,336,000	1,703,300	1,703,300	+367,300	---
Spending from new fees (proposed legislation).....	208,754	---	---	-208,754	---
Total, Patent and Trademark Office.....	1,544,754	1,703,300	1,703,300	+158,546	---
Offsetting fee collections.....	-1,336,000	-1,703,300	-1,703,300	-367,300	---
Total, Economic and Information Infrastructure..	1,071,161	986,112	932,257	-138,904	-53,855

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY					
Technology Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	6,460	4,200	6,460	---	+2,260
National Institute of Standards and Technology					
Scientific and technical research and services.....	378,764	426,267	397,744	+18,980	-28,523
(Transfer out).....	---	(-9,000)	(-1,000)	(-1,000)	(+8,000)
Manufacturing extension partnerships.....	247,943	46,800	106,000	-141,943	+59,200
Construction of research facilities.....	72,518	58,898	45,000	-27,518	-13,898
Working capital fund (by transfer).....	---	(9,000)	(1,000)	(+1,000)	(-8,000)
Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology.....	699,225	531,965	548,744	-150,481	+16,779
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration					
Operations, research, and facilities.....	2,766,612	2,528,168	2,444,000	-322,612	-84,168
(By transfer from Promote and Develop Fund).....	(65,000)	(77,000)	(77,000)	(+12,000)	---
By transfer from Coastal zone management.....	2,960	3,000	3,000	+40	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	16,900	---	---	-16,900	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	7,070	---	---	-7,070	---
Total, Operations, research, and facilities.....	2,793,542	2,531,168	2,447,000	-346,542	-84,168
Procurement, acquisition and construction.....	1,039,365	965,051	936,000	-103,365	-29,051
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	3,800	---	---	-3,800	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	10,170	---	---	-10,170	---
Total, Procurement, acquisition and construction	1,053,335	965,051	936,000	-117,335	-29,051
Pacific coastal salmon recovery.....	88,798	90,000	50,000	-38,798	-40,000
Coastal zone management fund.....	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	---	---
Fishermen's contingency fund.....	492	---	---	-492	---
Fisheries finance program account.....	-8,000	-2,000	-1,000	+7,000	+1,000
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.....	3,925,167	3,581,219	3,429,000	-496,167	-152,219
Total, Science and Technology.....	4,630,852	4,117,384	3,984,204	-646,648	-133,180
OTHER					
Departmental Management					
Salaries and expenses.....	47,466	53,532	47,466	---	-6,066
Travel and tourism.....	9,866	---	---	-9,866	---
HCHB renovation and modernization.....	---	30,000	---	---	-30,000
Office of Inspector General.....	21,371	22,758	22,758	+1,387	---
Total, Departmental management.....	78,703	106,290	70,224	-8,479	-36,066
Florida grouper (sec. 218).....	345	---	---	-345	---
Total, Department of Commerce.....	6,550,358	9,450,022	5,715,203	-835,155	-3,734,819
Total, title II, Department of Commerce and related agencies.....	6,654,204	9,554,079	5,822,734	-831,470	-3,731,345
Appropriations.....	(6,616,264)	(9,554,079)	(5,822,734)	(-793,530)	(-3,731,345)
Emergency appropriations.....	(37,940)	---	---	(-37,940)	---
(By transfer).....	(65,000)	(86,000)	(78,000)	(+13,000)	(-8,000)
(Transfer out).....	---	(-9,000)	(-1,000)	(-1,000)	(+8,000)

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III - SCIENCE					
Executive Office of the President					
Office of Science and Technology Policy.....	6,328	5,564	5,564	-764	---
National Aeronautics and Space Administration					
Science, aeronautics and exploration.....	9,334,700	9,661,000	9,725,750	+391,050	+64,750
Emergency appropriations (P.L.108-324).....	126,000	---	---	-126,000	---
Exploration capabilities.....	6,704,400	6,763,000	6,712,900	+8,500	-50,100
Office of Inspector General.....	31,300	32,400	32,400	+1,100	---
Total, NASA.....	16,196,400	16,456,400	16,471,050	+274,650	+14,650
National Science Foundation					
Research and related activities (non-defense).....	4,153,100	4,265,970	4,310,000	+156,900	+44,030
Defense function.....	67,456	67,520	67,520	+64	---
Major research equipment and facilities construction..	173,650	250,010	193,350	+19,700	-56,660
Education and human resources.....	841,421	737,000	807,000	-34,421	+70,000
Salaries and expenses.....	223,200	269,000	250,000	+26,800	-19,000
National Science Board.....	3,968	4,000	4,000	+32	---
Office of Inspector General.....	10,029	11,500	11,500	+1,471	---
Total, National Science Foundation.....	5,472,824	5,605,000	5,643,370	+170,546	+38,370
Total, title III, Science.....	21,675,552	22,066,964	22,119,984	+444,432	+53,020
TITLE IV - DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY					
DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
Administration of Foreign Affairs					
Diplomatic and consular programs.....	3,522,316	3,783,118	3,747,118	+224,802	-36,000
(Transfer out).....	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	---	---
Worldwide security upgrades.....	649,904	689,523	689,523	+39,619	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	734,000	---	---	-734,000	---
Total, Diplomatic and consular programs.....	4,906,220	4,472,641	4,436,641	-469,579	-36,000
Capital investment fund.....	51,452	133,000	128,263	+76,811	-4,737
Centralized IT modernization program.....	76,812	---	---	-76,812	---
Office of Inspector General.....	30,029	29,983	29,983	-46	---
Educational and cultural exchange programs.....	355,932	430,400	410,400	+54,468	-20,000
Representation allowances.....	8,524	8,281	8,281	-243	---
Protection of foreign missions and officials.....	9,762	9,390	9,390	-372	---
Embassy security, construction, and maintenance.....	603,510	615,800	603,510	---	-12,290
Worldwide security upgrades.....	900,134	910,200	910,200	+10,066	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	592,000	---	---	-592,000	---
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service....	987	13,643	10,000	+9,013	-3,643
(By transfer).....	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	---	---
(Transfer out).....	---	(-1,000)	(-1,000)	(-1,000)	---
Repatriation Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy.....	604	712	712	+108	---
Administrative expenses.....	599	607	607	+8	---
(By transfer).....	---	(1,000)	(1,000)	(+1,000)	---
Total, Repatriation loans program account.....	1,203	1,319	1,319	+116	---
Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan.....	19,222	19,751	19,751	+529	---
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund.....	132,600	131,700	131,700	-900	---
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs.....	7,688,387	6,776,108	6,699,438	-988,949	-76,670

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
International Organizations					
Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment.....	1,166,212	1,296,500	1,166,212	---	-130,288
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year.....	483,455	1,035,500	1,035,500	+552,045	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	680,000	---	---	-680,000	---
Total, International Organizations and Conferences.....	2,329,667	2,332,000	2,201,712	-127,955	-130,288
International Commissions					
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:					
Salaries and expenses.....	26,880	28,700	27,000	+120	-1,700
Construction.....	5,239	6,600	5,300	+61	-1,300
American sections, international commissions.....	9,466	9,879	9,500	+34	-379
International fisheries commissions.....	21,688	25,123	22,000	+312	-3,123
Total, International commissions.....	63,273	70,302	63,800	+527	-6,502
Other					
Payment to the Asia Foundation.....	12,827	10,000	10,000	-2,827	---
International Center for Middle Eastern-Western dialogue.....	6,906	1,000	---	-6,906	-1,000
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship program.....	493	500	500	+7	---
Additional funding (Sec. 122 Div. J).....	992	---	---	-992	---
Israeli Arab scholarship program.....	370	375	375	+5	---
East-West Center.....	19,240	13,024	6,000	-13,240	-7,024
National Endowment for Democracy.....	59,199	80,000	50,000	-9,199	-30,000
Total, Department of State.....	10,181,354	9,283,309	9,031,825	-1,149,529	-251,484
RELATED AGENCY					
Broadcasting Board of Governors					
International Broadcasting Operations.....	583,107	603,394	620,000	+36,893	+16,606
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	4,800	---	---	-4,800	---
Broadcasting to Cuba.....	---	37,656	---	---	-37,656
Broadcasting capital improvements.....	8,446	10,893	10,893	+2,447	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13).....	2,500	---	---	-2,500	---
Total, Broadcasting Board of Governors.....	598,853	651,943	630,893	+32,040	-21,050
Total, title IV, Department of State and Related Agency.....	10,780,207	9,935,252	9,662,718	-1,117,489	-272,534
Appropriations.....	(8,766,907)	(9,935,252)	(9,662,718)	(+895,811)	(-272,534)
Emergency appropriations.....	(2,013,300)	---	---	(-2,013,300)	---
(Transfer out).....	(-4,000)	(-5,000)	(-5,000)	(-1,000)	---
(By transfer).....	(4,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(+1,000)	---
TITLE V - RELATED AGENCIES					
Antitrust Modernization Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,172	1,620	1,172	---	-448
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad					
Salaries and expenses.....	492	499	499	+7	---
Commission on Civil Rights					
Salaries and expenses.....	8,975	9,096	9,096	+121	---

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Commission on International Religious Freedom					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,960	3,000	3,200	+240	+200
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,806	2,030	2,030	+224	---
Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,875	1,900	1,900	+25	---
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	326,803	331,228	331,228	+4,425	---
Federal Communications Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	281,085	304,057	289,771	+8,686	-14,286
Offsetting fee collections - current year.....	-280,098	-299,234	-288,771	-8,673	+10,463
Direct appropriation.....	987	4,823	1,000	+13	-3,823
Federal Trade Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	204,327	211,000	211,000	+6,673	---
Offsetting fee collections - current year.....	-101,000	-116,000	-116,000	-15,000	---
Offsetting fee collections, telephone database....	-21,901	-23,000	-23,000	-1,099	---
Direct appropriation.....	81,426	72,000	72,000	-9,426	---
HELP Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	987	1,000	1,000	+13	---
Legal Services Corporation					
Payment to the Legal Services Corporation.....	330,803	318,250	330,803	---	+12,553
Marine Mammal Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,865	1,925	1,865	---	-60
National Veterans Business Development Corporation					
National Veterans Business Development Corporation....	1,973	---	---	-1,973	---
Securities and Exchange Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	913,000	888,117	888,117	-24,883	---
Prior year unobligated balances.....	-57,000	-25,000	-25,000	+32,000	---
Direct appropriation.....	856,000	863,117	863,117	+7,117	---
Small Business Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	318,029	307,159	318,029	---	+10,870
Office of Inspector General.....	12,840	14,500	13,500	+660	-1,000
Surety bond guarantees revolving fund.....	2,861	3,000	2,861	---	-139
Business Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy.....	1,435	---	1,000	-435	+1,000
Administrative expenses.....	124,961	129,000	124,961	---	-4,039
Total, Business loans program account.....	126,396	129,000	125,961	-435	-3,039

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Disaster Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy.....	---	83,335	79,538	+79,538	-3,797
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	501,000	---	---	-501,000	---
Administrative expenses.....	111,648	56,000	49,716	-61,932	-6,284
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	428,000	---	---	-428,000	---
Total, Disaster loans program account.....	1,040,648	139,335	129,254	-911,394	-10,081
Total, Small Business Administration.....	1,500,774	592,994	589,605	-911,169	-3,389
State Justice Institute					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,578	---	2,000	-578	+2,000
United States - China Economic and Security Review Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,960	4,000	4,000	+1,040	---
United States Senate-China Interparliamentary Group					
Salaries and expenses.....	98	---	---	-98	---
United States Institute of Peace					
Operating expenses.....	22,693	21,850	22,850	+157	+1,000
Additional funding (Sec. 122 Div. J).....	99,200	---	---	-99,200	---
Total, United States Institute of Peace.....	121,893	21,850	22,850	-99,043	+1,000
Total, title V, Related agencies.....	3,246,427	2,229,332	2,237,365	-1,009,062	+8,033
TITLE VII - RESCISSIONS					
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
General Administration					
Working capital fund (rescission).....	-60,000	---	---	+60,000	---
Legal Activities					
Assets forfeiture fund (rescission).....	-61,800	---	-62,000	-200	-62,000
Rescission (P.L. 109-13).....	-40,000	---	---	+40,000	---
Office of Justice Programs					
Justice assistance (rescission).....	-1,619	---	---	+1,619	---
State & local law enforcement assistance (rescission).....	-29,380	---	-38,500	-9,120	-38,500
Community oriented policing services (rescission).....	-99,000	---	-86,500	+12,500	-86,500
Juvenile justice programs (rescission).....	-3,500	---	---	+3,500	---
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
National Institute of Standards and Technology					
Industrial technology services (rescission).....	-3,900	---	---	+3,900	---
Departmental Management					
Emergency steel guaranteed loan program account (rescission).....	---	-50,168	-35,000	-35,000	+15,168

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

RELATED AGENCIES					
Federal Communications Commission					
Salaries and expenses (rescission).....	-12,000	---	---	+12,000	---
U.S. - Canada Alaska Railroad Commission					
Salaries and expenses (rescission).....	---	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	---
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Total, title VII, Rescissions.....	-311,199	-52,168	-224,000	+87,199	-171,832
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	62,939,025	64,296,244	61,293,861	-1,645,164	-3,002,383
Appropriations.....	(59,838,310)	(64,935,412)	(61,517,861)	(+1,679,551)	(-3,417,551)
Emergency appropriations.....	(3,411,914)	---	---	(-3,411,914)	---
Rescissions.....	(-311,199)	(-639,168)	(-224,000)	(+87,199)	(+415,168)
(Transfer out).....	(-4,000)	(-14,000)	(-6,000)	(-2,000)	(+8,000)
(By transfer).....	(69,000)	(91,000)	(83,000)	(+14,000)	(-8,000)
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the chairman has put together a good bill for us this year in the face of some really large reductions and legislative proposals that were contained in the President's budget request. He has crafted a bipartisan bill, and, during the process, the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) took into consideration all concerns that the minority expressed. He has been as accommodating in that process as he could be within the allocation that this committee was given, and the minority, Mr. Chairman, are really appreciative of that. He has done an excellent job, and his staff, likewise, has worked cooperatively with the minority genuinely to craft this bill.

Our allocation for the Science, State, Justice and Commerce bill, as the chairman indicated, is \$57.45 billion, an increase of 2.1 percent from the fiscal year 2005 enacted level, but a decrease from the President's fiscal year 2005 request. It certainly sounds like a lot of money, but this year's increase does not keep pace with inflation, and it is not adequate to meet the varied needs of the important Federal agencies contained in this bill.

I am concerned that when we look at funding trends for these crucial programs over time, we are systematically reducing the Federal investments in our communities. For example, the chairman has restored about \$1 billion over the President's cuts to the State and local law enforcement, but the bill is still about \$400 million below last year's level. Now, that is a crucial fact. As we face terrorism, as we continue to fight crime, as we have been successful with it over the last 10 years in large part because of the Federal contribution to State and local levels, this is no time to back off of this support; but this bill is \$400 million below last year's level for support to State and local law enforcement.

Mr. Chairman, the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), went before the Committee on Rules. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) asked to be made in order an amendment to restore some of this funding and to have an offset, that would have been particularly appropriate, to offset just a small part of the tax cut that the most wealthy 1 percent in this country have received over the last 4 and 5 years, to support State and local law enforcement. I cannot think of a worthier program to support, a more important program to support in this time of national emergency and terrorist threats, and I cannot think of a more fair offset from a percentage of our population, the most wealthy, who have enjoyed the benefit of the tax cuts greater than anyone else in our country. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is going to offer an amend-

ment on the floor to address this issue, and I would hope that there would not be an objection against it.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) has also restored \$200 million to the Economic Development Administration's grant program. This was eliminated in the President's proposal. However, that restoration of \$200 million is approximately two-thirds of last year's enacted amount for an extremely important program, the Economic Development Administration grants. They help the most needy communities in our Nation, and that is an area that did not need to be cut in the President's request, and we appreciate the chairman restoring it partially.

Smaller programs that are important to our States and our local communities were also zeroed out in the President's budget and could not be restored. The Public Telecommunications Facilities and Planning Account, the Advanced Technology program, and the SBA Prime program were not funded.

The President has also proposed zeroing out the Steel Loan Guarantee program. And I very much appreciate the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) restoring \$15 million to the Steel Loan Guarantee program so that we can argue in conference for this valuable program, which has been so important to significant steel producers in the past.

For some agencies, this bill is a mix of good news and bad news. In the Department of Commerce, the President's so-called Strengthening America's Communities proposal was rejected, and some funding was restored to EDA, but we were not able to include requested funding for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for construction of new facilities. In the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, funding was increased for the National Environmental Satellite Data and Information Service, but the National Marine Fisheries and the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery program are both reduced.

The National Science Foundation overall fares well. The cuts this agency faced last year have been restored, and this bill provides \$170 million more than last year's enacted level. But within the Education and Human Resources Directorate, many of the education programs are flat-funded, including EPSCOR, Informal Science, Advanced Technology Education, and Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

NASA, Mr. Chairman, is funded slightly above the President's request. The Space Shuttle's Return to Flight is fully funded, and the chairman has restored aeronautics funding to last year's level, and has increased the Science Accounts to \$40 million. However, I am concerned that crucial science and aeronautics programs are being reduced, deferred, and ultimately will wither. The Science Account, in-

cluding programs such as Solar System Exploration, Universe Exploration, and the Earth Sun System would receive less than a 1 percent increase over this budget proposal; yet the most recent successes have come from this program.

The clear winner in this bill is Federal law enforcement. The FBI received \$50 million above the President's request, including funding for drug agents that the President proposed to transfer into organized crime and drug enforcement task forces. DEA and the Marshal Service are both funded above the President's request.

The bill rejects the President's proposal to tax the explosives industry by adding new fees, and rejects the proposal to transfer the High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Area, the HIDTA program, into the Department of Justice from ONDCP. We certainly can have a discussion on the merits of locating a program in one agency versus another, but, in this instance, when the HIDTA coordination efforts are going well, I think we can all agree that the program should be fully funded wherever it is located. I hope the Subcommittee on Transportation, Treasury, HUD, The Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies is looking at this issue as they prepare their bill.

The bill before us overcomes many deficits in the President's budget, but, over the long term, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that the constraints placed on the Committee on Appropriations through the budget resolution are continuing the systemic reduction of domestic discretionary programs that are crucial to our State and local communities.

I would, as the chairman did, like to recognize and thank our staffs for doing such an outstanding job. They are dedicated, and they have been very dedicated to efforts on this bill. To Mike Ringler, Christine Kojac, John Martens, Anne Marie Goldsmith, Joel Kaplan, and Clelia Alvarado with the majority, I express thanks; and to David Pomerantz and Michelle Burkett, Dana Polk with the minority staff, and Sally Moorehead and Julie Aaronson on my personal staff, have put in a great deal of time, a great deal of hard work into the bill, and I know that the chairman and I share his deep sense of appreciation for their efforts.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman and ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for bringing this bill to the floor, and I also want to commend the full Committee on Appropriations for doing outstanding work in bringing all of these bills to the floor in a timely manner.

Mr. Chairman, I am here to talk about a potential amendment that may

come to this bill, and I ask the question: How much is life worth? This may seem to be a more philosophical question than one normally hears in a debate about an amendment to an appropriations bill, but I do not mean it philosophically; I mean it literally.

Later today the gentleman from Wisconsin will offer an amendment that would take \$200 million away from NASA and spend it instead on the undeniable, useful purpose of local law enforcement. Yet, Mr. Chairman, the amendment in no way alters the fundamental mission or programmatic activities at NASA. That is, under the Obey amendment, the United States would still order our best scientists and engineers to send our bravest astronauts back into space; we just demand that they cut a few corners along the way.

This is scientifically and morally unacceptable, Mr. Chairman. If the gentleman from Wisconsin or anyone else wants to have a debate about the wisdom of the American people's investment in space exploration, we can have that debate.

□ 1200

You can bring out a bunch of flow charts about the deficit and all the noble government aspirations that are currently underfunded. And I could read a list of people around the world whose lives have been saved and whose livelihoods depend on technologies developed over the last 4 decades by America's space program: the MRI machine, the portable x-ray, the automatic insulin pump, rocketry, satellite technology, touch tone phones, cellular telephony.

Which of these innovations, all directly attributable to our decades-long commitment to space exploration, might our society have missed out on over the last 40 years if along the way we asked NASA to cut a few corners here and there?

What future technological breakthroughs will we miss out on in the next 40 years if we start cutting back on NASA now?

That is an important debate, Mr. Chairman, and one that I relish the opportunity to have. But that is not what this amendment is about. This is not about scaling back our space program, but scaling back our commitment to the men and women who risk their lives for it.

If the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) wants us to turn our backs on space and surrender mankind's ancient struggle against ignorance, so be it. But as long as we are sending American citizens into space, we have a moral obligation to provide NASA's engineers every resource they require to bring our astronauts home safe.

If Members do not want our astronauts to return to flight, return to the Moon, complete the international space station or go to Mars, let them say so.

But if we do support our space program, if we do support our NASA com-

munity, and if we do support our astronauts and we risk their lives by sending them into the unknown on the cheap, Mr. Chairman, we will never be forgiven.

I would ask Members to pay attention to the amendments that are offered to this bill and most importantly, vote "no" on the Obey amendment.

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

The distinguished majority leader must know that the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), went to the Rules Committee to ask for a rule to allow him to offer an amendment to increase the funding for State and local law enforcement, which was dramatically reduced in this bill. It only exists in the bill because the chairman has restored several hundred million dollars to States and locals which the President asked to cut.

So the distinguished majority leader must know that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) went to the Rules Committee and that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is trying to get at the inadequacy of the funding for State and local law enforcement levels from the Federal Government, and the gentleman is not at all interested in cutting NASA.

But the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is left in a position now that his amendment, which proposes to offset the high income tax cut in order to fund additional State and local law enforcement, was denied. The gentleman was not able to offer that amendment, so he is getting at the issue of the inadequacy of the funding of State and local law enforcement by having, in a tight bill where we do not have many offsets, offsets against NASA. That is difficult. That is tough. But it does get at the issue of the inadequacy of State and local law enforcement, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) really has no choice if he wants to raise the issue, but to take a route like this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished minority ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I note the majority leader's reference to morality. It is really interesting indeed to be lectured on morality by the majority leader, almost makes me laugh. But let me simply say one thing. We are here today with a bill brought by a fine Member of Congress, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who does his dead level best to provide a fair allocation of money within the amount assigned to his subcommittee.

The problem is that because the majority party has already made its basic budget decisions, and it has made as its number one priority providing tax cuts including \$140,000-a-year tax cuts for people making more than a million bucks, because of that, there is very

little left on the table for any of the domestic programs. And so the majority is now bringing to the floor bills which are inadequate for education, inadequate for science, inadequate for health, inadequate for law enforcement.

Now, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority leader, objects to the amendment that I intend to offer. Let me tell you how we got here. Last year, the gentleman was unhappy because the funding for NASA was scaled back by the VA HUD subcommittee in order to provide more room, in order to provide more money for housing, and to provide more money for veterans care. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) did not like that arrangement, so he abolished that subcommittee because the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is from Houston and he wanted an exception to the rule that required everybody else to have their pet programs squeezed except him. So he abolished the subcommittee.

Instead, he rearranged the jurisdiction of the subcommittee. So now, NASA is in competition, not with housing, not with veterans health care. Now NASA is in competition with local law enforcement. So you have got a \$500 million increase in this account for NASA, and it is paid for by a \$400 million cut in local law enforcement.

My first choice was to go to the Rules Committee and ask them to allow me to offer an amendment to scale back the size of the tax cut for those making a million dollars or more a year by \$2,000. That means those poor devils are going to have to get by with a \$138,000 tax cut next year. The majority party denied that. They force me now to look for other sources within the bill. So what I have done is to look at the places where this bill has increased over last year, because local law enforcement, since 2001, has been cut by a billion dollars. And so what the amendment does, it says let us scale back our plans to go to Mars by 2030 and instead make as a higher priority providing better law enforcement for grandma and grandpa back home. That is what we are trying to do. I make no apology for it.

If the majority leader does not like the fact that we had to go to NASA to take the money out in order to fund local law enforcement, he has only himself to blame because he reorganized the subcommittees in the first place to create this jurisdictional trade-off. If the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) does not like the result, he ought to look in the mirror.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill. As we all know, this is a difficult budget year. The American people have expressed, both Democrats and Republicans, strong concern about the budget deficits and are asking Congress to

move in a direction of a balanced budget. That is what this bill does, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) needs to be commended. It has a slight decrease in the State Department and Commerce Department funding, a slight increase in Justice Department funding, and as has been pointed out an increase in the science account.

I specifically rise to speak in support of the NASA accounts. We, in the congressional district that I have the privilege of representing, launch the space shuttle into space, and that space shuttle is America's space shuttle. It is not a Republican or a Democrat space shuttle, and it is poised to return to flight soon. We need to make sure that it completes the remainder of its assigned mission safely and safely brings the crew back to Earth. And this bill funds the shuttle at the needed level. It also has adequate funding for the space station. We have not completed the construction of the space station, and we have engaged in partnerships with European countries and with the Japanese and the Russians; and once the space shuttle is flying again and with the funding level the chairman and the ranking member have put in this bill, we should be well on track to complete construction of the space station.

I would like to also rise and speak in support of the initiative in this bill to increase aeronautics funding. And my colleagues, the United States has dominated the world in aeronautics. We are the home to the Wright brothers. And today we are being eclipsed. Today, Airbus has a greater global market share than Boeing, our sole remaining commercial airline manufacturing company. And this is critical seed corn if we, as a Nation, are going to be able to continue to have our edge in commercial aviation and in the whole field of civil aviation and aeronautics.

I would like to specifically address the issue of the President's space initiative. And one of the things that I have been increasingly concerned about in my position as a legislator is the fact that people in education tell me we just do not have enough American kids going into science, mathematics, and engineering. And those same educators tell me over and over again the thing that motivates kids more than anything else to go into those fields is the space program. And for years, NASA languished because many people criticized it for not having a clear vision. President John Kennedy gave it a clear vision in the 1960s; and, finally, today, we have that vision again. We are talking about going back to the Moon and on to Mars. President Bush gave us that vision, and now is not the time to cut back.

We have a critical situation where, in many of our colleges and universities, the majority of people pursuing graduate degrees in science and engineering fields are foreigners. They are not Americans. We are not graduating enough American citizens in these

fields, and there is no better way to motivate our young people, young kids in grammar school, in secondary school.

Let me just say one other thing to close out. A lot of this space exploration is about the spirit of being an American citizen. We are a Nation of explorers, and if we are going to turn our back, or if we are going to delay, and I am very sympathetic to what the ranking member is trying to do with more funding for police, and I would certainly hope we may be able to do that in conference. But if we are going to remain a Nation that is always on the cutting edge of science and exploration, we desperately need NASA and what this bill is about.

I would strongly encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose any initiative to reduce the NASA accounts, to reduce the science accounts, to support the underlying bill. It is the right thing for our kids. It is the right thing for our competitiveness in the future. And it is the right thing to make sure that our space program stays on track.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill providing appropriations for the science agencies, the Department of State, Justice and Commerce and several related agencies for fiscal year 2006.

As in past years, I wish our 302(b) allocation could have been more generous, but that is not the fault of this committee. However, I am impressed with how much the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) was able to accomplish with the allocation he was given.

I would also like to say what a pleasure it has been to work with the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and the outstanding majority and minority staff on this bill. On this subcommittee, there is an excellent working relationship among all of the members, and I credit the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for that.

Many important priorities were funded in this bill, and some of the highlights include increases for counterterrorism and counterintelligence activities at the FBI, restored funding for DEA's mobile enforcement teams, and the demand reduction assistance, much more than requested for the MEP program, funding levels for NOAA that I hope we can continue to increase as we move through the process, significant increases for NASA and the National Science Foundation, full funding at the requested level of \$1.3 billion for international peacekeeping activities, a wonderful way, in my opinion, for us to use our military and our resources, contributions to international organizations that I hope can be increased to the requested level before the final bill is completed.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not express concern about the burdens on the Legal Services Corporation from restrictions on their use of non-Federal funds. But I am pleased that funding was provided at last year's level and above the administration's request.

Some needs will go unfunded at SBA, and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member, will speak to that in a short time. But fortunately, the committee was able to provide funding for the microloan program.

□ 1215

Again, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate both the ranking member and the chairman for a good bill, and I will support it.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) for the time.

I want to, at this time, personally thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) of the House Committee on Appropriations for saving VOCA, the Victims of Crime Act funding, by not removing these funds and giving them to other projects.

This was a novel brainchild of the Reagan administration. VOCA constitutes the United States Government's vision to make criminals literally pay for the crimes they have committed. Since the beginning of VOCA in 1984, fees and fines and forfeitures that are collected from criminals in any given year go to VOCA's Crime Victims Fund. The following year, these grants are then issued to States for services that go directly to victims of crime. The money does not come from taxpayers, but criminals pay for the system they have created.

So I want to praise the effort of the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) because they are not only saving VOCA, they have also affirmed that victims of crime should have a high priority, more of a priority than building another bridge someplace or expanding the bloated bureaucracy. Saving these funds is a statement that we as a Congress will not forget the plight of American crime victims.

I also want to thank the effort of fellow members of the Victims Rights Caucus that we have cofounded, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) and my good friend across the aisle, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

More importantly, there are numerous victims of crimes organizations in the United States that fought to save these funds. They include Justice Solutions, the National Association of VOCA Assistance Administrators, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, the National Association of

Crime Victim Compensation Boards, the National Children's Alliance, the National Center for Victims of Crime, and the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, and many others.

So I want to commend these organizations for coming on board to make the statement basically: Do not mess with crime victims.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), a distinguished member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for the time.

I rise in strong support of this subcommittee bill. I am privileged to be a member of this subcommittee, and I think the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF), and his staff have crafted an unbelievably good bill under very difficult circumstances.

I particularly, on behalf of the National Children's Alliance, want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their commitment to funding for this remarkable national network of children's advocacy centers which have been a part of this bill for many years now.

As my colleague from Texas just remarked about the crime victims trust fund funding, my local nonprofits there in north Alabama and around this country are pleased that that trust fund was not rescinded, that money was restored in there. Again, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for those plus-ups.

This is a good bill. It should be supported by the Members.

On the NASA side, on the NASA account, we are fully funding the Shuttle Return to Flight, and the President's space exploration program on behalf of the Marshall Space Flight Center, also there in north Alabama. This is a good bill for NASA, and, again, it is under difficult circumstances.

In my area of the country, we have a problem with the crystal meth issue. There is money available under this bill for the meth hotspots at the level of \$60 million. My community sorely needs that kind of funding available for them to attempt to combat this raging and very difficult problem.

The bill restores \$40 million for the drug courts. In my opinion, that is related to the crystal meth issues, at least in my area anyway, and we need those moneys restored. I might remind my colleagues that that program, the drug court program, was zeroed out in the President's budget.

This bill fully restores funding for the NEP program, and that is important.

So, all in all, as I have rambled through the various provisions in this bill, this is a good bill, and on behalf of the citizens of the Fifth Congressional District of Alabama, I urge my Members to support this bill.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY

BROWN-WAITE) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to engage in a colloquy, and I thank him very much for yielding time to me.

I wish to express the concern of many of my constituents regarding potential threats to the integrity of the Small Business Administration's loan program.

Under current law, no funding for the Small Business Administration funds may be used to assist individuals who are in the United States illegally. Actually, to date, the best information we have is that SBA has never guaranteed a loan to an individual living illegally in the United States. However, SBA only guarantees the loans, while banks actually provide the funds to applicants. Thus, the burden of ensuring the legal status of loan applicants is actually placed on the financial institutions.

While banks have internal measures designed to specifically prevent fraud, the success of SBA's policy hinges on prompt notification, rather than up-front security.

Unfortunately, the post-9/11 world has highlighted the consequences of fraud. My constituents and those around the United States demand that Congress act aggressively to strengthen and protect the integrity of the SBA loan system rather than passively waiting for the worst.

Can the distinguished gentleman describe what steps have been taken to combat this sort of fraud and to protect America?

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

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to do so for the gentlewoman.

I share her concerns about waste, fraud and abuse, and have also expressed my concerns to the SBA about this issue. In fact, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) had expressed the same concern, too.

I understand that the SBA is now collecting the information on, and essentially tracking, loan agents. Any potential fraud cases are immediately referred to the Inspector General, and perhaps we ought to put some language in saying they should be referred to the FBI for prosecution.

I will assure the gentlewoman I will work with the SBA Administrator and the Inspector General, and also, if the gentlewoman would agree, the FBI, to assure that no fraud occurs in the small business loan program.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his time and consideration and certainly look forward to working with the Chairman on this important matter in the future.

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

Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Treasury, HUD, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Ranking Member MOLLOHAN) for all their work on this bill.

I particularly commend them for rejecting the administration's proposal to create an umbrella community development program in Commerce, which would have greatly reduced the breadth and creativity of the community development programs as they currently operate.

I appreciate my colleagues' efforts to restore funding for other vital programs within their wholly inadequate allocation. I especially thank them for restoring partial funding for the SBA's microloan program, which the President's budget eliminated.

Through the microloan program, 170 intermediary lenders nationwide provide loans and technical assistance to our smallest businesses, many of which could not secure loans from more restrictive SBA programs or conventional banks. Since its creation 13 years ago, the microloan program has provided over 21,000 microloans totaling \$250 million, which averages to fewer than \$12,000 per loan. Yet, 60,000 jobs have been created at roughly \$3,500 per job.

One microlender in my district, the Western Massachusetts Enterprise Fund, has made 138 loans totaling \$2.25 million. One hundred percent of the microloans were made to locally owned businesses, half of which were start-ups, and all received watchful technical assistance, which is why so few of these loans default.

As we all know, small businesses are the backbone of the American economy, and I thank my colleagues for their support and urge them to work toward restoring the microloan program to last year's funding level.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Ranking Member MOLLOHAN) for putting together a very balanced bill within the available allocation.

As the new chairman of the House Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, we are in the process of drafting a NASA authorization. Our authorization will be the first opportunity for the House of Representatives to endorse a Vision for Space Exploration, a bold initiative that is the cornerstone for investment in both human and robotic exploration.

Space exploration is a technology engine for this country. We need this vision to encourage the next generation

of skilled workers and to drive innovation. Telling kids that they need to study math and science rings hollow unless there is a real reason to do so, like space exploration.

I certainly support State and local law enforcement assistance; however, Congress has a long track record of providing law enforcement with ample resources. Since September 11, 2001, Congress has provided more than \$15 million to assist State and local law enforcement, and, in this bill, has generally funded law enforcement above the President's request. Funding to these State and local agencies is also provided through a number of other agencies, such as Homeland Security, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and others.

NASA has a new Administrator, Mike Griffin, who is getting the Agency moving in the right direction to carry out this Vision for Space Exploration most effectively. These cutting-edge technologies will ensure our global technological leadership, our Nation's security and our competitiveness worldwide.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Obey amendment and support the committee bill that we have before us today later in this debate.

I thank the gentleman for his time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia.

I would like to thank the gentleman because he has done the Nation a great service by authoring the section of this bill's committee report that deals with aeronautics at NASA. I also note that the report singles out the important role of the individual NASA centers. Again, I applaud the gentleman for his insight and action because I, too, am an advocate of the centers. I am fortunate to have NASA Glenn in my district, which is one of the most decorated centers in the Agency.

I would like to ask the gentleman for a point of clarification. In the committee report for this bill, there is a requirement that NASA provides a plan for how it will allocate aeronautics funds for fiscal year 2006. Would the gentleman agree that the plan should include a definition of work that leads to additional breakthroughs, including rotorcraft, hypersonics, propulsion and vehicle systems?

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would, definitely.

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

Again, I would like to thank the gentleman for his staunch advocacy of such a worthy issue. I know thousands

of constituents in Cleveland are equally grateful for his work and his vision.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I especially thank the chairman of the committee for his wonderful work, with a very tight budget this year and insufficient allocation. Nothing in my comments is to be interpreted as a criticism of the committee or its work.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in order to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies.

Within the Education and Human Resources Directorate of the National Science Foundation, better known as NSF, I am especially concerned about the Math and Science Partnership program. This program connects States and local school districts together with higher education institutions to strengthen pre-K-12 math and science education. The partnerships also aim to increase the number, quality and diversity of math and science teachers.

The Math and Science Partnership program budget has been greatly diminished since 2002, when it was funded at \$160 million. This year the committee was able to fund the program at \$60 million, which will prevent NSF from starting any new partnerships.

This spring, 76 Members of Congress signed a letter supporting the funding of this program at \$200 million for fiscal year 2006. In addition, the National Science Board, the guiding body of the National Science Foundation, has publicly stated, and I quote from a letter I recently received, "Should funding become available to restore some of the cut programs, clearly, retaining the MSP program in NSF is the highest priority."

□ 1230

"Large-scale, sustained experiments like the math and science programs are crucial for developing models of excellence in science, technology and math education, linking precollege and college education and providing other links to the community and the workforce."

And, Mr. Chairman, I will include this entire document for the RECORD.

We know our students need to improve in math and science education. We know that other countries are investing in these areas and that their students are succeeding where ours are not. We know that the United States will not be able to compete with the rest of the world indefinitely if our workforce is not on the cutting edge of these fields.

I would appreciate Chairman WOLF's willingness to consider, in the event that any additional funds may become available in the future, that his committee examine the possibility of de-

voting such funds to the Math and Science Partnership program. I believe this program must be able to fund some new starts and target the partnerships in this most needed of areas. I recognize that the gentleman's committee has taken steps to help address the educational areas of greatest need to improve in math and science education, and I look forward to working with him on this endeavor.

Mr. Chairman, the document from the National Science Board, which I referred to earlier, is herewith submitted in its entirety for the RECORD:

NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD,
Arlington, VA, May 26, 2005.

Hon. VERNON J. EHLERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. EHLERS: Thank you for your letter of March 29, 2005 in which you requested that the National Science Board (NSB, the Board) delineate the priority of programs within the Education and Human Resources portion of the National Science Foundation (NSF) Budget, to help Congress to focus any additional funds for NSF back to education, should they become available. The Board appreciates your continuing strong support for the NSF's role in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) education. The Board is, like you, concerned by the decline in funding for education in the NSF budget. We agree with you that such cuts would undermine the NSF's role in education in STEM fields at a time when STEM skills are becoming increasingly vital to the continued security and prosperity of our Nation.

NSF is unique as the only Federal agency with both science research and science education in its charter. The programs in the NSF Education and Human Resources directorate are designed to support and improve U.S. STEM education at all levels and in all settings (both formal and informal). These programs are unique in their capacity to identify and study the most promising ideas for math and science education, to develop new and improve materials and assessments, to explore new uses of technology to enhance K-12 instruction, and to create better teacher training techniques. The results of NSF supported research can then be transferred into practice. NSF's highly-regarded peer review system that enlists leading scientists, mathematicians, engineers, and academicians to improve K-12 STEM education programs is at the center of this education improvement infrastructure.

The proposed NSF FY 2006 budget begins an end to the commitment for large experimental programs in the Math and Science Partnership (MSP) program, which builds on NSF experience in large-scale precollege and preservice experiments. The proposed budget also reduces critical areas of education research and undergraduate education. You have asked for the Board's priorities for education, should funding become available to restore some of the cut programs. Of the three major areas, all of which contain experimental programs to advance STEM learning, clearly, retaining the MSP program in NSF is the highest priority. Large scale, sustained experiments like the MSPs are crucial for developing models of excellence in STEM education, linking precollege and college, and providing other links to the community and the workforce.

NSF has the mandate, depth of experience under its Systemic Initiatives and other large-scale multifaceted education activities, and well-established relationships to build such partnerships for excellence in K-12 STEM education.

In 1983, the NSB Commission on Precollege Education in Science, Mathematics and Technology published its recommendations for U.S. students to become first in the world in science, mathematics and technology. Most of the recommendations of this report are still relevant today. Some progress has been made in precollege STEM education through research and implementation of model programs, but much more is needed. As a workforce with basic STEM skill has become ever more essential to American economic prosperity and national security, it is now critical to our future that our precollege education system is prepared to perform its essential role in U.S. STEM education. Today it clearly is not.

Certainly, world class STEM education is a moving target, as science and technology advances and as other nations raise the bar for STEM education in their own precollege systems. The Board therefore has determined, in response to requests from the Congress and other stakeholders, to undertake an update of the 1983 Commission report.

The Board is hopeful that our Nation is ready to implement an aggressive, research-based program in precollege STEM education. Within the framework of No Child Left Behind legislation, it is critical that U.S. education systems implement research-based strategies to improve STEM learning, with the goal of international leadership in precollege STEM education. It is also critical that we build on and continue the long-term research in K-12 education sponsored by NSF.

We thank you for your efforts on behalf of NSF, and we offer our further assistance in any way that would be helpful.

Sincerely,

WARREN M. WASHINGTON,
*Chairman, National
Science Board.*

ELIZABETH HOFFMAN,
*Chair, EHR Com-
mittee, NSB.*

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

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for their hard work on this bill. I believe they have done everything within their power to support the National Science Foundation, given the funds available. To that end, I would like to work with the chairman and his subcommittee to bolster the future allocation for fundamental science. We cannot let our investment stagnate or slip.

I know they understand, and we all need to appreciate, the impact innovation has on jobs in our economy. We need to remain dedicated to investing in innovation; and I want to stand by Chairman WOLF, and once again let me express my deep appreciation and to stand by the chairman and to offer to help in this very important process.

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

Mr. EHLERS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank both the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for their comments. Frankly, I have learned a lot from them on this issue, and a lot of what they have been push-

ing for, I now see, if you will. So I want to thank them.

I understand their concerns, and I will be pleased to work with them to explore what might be done to address these concerns in conference. I support the MSP program at the NSF and look forward to working with the gentleman from Michigan and also the gentleman from New York to see if we can address the legitimate concerns they raise.

Furthermore, I am committed to ensuring that our investment in future innovation does not waiver; and I look forward to working with both my colleagues and, hopefully, the President of the United States with additional resources as the budget comes up next year on improving the allocation for science in future budgets.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises Members that the time for general debate for the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has expired. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the gentleman from Virginia in a colloquy regarding the American Corners Program.

Mr. Chairman, the American Corners Program are partnerships between the Public Affairs sections of U.S. Embassies and host institutions. They provide access to current and reliable information about the U.S. via book collections, the Internet, and through local programming to the general public.

Sponsored jointly by a U.S. Embassy and a host country organization, an American Corner serves as an information outpost, similar to a public library reference service. The multi-media book and periodical collections are open and accessible. Associated reading or meeting rooms are made available to host program events and activities, like author readings, films, speaker programs, workshops, meetings, and exhibits.

Recently, a Pakistani official, Hussain Hakanni, told me about his experience at an American library in Pakistan as a young boy. One day he met the U.S. Ambassador and he beat the Ambassador in a game of Trivial Pursuit. When the Ambassador asked him how long he had been in the United States, he responded, I have never been to your country. I have visited your libraries. Today, he is a strong ally for the United States in a region where we need strong allies.

This program was his first contact with America, and it succeeded in doing what we are today struggling to do with youth in that corner of the world, winning hearts and minds. That is why I support the American Corners program, and I hope to work with Chairman Wolf as this bill progresses

to ensure strong support for this important international program.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from New York that the State Department's American Corners Program is important for several reasons. It encourages the opening flow of ideas, which we desperately need at this time. It teaches people about America, which we also desperately need. And it increases global literacy.

The fundamental function of the American Corners Program is to make information about our country available to foreign publics at large. Access to the American Corners collection is free and open to all interested citizens of the host country, and I think it is particularly important to countries that are closed.

I am happy to work with the gentleman from New York to ensure strong support for this program going forward.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WOLF for his bipartisanship.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with my friend, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

First I want to thank Chairman WOLF as well as Ranking Member MOLLOHAN and the other members of the subcommittee for their hard work in putting together this appropriations bill. Mr. Chairman, last year, the Department of Commerce notified the NOAA and NIST and NTIA research laboratories in Boulder, Colorado, that it had decided to build a security fence around the campus where the labs are located. This has been a matter of concern to Boulder, local residents, and the people who work in the labs. They raised questions about the nature of the unspecified threats that the fence is intended to address and about the effectiveness of a fence.

At my urging, the Department of Commerce and NIST worked with Boulder residents and city officials to determine the most acceptable placement of the fence. However, the Department still has not made clear the nature of the security threat, the proposed timetable for building the fence, or how they propose to pay for it. I understand no funding has been requested for the project.

In my view, it would not be right to reduce funding to research operations or other needed construction work in NIST and NOAA in Boulder in order to pay for the fence. So I would like to ask the chairman whether he agrees that if this fence is to be built, it

should not be done at the expense of ongoing research or capital improvements to these laboratories.

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Yes, I do agree with the gentleman that this funding for ongoing research and capital improvements to these laboratories is important. To date, no new funding has been requested by the administration, and plans for such a fence have not been finalized. The committee understands this project may be considered for future budget requests to the Congress.

Also, I tell the gentleman that I would be glad to set up a meeting with the new director of NIST and others to kind of meet in our offices and see how we can resolve this to the gentleman's satisfaction.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his willingness to work with me, and I thank the ranking member for his help as well; and I look forward to holding that meeting with the gentleman.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage Chairman WOLF in a colloquy with me.

I thank the chairman for agreeing to engage in this important discussion with me. As you know, I represent Laredo, Texas, along the U.S.-Mexican border. There has been much violence along the border, including 31 Americans that have been kidnapped on the Mexican side. That is 31 Americans. Twelve of them have been returned, two were killed, and the remaining are unaccounted for.

I have been working to increase cooperation with the law enforcement agencies policing the border. In May, I brought together officials from agencies ranging from the FBI to the State Department along with the local law enforcement to help formulate a plan.

The Mexican Government on the other side has increased police and federal presence along the border, which is good news, but unfortunately they haven't done enough. We need to respond with strong, decisive efforts of our own to help forge a lasting resolution.

I am excited to know, Mr. Chairman, that this bill increases by \$23 million the Violent Crime Impact Teams assigned to cities in the United States, and I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), and the members of the subcommittee for the leadership that you have shown. I am also currently working with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, and the Attorney General, Mr. Albert Gonzales, to get a team permanently assigned to the Laredo area; but

unfortunately at this time we need some funding.

I hope the chairman and I can work together to try to get a Violent Crime Impact Team assigned to Laredo. The violence spilling over across the border is great, and I believe this effort can go a long way towards addressing this problem, and so I ask for your assistance in this matter.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, we will be glad to work with the gentleman from Texas and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN to see what we can do to help. That sounds like a horrible situation: 31 Americans kidnapped. So if we can help, we will do whatever we can to help you.

Mr. CUELLAR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank both Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for their help, and I thank the chairman for his bipartisan approach to address this very, very important approach to a violent situation.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to the time remaining for our side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. GILCREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise to ask the chairman to engage in a colloquy.

While I applaud the appropriation subcommittee's overall efforts to contain the Federal budget, I have some concerns about ocean issues. And when we talk about ocean issues, these are critical issues crucial to the survival of humans on the planet when we consider the extent and the complexity of the oceans and life on the planet.

The over-500-page report of the U.S. Ocean Commission emphasized the need to take action now to invest in ocean and coastal programs to ensure conservation and the sustainable use of resources for future generations. The Ocean Commission report called for doubling the investment in the coastal and ocean science and to provide an additional \$500 million to \$1 billion in assistance over the next several years to support ocean programs and fisheries management.

In April of this year, I joined over 100 House Members deeply concerned about the health of our oceans and coastal areas to request support for additional funding for key National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration programs, or NOAA. After considering other competing priorities, the subcommittee approved the NOAA budget of \$3.43 billion, almost \$500 million below last year's level.

Now, I understand the Federal budget constraints, and I understand the con-

straint of the subcommittee and the appropriations process; but I would ask the chairman to consider looking at these issues as we move this bill through to the conference.

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

Mr. GILCREST. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for bringing this issue to our attention, Mr. Chairman. As the gentleman said, the budget is very tight this year and difficult decisions had to be made. While I believe that all the programs in the bill are worthy of funding, we had to keep the bill within the subcommittee 302(b) allocation.

I agree with the gentleman that the functions of NOAA are very important and will work to see that the conference funding levels are adequate.

Mr. GILCREST. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his consideration; I thank the chairman for his effort to balance the budget and to allocate the funds equitably to all the various programs. I look forward to working with the chairman in the future on this issue.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on H.R. 2862, the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2006. This bill provides funding for a variety of agencies and programs, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, the U.S. Marshals Service, the Drug Enforcement Administration, DEA, State and local law enforcement grants, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA, and the diplomatic and consular programs at the Department of State to name a few.

This bill marks the halfway point for the House in completing work on Appropriations for fiscal year 2006. I want to commend Chairman LEWIS and my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their aggressive pace in bringing these bills to the floor for debate and wish them well as we continue on in this process.

As Chairman of the Budget Committee, I am pleased to note that this bill complies with the budget resolution for fiscal year 2006 (H. Con. Res. 95), specifically section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of bills in excess of an Appropriations subcommittee's 302(b) allocation of budget authority in the budget resolution.

H.R. 2862 provides \$57.5 billion in appropriations for fiscal year 2006. This is an increase of \$76 million in BA and \$1.3 billion in outlays over the fiscal year 2005 level, and \$3.2 billion in BA, and \$615 million in outlays below the President's request.

I should point out that in order to stay within the 302(b) allocation the bill derives savings from adjustments to various mandatory accounts and requiring the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to accrue certain retirement benefits. The largest savings results from the annual capping of the Crime Victim's Fund, which is set at \$625 million for fiscal year 2006, and delaying the obligation of the remaining \$1.2 billion until fiscal year 2007. Additionally, \$62 million in savings is derived from a permanent and indefinite appropriation for the expenses of the management and disposal of assets from the Assets Forfeiture

Fund. The accrual provision would technically result in \$39 million in savings.

The bill also shifts resources from some lower-priority programs at the Department of Commerce toward more important and higher-priority public safety and crime prevention programs like the FBI and DEA at the Department of Justice.

Personally, looking to the needs of Iowa, I support increased funding for the Byrne Assistance Grants financed through offsetting reductions in other accounts within the bill. As reported by the full Committee, the bill sharply reduces funding for this program below last year's level. These funds are critical to ongoing efforts to fight illegal methamphetamine use in many States across the country.

In conclusion, I express my support for H.R. 2862 and again commend Chairman LEWIS and the Appropriations Committee on their steady work in bringing bills to the floor that comply with H. Con. Res. 95.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this overall measure, H.R. 2862, which appropriates funds for the Department of Commerce, State, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies in FY 2006. I am encouraged that the overall measure provides \$57.8 billion or 2% more than the 2005 level of funding.

I am very encouraged by the fact that the Appropriations Committee gives \$21.7 billion for Justice Department programs which is 4% more than the current level of funding and 5% more than the administration's request. I also applaud the Committee for providing \$334 million for juvenile justice programs which is 44% more than requested by this administration but is still 12% less than the current level.

I am disappointed however, that this bill provides only \$520 million for the Community Oriented Policing Services—COPS—program which is a startling 13% less than the current level. This total includes \$120 million for COPS technology, and \$60 million for a new anti-gang initiative. We are sworn to serve the people of this Nation, and I can not see how reducing spending on such a vital community safety program can serve that honorable goal.

The Committee denied the president's request for \$3.7 billion for a new community development block grant, and instead provided \$228 million for the existing Economic Development Administration, and I understand that the administration plans to phase this initiative out.

For the first time this Subcommittee's appropriation's bill includes funding for NASA and the National Science Foundation. Until this year, NASA had to compete for funds with veterans and housing programs when it was part of the old VA—HUD—Independent Agencies Appropriations bill. Many believe that pairing NASA with the State and Commerce departments has made it much easier to provide increases for the space agency without offending powerful domestic constituencies.

As a member of the Science Committee's Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, the provision of \$16.5 billion for NASA, or 2% over the current level represents a positive step toward reaching our goals in space technology and exploration. In addition, the NASA total includes \$9.7 billion for science, aeronautics and exploration, which amounts to 4% more than the current level and about 1% more than the President's request. In this instance I appreciate that the committee did not agree to

the administration's request to cut the Aeronautics Research program by \$54 million.

This appropriation also provides \$5.6 billion for the NSF making it \$171 million more than the FY 2005 level and \$38 million more than the President's request. This funding provides money for vital research and research equipment that can make the difference between achieving a great discovery and falling short. As well this Appropriation provides funding for education and human resources, which are designed to encourage the entrance of talented students into science and technology careers, to improve the undergraduate science and engineering education environment, to assist in providing all pre-college students with a high level of math and science education, and to extend greater research opportunities, to underrepresented segments of the scientific and engineering communities.

I also want to applaud the Appropriations Committee for directing NASA to include in its FY 2007 budget request detailed information on the prior year, current year, and requested funding levels for each program, project or activity, and on all proposed changes being requested. Clearly, the committee was disappointed with the lack of detail provided in NASA's FY 2006 funding request. In this vein I have asked that language be included that would direct NASA to report the amount of money spent in its budget for safety overall as well as for each major program and initiative for its FY 2007 budget request and for all following years. The need for this information is clear, since the Colombia Space Shuttle safety must be our number one priority. Yet, NASA has no exact figures for safety spending either in the overall spending or for each individual program or initiative. This language about NASA safety will help determine if enough funds are being dispersed for safety procedures. In addition, it will allow Appropriators to determine from year to year whether there has been an increase or decrease in safety spending. I have been assured by the majority staff of the Appropriations Committee that they will work to have this language added to the Conference Report.

However, my only concern with this portion of the legislation is that NASA Exploration Capabilities were funded at \$50.1 less than the President's request. This funding would be provided for the Space Operations Missions Directorate, including the International Space Station, the Space Shuttle program, and Space and Flight Support. The funds for NASA Exploration Capabilities are essential to the President's vision for space exploration. This appropriation comes at a watershed moment for NASA and the future of America's space exploration mission. After the tragic Colombia Space Shuttle accident we had to step back and reassess our space shuttle program. Today, NASA is preparing to return to flight, but safety is still at the forefront of our concerns. The funds being addressed here are applicable to safety as well and we must ensure that everything is done to keep our NASA astronauts from possible harm.

I applaud the Subcommittee's prohibition of the funding of measures that implement torture. This is quite important given the recent report by organizations such as Amnesty International and the work that the Democrats of the Committee on the Judiciary have done to bring this issue to light. I wrote a letter to both U.S. Attorney General Gonzales and Sec-

retary Chertoff requesting a full report on the conduct of the detention facilities located at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and I hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will hold at least one hearing on this important matter.

This measure provides \$1 million for eight additional criminal division positions to assist U.S. attorney's offices and to coordinate investigations across judicial districts; and \$60 million for a new anti-gang state and local law enforcement grant program. However, it is quite troubling to me that it does not provide any dollars for treatment programs to help these troubled juveniles.

As Founder and Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I undoubtedly recognize the need for us to legislate to create protections from the danger and violence produced by gangs. However, before we haphazardly amend the law to add excessive and egregious mandatory minimums and other penalties that apply to groups of people or young groups of people, we just clearly define the acts that we seek to penalize. That is the essence of crafting law that is "narrowly tailored" and that does not suffer from over breadth.

In addition, this measure provides funding for Byrne Grant applications from state and local law enforcement agencies. Grants to fund state and local anti-drug task forces come from the "Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs," in Title 42 U.S.C., Subchapter V. As a member of the House Law Enforcement Caucus, I am an ardent proponent of initiatives that strengthen and support our law enforcement agencies. Furthermore, as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I make it a goal whenever possible to advocate for increased funding, better facilities, training, an equipment, and for improved interoperable communications for these first responders. However, with my amendment, I seek to restore the integrity, honesty, evenhandedness, and judiciousness of our law enforcement agencies.

Similarly, I will offer an amendment that states the following: No funds made available in this Act shall be used to facilitate the issuance of affirmances by single members of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) without an opinion. An affirmance without opinion just says:

The Board affirms, without opinion, the result of the decision below. The decision below is, therefore, the final agency determination. See 8 CFR 3.1(e)(4).

The reason for this provision in the Regulations is to move apparently meritless cases quickly through the appellate process. I pasted the authorizing regulations to the bottom of this note.

Cases coming to the Board that appear to be easy are separated out and sent to the streamlining panel. These cases are then assigned more or less randomly to staff attorneys without directions or supervision. If the staff attorney who reviews the case decides that affirmance without opinion is appropriate, he will print out a firm decision, and then give the file to a single Board member with a cover sheet that will have an explanation for why such disposition is appropriate. The explanations typically are a few lines.

My amendment would permit this practice but only with cases that more than one Board member has reviewed and that result in the issuance of an opinion with the affirmance.

The proportion of “affirmances without opinion” decided by a single Board member had increased from 10% to over 50% of all Board decisions, beginning immediately after the new rules were proposed. At the same time, the proportion of cases that are favorable to the alien decreased. Prior to proposing the “Procedural Reforms”, one in four cases was decided in favor of the alien. Since then, only one appeal in ten is decided in favor of the alien.

Single-member review creates an incentive to rubber stamp immigration judges’ decisions. Affirmance without written decision is much faster and easier than writing a decision and creates an incentive (whether conscious or unconscious) for Board members to meet case processing guidelines by affirming removal orders notwithstanding the merits of the appeal. Moreover, intellectual rigor in decision-making may be diminished because Board members no longer need to articulate the basis for their decisions. They need only decide whether they agree with the result ultimately reached by the immigration judge.

A panel of three Board members is far more likely to catch an error below than a single Board member. In the immigration context, there is only one administrative hearing before the case reaches the Board. Other administrative agencies that employ single-member review have several layers of administrative process (i.e., interview, hearing, and reconsideration) prior to reaching the administrative appeals level as well as the option of a later *de novo* hearing in federal district court and court of appeals review.

Single-member review makes it difficult for the Board itself to determine whether its members are making errors. The courts of appeal, when such review is available, similarly lack guidance in reviewing the decisions of the immigration judges and the Board. This issue must be addressed in order to save the federal district court dockets.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, my home state of Utah is particularly fortunate to have a number of dedicated individuals working in law enforcement to protect our citizens.

These days, we all tend to focus on the armed forces, which are obviously a critical element of national defense. But it is also important to remember those on the front lines here at home. Local law enforcement officers need Congress’ help to ensure that our streets stay safe for law-abiding citizens.

I’m very disappointed that this bill cuts funding for Byrne Grants, COPS grants, Juvenile Justice programs, and Drug Courts.

During my time in Congress, every single person involved with law enforcement has made it a point to share with me exactly how these grants help protect Utah citizens. I don’t think we can say enough about the men and women who use this funding to better patrol our streets, decrease the availability of drugs in our schools, and ensure that each and every citizen is safe and protected.

Officer safety and the ability to investigate major crimes are often compromised by a lack of resources. One of the local police chiefs in a small town in my district said to me last year: Jim, I’m not worried about Al Qaeda attacking our little town. I’m worried about dealing with drugs in our middle school down the street.

Every single day, acts of heroism and valor are performed by police officers across our

nation. We have made tremendous progress in terms of crime prevention and crime solving, but we need to remember that there are only so many available law enforcement officers at a given time. As our society grows, the demands placed on these individuals have also increased tremendously.

The best way that the federal government can serve local law enforcement is to actually provide the grant money that is best utilized by people on the beat. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the amendments that will be offered later today to increase funding for Byrne grants and COPS grants.

I truly thank the members of law enforcement across this nation for their service and I commit to working in support of both homeland security and domestic security.

Before I close, I also want to add that there are some good things about this bill too. I’m very pleased to see that the bill does not transfer responsibility or reduce funding for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) Program. This program is very important to police chiefs and sheriffs in Utah and in other western states.

This bill also fully funds the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, which is another great program that does exactly what we all say federal dollars should do. MEP helps small businesses avail themselves of technological improvements and best practices that allow them to grow. Members of Congress tend to agree that growth in our manufacturing sector is critical and it seems to me that we should support that goal by supporting the MEP program.

In closing, I recognize that we’re facing an extremely tight budget. That’s exactly why we should prioritize law enforcement and other aspects of our government that best help our citizens and make good use of limited federal dollars.

Mr. FARR. I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their efforts to put together a balanced Science, State, Justice, Commerce bill; especially working with such limited resources. However, I would like to point out the shortfall in funding to the ocean, or wet, side of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) in this bill.

It is distressing to see NOAA, our primary domestic ocean agency, take a \$500 million cut from FY 05 levels less than a year after the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy issued its final report calling for an increase of \$1.5 billion in ocean funding during the first year after the report. The U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy was established by the Oceans Act of 2000 and appointed by President Bush to study our oceans and make recommendations for a coordinated and comprehensive national ocean policy. The Oceans Commission spent four years studying our oceans and made over 200 recommendations, and it spent \$9.5 million figuring out how to better manage our oceans. We are now ignoring the clear, loud message that we need to invest more in our oceans. To put it another way, we are cutting more than a million dollars in ocean programs in our primary ocean agency for each page in the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy final report.

With the atmospheric, or dry, side of NOAA seeing a 9% increase for the National Weather Service and a 7% increase for the National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information

Service, the cuts to the wet side of NOAA are even deeper than they first appear. The National Ocean Service will receive a 40% cut and the National Marine Fisheries Service will receive a 20% cut.

To no one’s surprise, Americans love the oceans, but what many Americans probably do not know is how much our economy relies on the oceans. The ocean economy—the portion of the economy that relies directly on ocean attributes—contributes well over \$100 billion to American prosperity. About one tenth of the nation’s annual gross domestic product (GDP) is generated in nearshore areas, the relatively narrow strip of land immediately adjacent to the coast. Coastal watershed counties, representing about one quarter of the nation’s land area, contribute about half of the nation’s GDP. NOAA funding is not only an investment in the protection, wise management, and productivity of our oceans and coasts; it is an investment in the well being of our coastal cities and communities.

Cuts to NOAA threaten the wise management of our oceans and will have far reaching ramifications such as on the tourism industry in my district and tourism in coastal districts around the nation. Tourism is one of the largest economic drivers of coastal areas, and my district is no exception. Tourists flock to my district for the same reason people want to live there, because of its natural wonders. Not only are the rocky shores dramatic, but people can watch sea otters paddle in the kelp, sea lions lounge on the docks, and whales breach in the bay. The more adventurous dive in the lush fish filled kelp beds, and the less adventurous—well, they go to the Monterey Bay Aquarium.

The Marine Sanctuaries program has been cut by 40% and the Coastal Nonpoint and Community Resource Improvement Grants program has been cut out completely. These two NOAA programs have been instrumental in keeping the coastal waters of my district unpolluted, allowing the waters to teem with life. The Monterey Bay Sanctuary office has been working with farmers in the productive valleys that drain into the Monterey Bay to reduce pollution from pesticides and nutrients. The farmers were skeptical until they realized they were saving money by finding ways to keep their fertilizers and pesticides on the fields and out of our ocean waters. The farmers are now bigger proponents of the program than the Sanctuary office. I don’t want the ocean waters off my district to end up as a dead-zone like the waters off Louisiana, where due to nutrient pollution, there is a dead zone the size of Massachusetts. Pollution kills more than marine life; it kills fisheries and it kills tourism—For some reason I just can’t quite picture a tourism brochure that reads “Come visit the country’s biggest ocean dead-zone.”

The State Coastal Zone Management Grants program was cut by \$2 million. The National Estuarine Research Reserves program was cut by \$3.7 million, and the Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation program was cut by a whopping \$38.7 million. These programs have been instrumental in allowing my district and other districts around the country to grow wisely striking a balance between development and preservation. The natural areas, parks and public beach access—besides pleasing the environmentalists—have been a smart tourism investment. Without the

ability for people to access the beach and enjoy the wildlife in these natural areas, people will not bother coming to my district.

When I think about the oceans, fishing is one of the first things that comes to mind. It is an economic and cultural backbone for many coastal communities, and with American consumers eating over 15 pounds of fish per person every year, it is an important food source for people across our nation. Recreational fishing is a boon to coastal tourism as well, with more than 17 million recreational fishers spending approximately \$25 billion a year on fishing-related activities. At a time when we know the status of less than a third of our fish stocks and are overfishing or have overfished more than 30% of the stocks we know about, we should be investing heavily in the National Marine Fisheries Service instead of making deeper budget cuts.

At a time when we know clearly from the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy report that we need to be investing in our oceans, making drastic funding cuts to NOAA, the primary agency for managing our coasts and oceans, makes no sense.

I, with my fellow co-chairs of the House Oceans Caucus, sent a letter to the Appropriations Committee asking for adequate funding of key nation wide NOAA programs. We had the support of 84 bipartisan members who felt strongly about these programs. Of the 13 different programs we highlighted in our letter, none of them was funded at our requested levels. Only one program received a small increase over FY 05 enacted levels and only one was level funded. This is especially disappointing given the support of so many members—nearly 20%—of the House.

While I believe the Committee did a good job given the tight budget situation, it is disappointing to see NOAA receive such large cuts when they should be getting large increases. NOAA needs more money to do its job of protecting, managing and keeping our coasts and oceans healthy and productive.

The CHAIRMAN. Time of the gentleman has expired. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2862

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, namely:

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues may know, methamphetamine abuse has exploded across the

U.S. over the last 15 years. Many States now break up between 500 and 2,500 meth labs per year. Meth is relatively cheap, tremendously addictive, and oftentimes addicts in one exposure. It is available nearly everywhere, particularly in rural areas.

Even though local meth labs are a tremendous problem, most meth comes from the superlabs in Mexico. Mexican superlabs purchase the basic ingredient, either sudafedrine or ephedrine from China, often in amounts of one ton or more. Mexico is currently importing much more ephedrine and sudafedrine than it uses for medical purposes.

The Office of Narcotics and Drug Control Policy released the National Synthetic Drug Action Plan. This plan specifically recommends that the Drug Enforcement Agency and other Federal agencies focus resources on stopping large shipments of sudafedrine from Asia to Mexico which are destined for meth labs.

Law enforcement agencies need to identify and aggressively pursue those responsible for these superlabs, as they now account for more than two-thirds of the meth entering the United States.

□ 1245

I hope that the chairman agrees that Congress needs to work with the administration, Mexico and other countries to reduce pseudoephedrine shipments used to produce meth. I look forward to working with the chairman to address this critical issue.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I agree with the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and will work with the gentleman to address this issue. If the gentleman can come up with something creative, working with the authorizers, working with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), maybe there is something we could put in our bill at the end, assuming the authorizers agree, that does something special and more direct with regard to the meth issue. I am wide open. I know how meth has impacted the gentleman's State, and he has been a leader with the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) on this issue. I suggest you talk with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), and maybe we could do something dramatic to deal with this issue.

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

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the administration of the Department of Justice, \$126,956,000, of which not to exceed \$3,317,000 is for the Facilities Program 2000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 45 permanent positions and 46 full-time equivalent workyears and \$11,821,000 shall be expended for the Department Leadership Program exclusive of augmentation that occurred in these offices in fiscal year

2005: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 28 permanent positions, 23 full-time equivalent workyears and \$3,980,000 shall be expended for the Office of Legislative Affairs: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 17 permanent positions, 22 full-time equivalent workyears and \$2,764,000 shall be expended for the Office of Public Affairs: *Provided further*, That the latter two aforementioned offices may utilize non-reimbursable details of career employees within the caps described in the preceding two provisos.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1) (increased by \$1)"

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$270,000,000)"

Page 23, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$270,000,000)"

Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$140,000,000)"

Page 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$53,000,000)"

At the end of title VI, insert the following: "SEC. ____ . In the case of taxpayers with adjusted gross income in excess of \$1,000,000, for the calendar year beginning in 2006, the amount of tax reduction resulting from enactment of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (P.L. 107-16) and the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-27) shall be reduced by 1.466 percent."

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved on the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe the House is familiar with this amendment. I have offered similar amendments a number of times. It does go straight to the question of our national priorities.

Let me take a little broader view than just this year. If we look at some of the reductions in this bill, and just look at the 1-year reductions, such as we have here in EDA or such as we have in law enforcement, the 1-year reductions do not look too bad, but if we take a look at what happened to these programs since fiscal year 2001, we see that we still have a deep reduction in some of these activities. For example, the State and local law enforcement grants have been cut by \$1 billion over that time. There is no way that we cannot have an effect on local law enforcement by having cuts of that magnitude over that period of time.

The same is true with EDA. There are many urban districts who do not care much about EDA, but my district, I do not have a city over 37,000. Small cities like that cannot hire a bunch of

fancy grant writers. They need all of the help they can get to compete for Federal money for job creation, and the Economic Development Administration, EDA, tries to provide that.

What this amendment would simply do is to try to restore the \$410 million cut by the committee for local law enforcement grants and increase funding for EDA by \$53 million, restoring that cut, and it would simply pay for that cut by reducing the size of the tax cut this House has previously approved for persons who make over \$1 million. It would simply reduce that tax cut by \$2,000. So instead of getting on average a \$140,000 tax cut, they would get a \$138,000 tax cut. It is hardly draconian, but it would help take care of a significant national priority.

I know that taxes are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, but the fact is that because the Committee on Ways and Means jurisdiction was placed first in terms of a priority by the Committee on the Budget, that means every time we have a tax cut paid for with borrowed money, you wind up putting an additional squeeze on deserving appropriated programs, including local law enforcement.

This amendment tries to correct that imbalance to a very small degree. I would urge support for the amendment.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Obey amendment to the fiscal year 2006 Science, State Justice, Commerce appropriations bill, and to voice my specific concerns about the funding level for the Community Oriented Policing Services, COPS, program.

I was deeply concerned when President Bush earlier this year proposed gutting State and local law enforcement assistance grants by \$1.4 billion in his fiscal year 2006 budget—a 46 percent cut from last year. While the Appropriations Committee restored \$1 billion from those proposed cuts, the fiscal year 2006 Science, State Justice, Commerce appropriations bill before us today still cuts these grants by \$400,000 from last year's funding levels.

That is why I support Ranking Member OBEY's amendment. This amendment would provide an additional \$410 million for State and local law enforcement, including COPS grants, and restore them to the fiscal year 2005 enacted levels. To do this, Representative OBEY reduces the size of the tax cut for millionaires by only \$2,053. These millionaires will still get a \$138,816 tax rebate. That is all we need to do to restore these cuts. That small tax cut repeal would fully fund these important programs at last year's levels and help keep our streets safe. That is a tradeoff that is worth making, and one, I would suggest, that even the top of all taxpayers would support.

Concerning the COPS program, this bill allocates only \$520 million for it. Again, I am glad that the Appropriations Committee has restored a part of the destructive cuts that the President originally proposed. But we should be doing more. The COPS program has been remarkably successful over the last 10 years. According to the Department of Justice, every \$1 we spend on COPS grants contributes to a decline of 10 violent crimes and 27 property

crimes per 100,000 residents. Yet rather than increasing funding for this effective and important program, this bill actually would cut \$80 million from the COPS program. This is the wrong thing to do. It is the additional police officers that the COPS program helps local towns and cities hire, who are on the front lines of reducing crime and also protecting our homeland.

The COPS program has provided law enforcement agencies in my district and across the Nation with critical funding to fight and prevent crime. In my district, communities in Hunterdon, Monmouth, Mercer, Middlesex, and Somerset counties have received more millions of dollars in funding to help put additional police officers on the street. In 2004 alone, four towns in my district—Lawrence Township, Monroe Township, Spotswood Borough, and West Windsor Township—received almost \$380,000 to fund various law enforcement programs. This money helped Monroe Township hire three additional police officers, and helped upgrade the law enforcement technology of Spotswood and West Windsor. Overall in 2004, New Jersey communities received COPS grants totaling \$9.5 million and were able to hire 40 additional police officers. That is 40 cops on the beat who would not have been there without this important Federal program. Since 1994, the COPS program has helped fund 4,806 additional officers in New Jersey alone. This has made a big difference for the local towns and communities in New Jersey.

The creation of the COPS program was a breakthrough in law enforcement. By funding additional officers, critical technologies, and valuable training, COPS has been a catalyst for the revolutionary shift to community policing. But too many police departments are experiencing increases in the troubling indicators of violent crimes.

At a time when we are asking our cops to do more to reduce crime and protect our homeland from potential terrorist related threats, we are giving them less funding to do so. Just look at the largest 44 metropolitan police departments. Of them 27, yes 27, have actually been forced to reduce the size of their police departments. That means that there are less police officers on the beat and more crime on the street.

COPS and community policing have put us on the right track. Crime is at its lowest levels in more than a quarter of a century. The police chiefs and sheriffs in my district consistently tell me that we could have never achieved this much without the additional officers and technology funded under the COPS program. I just do not understand why we are not supporting this effective program appropriately.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to give up the progress we have achieved in crime reduction over the last 10 years. The COPS program has been vital to our local communities. Our police departments can only do so much with the resources they are given. We should do everything we can to increase, not cut, the funding of the COPS program. I urge my colleagues to support the Obey amendment.

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

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) insist on his point of order?

Mr. WOLF. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized on his point of order.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the rules under which this bill is brought to the floor, this amendment would be in order if no Member of the House chooses to lodge a point of order against it.

My understanding of the rule that the committee reported is that it has waived the rules for numerous provisions that were placed in the bill by the majority party. It is hard for me to imagine that the House would feel comfortable in not providing that same courtesy to this amendment.

I would also suggest that what I am trying to do by this amendment is to do a favor for the majority leader, because he does not want us to have to cut into NASA in order to fund this restoration for law enforcement grants. If he allows this amendment to go forward, if no Member of the majority party lodges a point of order against this amendment, then we can restore the badly needed funds for local law enforcement without having to go after some of the increases in the majority leader's favorite program.

I would urge the House to do a favor for the majority leader by not lodging a point of order against this amendment. If they do that, we could proceed to restore badly needed funds.

I would concede, Mr. Chairman, that if any individual Member does lodge a point of order, I would have to concede the point of order, but I would hope that a point of order would not be offered, or if it has already been offered, I would hope that it would be withdrawn as a special favor to the majority leader.

Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) concedes the point of order. The point of order is conceded and sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1) (increased by \$1)"

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$100,000,000)"

Page 23, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$100,000,000)"

Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$100,000,000)"

Page 53, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(decreased by \$200,000,000)"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for 10 minutes on his amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think my admiration for the subcommittee chairman is well known. I think he does a great job for his district and for this House, but we have been placed in a very tough position because of the priorities that were laid out by the budget resolution adopted by this House earlier this year.

Because of those priorities, we are faced today with the necessity for a trade-off. What has happened in this bill over the last 4 years is that State and local law enforcement grants have been cut by almost a billion dollars. They are cut from last year to this year by \$410 million in this bill. I am simply trying by this amendment to restore half of that money, restore \$200 million. Half would go into the COPS program, half into the Justice Assistance Grant program, and we would pay for that, in contrast to another amendment that I understand a Member may offer, which would pay for it by going after basic science programs in the National Science Foundation. This amendment would not do that. I think we need to put more money in science, not less.

What this amendment would do, and I offer it reluctantly because I would have preferred the first amendment, but the action of the majority party requires me to go to this option.

What this amendment does is to say we should scale back the \$500 million increase in the account that contains the Moon and Mars mission by \$200 million in order to pay for this law enforcement assistance. Of that \$200 million, \$160 million would be taken from Project Prometheus. NASA, the agency in charge, still has not been able to identify a relevant mission for the funds in that account. The planning is certainly not ripe, and so what we are saying in essence is since this is a pilot mission which would take place roughly around the year 2020 or 2030, what we are saying instead is for the moment we ought to put more money into law enforcement to help buttress law enforcement in our local communities, and we can on another day decide

where we can get the money for Project Prometheus so that sometime 20 or 25 years from now, we can use nuclear-powered craft to go to Mars. I do not think it is even a close choice, and I would ask for an aye vote.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The amendment would reduce funding for one of the President's top priorities, science and space. This represents more than a 6-percent reduction in the President's new Vision for Space Exploration and would significantly jeopardize NASA's ability to implement its new mission.

I would like to read a letter from the Administrator, Michael Griffin.

"Dear Mr. Chairman:

"It has come to my attention that, during House consideration of H.R. 2862, an amendment will be offered by Mr. Oby that proposes to reduce NASA Exploration Systems funding by \$200 million, and redirect the NASA funds to State and local law enforcement assistance activities.

"I must respectfully oppose this amendment. I support full funding of the President's fiscal year 2006 request for NASA. Any reduction in NASA's fiscal year 2006 Exploration Systems funding would threaten the ability of this Nation to ensure U.S. human access to space, our efforts to accelerate the availability of the crew exploration vehicle to minimize the gap between the retirement of the space shuttle and the first operational flight of the CEV, and our efforts to maintain a robust civil service workforce at NASA's field centers in support of these efforts."

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Oby amendment. This amendment would restore crucial funding for State and local law enforcement back to the fiscal year 2005 enacted level.

This bill cuts the funding for these programs by \$410 million from the fiscal year 2005 enacted levels, and the 2005 enacted level was already \$226 million less than was provided the year before that. So in 2 years, we have cut \$636 million from law enforcement programs. How long are we going to continue on this downward slope of funding for our critical law enforcement programs?

The Oby amendment would restore funding for the Byrne-JAG program and COPS, Community-Oriented Policing Services program. The COPS program has been highly successful and provides funding for our local and State agencies that they need to hire and train new police officers.

According to the Department of Justice, every dollar we invest in the COPS program contributes to a decline

in 10 violent crimes and 27 property crimes per 100,000 residents. As a former city police officer and a Michigan State Trooper, as well as cochair of the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, I understand how much our local communities need and rely on the Byrne grants and COP grants to keep these successful programs going in their neighborhoods.

The Byrne-JAG grants provide funding for 29 different and vital programs such as antidrug education programs, treatment programs, and alternative sentencing initiatives, giving the States the ability to choose which programs they find most beneficial in their State to do under this Federal funding.

□ 1300

As most of us know and we hear when we go back home to our local districts, the Byrne grants fund the local drug enforcement teams. We have to provide this funding so our drug enforcement officers can do their jobs. We must listen to what our drug enforcement officers are telling us and fully fund the Byrne grant program.

Local drug enforcement teams are crucial to keeping our communities safe and drug free. If Byrne grants are funded at the level currently provided in this bill, our teams will be unable to hire the officers they need to sustain their drug enforcement teams. In my home State of Michigan, we would lose 11 of the 25 teams we have in Michigan. California would lose 26 teams. Texas would lose 21 drug enforcement teams. New York would lose 34 drug enforcement teams.

Losing these drug enforcement teams would have a devastating and far-reaching effect not only in Michigan but throughout this country, especially in our rural communities. Let me be really clear. When it comes to crime and drug abuse and drug dealers, no community, urban or rural, is immune to this problem.

Congress needs to step up to the plate and show their strong commitment to law enforcement and the criminal justice system. Today we have a chance to do that by voting for the Oby amendment and showing our support for law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line each and every day to keep our communities safe and drug free. I urge support of the Oby amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Oby amendment. The \$200 million funding cut to NASA's exploration program proposed in this amendment would jeopardize U.S. jobs and jeopardize space launch capability. These cuts would threaten personnel reductions in existing NASA exploration systems' workforce across the Nation and could impact more than 1,000 employees. This cut will take money directly from work on the new crew exploration vehicle, a much needed vehicle that will replace the space shuttle

in 2010 or after 2010. It contains very likely the most vital addition of a crew escape module making it a safer vehicle for our astronauts. It is a very important thrust.

The gentleman from Wisconsin's amendment proposes to take funds out of NASA and put them toward justice assistance grants. While I am supportive of local law enforcement officials, it is important to point out that Congress has already appropriated billions for State and local law enforcement. On May 17, the House approved the fiscal year 2006 homeland security appropriations bill which provides \$3.7 billion for first responders, including grants to State and local law enforcement agencies. Since September 11, \$15 billion has been provided to assist State and local officials. Indeed, the bill on the floor today provides \$2.6 billion for crime-fighting initiatives, \$1 billion more than the President requested.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has and will continue to support our men and women who fight crime in our communities. Of course we are going to do that. The issue today is not whether Congress supports law enforcement. It is whether Congress supports the economic and national security that our space program provides. Since 1969, America has led the world into space, and it is time to renew that vision. Our ventures into space not only keep America at the forefront of exploration and innovation, but they also are vital to our economy and our national security. This new national vision sets America on a course toward the Moon and Mars, and we should embrace this dream and work to make it a reality.

As the preeminent leader in human space flight, we cannot afford to sit idle and let other nations reap the rewards of our hard work, research and sacrifice. We know that the People's Republic of China has developed a human space flight program that encompasses everything from low-Earth orbit to exploring the Moon and Mars. As the new NASA administrator said recently and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) just pointed out, we need to retire the shuttle as quickly as possible and begin flying the new crew exploration vehicle to the international space station and the Moon. These requirements and these funding cuts that the gentleman from Wisconsin proposes will have a direct impact on that momentum and the President's vision for space exploration, a vision that will advance our national economy and prestige internationally.

America's space program continues to be an engine for our national economy. Exploration brings jobs and technological growth to America. Nearly every State in the Union benefits from the development of technologies needed to propel our space mission. At a time when we are all concerned about jobs leaving the United States, supporting NASA makes sense because we are providing good jobs for Americans.

We owe it to future generations of Americans and the men and women who have kept the space program alive to oppose this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Obey amendment. This is a delicately balanced bill and the Obey amendment would destroy that balance. The account that the gentleman from Wisconsin is reducing funds the President's space exploration initiative, and also NASA's Earth science, space science, and aeronautics programs. All of these programs are at a critical point and are struggling for funds. At a time when we are trying to keep important Earth science missions on the drawing board, at a time when we face increased costs for both the Hubble space telescope and its planned successor, the James Webb space telescope, at a time when we are contemplating significant changes in our aeronautics program, at a time when we are trying to create new technologies to return to the Moon, this arbitrary cut proposed in this amendment is simply not appropriate.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, it is a shame that we are debating this Obey amendment. I just want to reemphasize that we should be debating the Obey amendment that was denied by the Rules Committee, because that would be the amendment with the appropriate offset. Everybody understands, I think, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle agree that this cut that we are experiencing to State and local law enforcement, the cuts that we are experiencing in the COPS program, and the cuts that we are experiencing in juvenile justice programs, are lamentable. They are cuts from last year, and they are serious.

State and local law enforcement is funded at 22 percent less than the current level. At a time when State and local law enforcement need resources, we are cutting resources. The COPS program, a tremendous program, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) pointed out, is provided 13 percent less than the current level funding in this bill. Juvenile justice programs, those programs that are in the forefront of helping our youth, and addressing at-risk youth issues experience a 12 percent cut from the current level.

There is no question that the restoration side of the gentleman from Wisconsin's amendment needs to be addressed. He went to the Rules Committee and tried to get it addressed in an appropriate way by having the perfect offset. The offset is a small cut to those who have earned income of over \$1 million, who currently enjoy a tax

cut of approximately \$140,000. The Obey amendment just reduces that tax cut a little bit, by \$2,000. That would have been the appropriate offset. The offset that the ranking member is using in this second amendment, which he is forced to do because the Rules Committee did not give him a rule for the high-income offset, is a lamentable offset.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to this amendment. Americans take great pride in the accomplishments of the manned space flight program and NASA going all the way back to its earliest days, Mercury, Gemini, Apollo and beyond. And there always were people who came to the floor of this body proposing cuts to those programs, to NASA, and always shifting dollars to very, very worthwhile, or seemingly very, very worthwhile, entities.

I would just like to point out to my colleagues, do not be misled into believing that local law enforcement is going to be in a crisis if they do not get these additional funds. Better than 99 percent of funding to local law enforcement comes from State and local funding sources, and this amount of money is literally a drop in the bucket.

I would just like to also add that the Bush tax cuts that we passed out of this body and became law are causing a tremendous amount of economic growth and job creation, and there has been actually a surge of revenue into the State and local treasuries. Indeed, I am even told that chronically underfinanced New York City has a \$2 billion surplus. My State that I come from in Florida, we are experiencing a surplus because of the robust growth caused by this tax cut package. Those local and State agencies can put more funding into COPS programs and fighting meth labs. They actually have much more resources to take care of the job.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY).

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia has done a marvelous job in balancing a lot of important competing priorities. I will tell you that Americans need to be aware of this. We have been the only leader in manned space flight ever since Apollo XIII. But this amendment guts America's future manned space flight program.

In the year 2010, we are due to retire the shuttle. Unless we move forward with a new vehicle, which is what this amendment guts, the funding to do the exploration, the design and the research for, we will have a huge gap. There are nine other countries waiting to watch what we do. The Chinese, for example, are going to have a manned space flight program any day now. Yes, it is important to have local law enforcement; and, yes, we support that;

and, yes, there is great funding in this bill that Chairman WOLF put together; and, yes, 99 percent of those moneys come from local and State government.

But nothing is more important to the long-term security of the United States than space intelligence, space communications, space capability, including manned space flight. What this program does is to take \$200 million out of the proposal that the President has to have a continual manned space flight program after the shuttle is retired. We basically are going to say, we are going to have huge personnel reductions, including some of the most talented engineers and scientists in the world that will go do other things.

We are going to basically lay off up to 1,000 people, talking about the next generation of human space flight, all so that we can give out local good-feeling grants to local law enforcement agencies on top of what they already have. The vehicle the President is talking about will be more flexible, will have more capabilities, will take us ultimately not just back to the Moon but on to Mars and beyond unless we gut it here today.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think I am hearing a different amendment being debated. The fact is this amendment does not cut our core sciences. The President's budget is the one that squeezed those programs. This amendment does nothing of the kind. This amendment is very simple. This bill before us has increased the account that contains the Moon to Mars mission which is a mission that is going to occur 25 years in the future. This bill raises that account by half a billion dollars, \$500 million. It is paid for by cutting \$400 million out of local law enforcement. All I am suggesting is that we take \$200 million of that back and give it to the local law enforcement agencies so we have a better balance between the two programs.

I do not like the fact that we have to cut these programs. I would have preferred to do it the other way. But the majority party blocked me from doing that. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) took the floor a while earlier crying about the fact that we were trying to cut the NASA budget. We are not trying to cut the NASA budget. The committee has cut the law enforcement budget. It has increased the NASA budget. We are simply trying to modify the increase to some degree in order to save local law enforcement.

□ 1315

If the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) does not like the trade-off, then he ought to look in the mirror because he is the fellow who required it.

Earlier we had a different jurisdiction of this subcommittee, but the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) did not

like the fact that last year the subcommittee took money out of NASA in order to fund other programs including housing and veterans' health care. So he rearranged the jurisdiction of the committees; so now it means that NASA is in competition with local law enforcement. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has given us no place to go.

So the choice is simple. If Members want to pay for a \$500 million increase in a mission to Mars that is going to take place 25 years from now, if they want to pay for that by cutting back local law enforcement, then vote against the amendment. If they do not, then vote for it.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I would point out to the Members of the House that this subcommittee has restored more than \$1 billion in proposed cuts to State and local law enforcement. There is a total of \$2.6 billion provided for crime-fighting initiatives, and the bill restores programs like the SCAAP program, \$355 million to reimburse States for housing and detaining criminal aliens; \$334 million for juvenile delinquency prevention; \$387 million for Violence against Women.

This bill does a good job of restoring proposed cuts in law enforcement, and the amendment, if it were adopted, would be devastating to our Nation's space program.

America's space program today is still in the age of sailboats. We are using chemical rocket technology that was originally developed by Robert Goddard in the 1920s, and the only research program out there that is developing the next generation of rocket propulsion that will allow us to explore the outer solar system, that will allow us to go on to explore other solar systems around other stars, is Project Prometheus. It is the only research program out there to develop ion or thermal emission propulsion systems. The new Administrator at NASA has directed it to allow us to do research to develop nuclear surface power for our lunar missions.

If this amendment were adopted, it would devastate and damage severely NASA's ability to protect our astronauts from radiation hazards that they are all exposed to in outer space. The majority leader is right about that.

The People's Republic of China, Mr. Chairman, recognizes the importance of investing in outer space. If we adopt this amendment, we are allowing the Chinese to continue to move rapidly ahead in space exploration. The Chinese are not slowing down. They are going to be launching a lunar rover. They are going to be launching a lunar orbiter.

I urge Members to oppose this amendment so we can continue to in-

vest in the future of manned and unmanned space exploration.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TERRY:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$568,763)".

Page 3, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$604,800)".

Page 3, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$492,800)".

Page 3, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$966,269)".

Page 3, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$5,474,560)".

Page 4, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$299,268)".

Page 4, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$50,176)".

Page 4, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$2,982,878)".

Page 5, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$28,372)".

Page 5, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$647,140)".

Page 6, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$7,285,134)".

Page 6, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$960,521)".

Page 7, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$5,466)".

Page 7, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$3,585,142)".

Page 8, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$43,272)".

Page 9, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$96,177)".

Page 10, line 1, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$2,271,091)".

Page 10, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$25,720,271)".

Page 11, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$90,070)".

Page 12, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$7,643,655)".

Page 13, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$4,137,786)".

Page 16, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$21,932,508)".

Page 17, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$314,102)".

Page 18, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$15,075)".

Page 19, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,735,987)".

Page 22, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,019,048)".

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$4,485,806)".

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$285,168,840)".

Page 23, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$285,168,840)".

Page 25, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$224,000)".

Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$2,329,855)".

Page 28, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,495,030)".

Page 30, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$21,880)".

Page 30, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$18,207)".

Page 34, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$200,610)".

Page 35, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$281,129)".

Page 36, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,823,024)".

Page 38, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$344,960)".

Page 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$900,413)".

Page 38, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$119,096)".

Page 39, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$134,508)".

Page 39, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$359,762)".

Page 39, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$931,970)".

Page 39, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$2,076,910)".

Page 40, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$719,542)".

Page 41, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$79,368)".

Page 42, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$8,960)".

Page 42, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$7,630,784)".

Page 44, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$28,941)".

Page 44, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,781,893)".

Page 45, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$474,880)".

Page 45, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$201,600)".

Page 45, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$10,949,120)".

Page 47, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$4,193,280)".

Page 48, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$224,000)".

Page 50, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$212,648)".

Page 50, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$101,956)".

Page 53, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$24,927)".

Page 53, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$43,571,360)".

Page 55, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$30,073,792)".

Page 55, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$145,152)".

Page 57, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$19,611,290)".

Page 58, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$866,208)".

Page 58, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$3,615,360)".

Page 59, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,120,000)".

Page 59, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$17,920)".

Page 60, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$51,520)".

Page 60, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$16,787,089)".

Page 62, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$3,089,063)".

Page 62, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$574,618)".

Page 63, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$134,324)".

Page 63, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,838,592)".

Page 63, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$37,099)".

Page 63, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$42,067)".

Page 64, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$2,703,725)".

Page 64, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$4,077,696)".

Page 64, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$44,800)".

Page 64, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$3,190)".

Page 65, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$2,719)".

Page 65, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$88,484)".

Page 65, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$5,224,630)".

Page 66, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$4,639,040)".

Page 68, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$120,960)".

Page 69, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$23,744)".

Page 69, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$42,560)".

Page 69, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$98,560)".

Page 69, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$44,800)".

Page 71, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$26,880)".

Page 71, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$224,000)".

Page 71, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$2,777,600)".

Page 72, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$48,801)".

Page 76, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$5,251)".

Page 76, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$2,236)".

Page 76, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$40,750)".

Page 77, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$14,336)".

Page 77, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$9,094)".

Page 77, line 20, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$8,512)".

Page 78, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,483,901)".

Page 79, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,298,174)".

Page 80, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$945,280)".

Page 81, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$4,480)".

Page 81, line 19, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,481,997)".

Page 82, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$8,355)".

Page 82, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$3,978,764)".

Page 84, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,424,770)".

Page 85, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$60,480)".

Page 85, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$12,817)".

Page 85, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$4,480)".

Page 86, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$559,825)".

Page 86, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$356,330)".

Page 86, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$222,728)".

Page 88, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$8,960)".

Page 88, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$17,920)".

Page 88, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$102,368)".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and any amendments thereto, conclude by 15 minutes, and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am honored today to offer this amendment to now fully fund Byrne-JAG grants with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE). And I also want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and others for their help in this.

I also want to congratulate or show my appreciation to the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF), who certainly has been an advocate in the fight against drugs and methamphetamines in our communities and, from the President's budget that zeroed out the Byrne-JAG grants, was able in his subcommittee to put back \$300 million. I am here, with my colleagues that I just read off, to take that back to the \$600 million that was in there before.

Let us put this in context. This amendment, unlike the last amendment that went after just one or two areas, this is an across-the-board reduction of .448. So as the subcommittee's report, the bill that comes out, the funding remains at 99.55 percent, in essence, of what the committee has asked.

Just to show that there has been incredible impact in our communities from methamphetamines, and the Byrne-JAG grants go directly to our police departments, our sheriff departments to fight the drug dealers on the ground, they are our front line in the war on drugs, and it just makes no sense to me that we are moving towards a policy of nationalizing our drug crime fight at a time when it is our police officers on the streets that are fighting meth and other drugs.

At least in the Midwest it started off as a drug that was easy and cheap to make. They just needed ammonia, Sudafed, other chemicals to make this. It is highly addictive, and it is highly destructive to our communities and to our families, and I would encourage support for this amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This amendment takes the worst possible approach to finding offsets with an across-the-board cut. It is a blunt instrument and does tremendous damage. Indiscriminate cuts in this amendment would be irresponsible. Hundreds of people, perhaps thousands, would lose their jobs, and many other negative consequences would occur in virtually every agency in the bill.

For every Federal law enforcement agency in the bill this is a cut. The FBI, working around the clock to protect the country from the next terrorist attack is cut by \$26 million. If adopted, a reduction of 161 FBI agents, gone; 45 DEA agents gone, 35 deputy U.S. marshals gone; 22 ATF agents gone; 65 U.S. attorneys gone. In addition, the Bureau of Prisons, \$22 million out; State and local law enforcement programs are reduced including a \$2 million reduction in COPS and \$1.5 million from Juvenile Justice.

This amendment, not that the gentleman meant it to be that way, even cuts education benefits for the survivors of public safety officers killed in the line of duty, as well as disability benefits for officers while injured on duty.

Lastly, NASA is cut by \$70 million. Science goes down the tubes and is cut with regard to that. Embassy security, \$6.8 million, and remember Americans killed in Tanzania, Americans killed in Nairobi. A \$4 million is cut from SEC. Remember Enron, and we would take money from the SEC. Nineteen million dollars cut from the National Science Foundation. At the very time we are falling behind and everyone here is saying put more money into NSF, this takes money out of NSF, as we are falling down behind in engineers and math and science and physics and chemistry, and we just had the colloquy with the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Lastly, there have been a number of groups opposed to this: the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against

Government Waste, American Conservative Union, Americans for Tax Reform. If Members find something, if they need something, look at a bill and go through it. To have it equally across the board is the wrong way to go.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) for yielding me this time.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) for doing an almost impossible job and doing it very well.

Methamphetamine use has increased at an alarming rate in the last 15 years, and these charts illustrate this. This is what meth abuse looked like in 1990. Two States had 20 or more meth labs, in 1998, this is what it looked like, about two-thirds of the country. And this is what it looks like today. Almost the whole country has been inundated by meth.

I would also like to point out what meth does to a human being. It is the most addictive substance known to man. This is a 10-year snapshot of one life. It started out when this young lady was about 30 and ended when she was 40, in the morgue.

We are being inundated by this problem, and we think that we need to reintroduce the Byrne funding and sustain it at \$634 million, which was what it was last year. Otherwise, our local law enforcement people will simply be overwhelmed by this problem. We hate to do it in this way. We respect the chairman, but this is about the only course of action that we were given in order to make this in order.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska and the other supporters of this amendment should be appreciative of the chairman's efforts with regard to law enforcement. They have a focus on methamphetamine and the plague that it represents across our country. They should know that there is hardly a hearing that goes by that the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) does not bemoan the condition that the country and the challenge that the Nation faces with regard to methamphetamine and illegal drug use. He is totally supportive of their efforts in principle.

The problem is we have a tough bill, and when they go to an across-the-board cut, that is an expression of extreme desperation with regard to the appropriation process. When they offer an across-the-board cut as an offset, what they are really saying is that this bill is so incredibly tight that we cannot find offsets anywhere else. It is absolutely the wrong place to go.

I would suggest to the gentlemen that are down to offering across-the-board cuts to reassess their vote on the

budget resolution. We need more money in these bills for law enforcement, to provide funds to State and localities which are being cut from last year.

I oppose the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) for his leadership on this. I also want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) for the great work he has done with the very difficult challenge of funding very important programs.

But I just cannot help but continue to think about a young girl named Megan in a beautiful town in Minnesota that started using meth in seventh grade at age 13, and when she first took it, which she got from a friend, she said, This is something I am going to do over and over again. She did. But when she could not afford it, her addiction, she, like too many other female addicts, was exploited into becoming a prostitute to pay for the meth she craved every day. After hitting bottom at age 18, she is now pulling her life back together. But she has too many in her company. One out of five people that are meth addicts in recovery are 17 years or younger in the State of Minnesota.

We need to make sure that we have the resources at the local level to address this. We need to send a signal that this is important to Congress, that we stand with our law enforcement agents as they are trying to rid this country of this scourge. We need to make sure that those that are trying to sell this poison know that we are out to stop them.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

□ 1330

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. An appropriations bill is all about balance. All of us have programs in this bill we would like to see funded a little more or a little less. But the question before us is whether the bill strikes the overall balance among programs, given the fiscal constraints that we all face. And I think that with this bill, the appropriators did an outstanding job with their balancing act. We should be very cautious about throwing off that balance.

Let me give you an example from a program under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science. Is the National Science Foundation lavishly funded? Hardly. The appropriation for NSF, for example, is not even enough to bring the agency back to its 2004 funding level. The committee recognized the importance to our Nation's future of funding long-range basic research at our Nation's universities, but the committee could not find the money to

provide anything like the authorized level of funding. That is the kind of balancing act the committee had to pull off throughout the bill.

Now this arbitrary across-the-board amendment comes along that would unravel all of this, and I oppose it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for the Byrne-JAG restoration amendment. Byrne and Justice Assistance Grants are critical to our local law enforcement and in the fight against methamphetamine. As cochair of the Congressional Meth Caucus, I know firsthand the importance of these funds to our local drug task forces as they work to bust meth labs.

I want to thank and recognize the subcommittee chair and ranking member for their great efforts in drafting this bill. Despite those efforts, the level of Byrne grant funding in this bill would cause harm to Washington State's drug task forces. These cuts would eliminate at least three task forces and potentially six others, and small police departments in my district rely on Byrne grants to make communities safer.

This past week there were two clear examples in my district of why Byrne grants are needed. One of those is in Whatcom County, where close to 40 arrests were made of Bandidos motorcycle gang members and their associates in Operation Roadhouse. This effort was a culmination of a 2-year investigation by Federal, State, and local law enforcement agents. The entire Northwest Regional Drug Task Force was closely involved in this investigation, expending literally thousands of dollars in resources and man hours to ensure the success of this operation.

As one sheriff from my district told me, these cuts cannot come at a worse time. So we need to be sure to fund Byrne grants.

I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his hard work and urge a "yes" vote on the Byrne-JAG restoration amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY).

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, all of us understand the intent of this amendment. We would like to stop the use and abuse and the sale of methamphetamine and other dangerous drugs. As a matter of fact, this bill does a great deal towards that end. But the problem with the amendment is that it robs Peter to pay Paul because you are gutting other long-standing law enforcement programs to start up new programs that traditionally have been established and protected at the local and State levels.

In addition, as I mentioned before, one of the things that we are trying to

do is not to lose the next space race. In the year 2010, the United States will, by plan, be out of the manned flight business because we will retire the shuttle. The President has proposed making sure we have a replacement vehicle more flexible and capable for the future.

This has huge ramifications for American security, American intelligence, American communications capabilities. The President's proposal and that of Michael Griffin, the new NASA Administrator, is to move up our manned capabilities to the year 2010 so we will have no gap where we have to rely on the Russians or other foreign powers to get us in a manned way into space. By the way, the Chinese are coming. In 2012, they expect to have a vehicle on the Moon. They will have manned flights after that.

Please, do not gut America's predominance in space when it comes to manned space flight and undermine law enforcement across America.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD).

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, Edmund Burke put it best when he said the main reason we have government is to keep people safe. That is why the cut made by the committee is extremely disappointing. We need to restore the funding for the important Byrne grant program.

In my home State of Minnesota, I have seen firsthand the importance of Byrne grants to local police in reducing crime and drugs and improving public safety. Byrne grants fund critical overtime pay, task forces, equipment and "buy" money. How else are you going to prosecute drug cases if you do not have Byrne grants to provide "buy" money? Without this money, Minnesota would lose nearly half of its 20 multijurisdictional drug task forces.

We all know in this body that violent crime is at a 30 year low. Why go backwards? We must never forget our cops are on the front lines in the war on crime, fighting drug dealers and protecting our homeland. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment to restore funding for the important Byrne grants. Let us restore this program to the 2005 levels.

It is time to honor the sacrifices made each and every day by our Nation's law enforcement community and give our finest the support they deserve.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I serve on this subcommittee, and in every single hearing the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) brought up the problem of fighting meth labs. In fact, this committee has tripled the request the President made for fighting meth abuse from \$20 million to \$60 million.

There is \$348 million in this bill for the Byrne-Justice Assistance Grant

programs. We cannot through the National Science Foundation even fund two out of five of the many grant requests that NSF receives. We are not making the investment necessary for a great country like the United States to protect our technological edge for the future.

The Chinese recognize the importance of investing in scientific research and in their space program. The Chinese will launch a lunar science orbiter in 2007. They will launch a lunar sample return mission in 2015. They will launch a lunar rover in about 2012. The chief scientist for the Chinese lunar program pointed out that the lunar exploration project will spur high-tech development in China, and I cannot calculate how much return there will be on that investment for the Chinese people.

I urge Members to vote against this amendment and support the bill laid out by the chairman as a wise investment in the future prosperity of the United States in science.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for yielding me time and for bringing this amendment.

There has been a lot of good work done on this bill overall, but I have heard said on this floor that this bill strikes the right balance. If it does, then the bill last year and the year before and the year before did not strike the right balance, because we are seeing a reduction in these funds that go into the JAG grant.

We have an intense amount of methamphetamine abuse across this country, and particularly in the Midwest. That is why you see Midwesterners down here on this floor. I will see 1,119 fewer adults and juveniles be offered up for treatment or be adjudicated due to violations of methamphetamine if we do not get this amendment passed today.

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

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I too commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) on his efforts to help local law enforcement. I commend the gentleman from Nebraska for his leadership in supporting the Byrne-JAG program. It is an important issue, and I am pleased to see it addressed.

I was the King County sheriff and worked for the sheriff's office for 33 years and spent my life in law enforcement. During my time in law enforcement, I have seen how Byrne and JAG grants have helped local law enforcement fight the war on drugs.

Washington received \$9.6 million under the Byrne grant formulas. Without this funding, our State would not have been able to effectively work to reduce violent drug-related crimes.

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

Mr. Chairman, my father was a policeman for 20 years, so I am not going to take any back seat to anybody else.

If you really want to do something, stand up to the drug industry, which this Congress will not do, and do what the State of Oklahoma did: pass the law that makes you go up to the counter and ask for it. If you really want to do something, do that and stand up to the drug industry and deal with it.

This amendment cuts COPS \$2 million; U.S. Attorneys, \$7 million; Marshals Service, \$4 million; the Do Not Call, FEC, \$4 million; Small Business Administration, \$3 million; NSF, \$19 million; NASA, \$72 million; DEA, \$7 million; public safety officer benefits. Why? If we were looking to have an amendment, we would sort of exempt that out.

That is why these across-the-boards are a bad thing. We would exempt that out. Oceans. We just had a colloquy with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) on oceans. We go down on oceans.

I understand. Meth is coming to my area. We do not want to take away from embassy security so Federal employees get blown up, or reduce the FBI that is fighting that, or DEA. There are other ways to deal with this.

I care about the meth issue as much as anybody else. This is not the way to do it. You cannot go out and explain why we make all these cuts. There must be some focus. If you think this is so important, find out that area, offer an amendment to cut it, and put it back in this. But across the board, this is a bad amendment.

I urge Members to vote "no."

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman TERRY for his leadership on this issue. I am pleased to be able to join my colleagues, as a co-sponsor and advocate of our amendment to restore funding to the Byrne-Justice Assistance Grant, JAG, program in the Science-State appropriations bill. If, we, as the House, do not pass the Obey amendment, then we must pass the Terry amendment—even though it may hurt some programs, we all support.

Unfortunately, this program is grossly underfunded in the bill—cutting funding from the \$634 million that was provided in fiscal year 2005 to only \$348 million in fiscal year 2006—a 45-percent cut. Our amendment restores \$286 million to Byrne, which will put the funding back to last year's level.

If we do not restore this funding now, it will only be a matter of time before this program is completely wiped out.

As a former Escanaba city police officer and Michigan State trooper as well as co-chair of the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, I understand how much our local communities need and rely on the Byrne grants program monies.

Byrne grants provide funding for 29 vital programs such as anti-drug education programs, treatment programs and alternative sentencing initiatives, giving the States the ability to choose the programs where this Fed-

eral funding would be most beneficial to law enforcement issues faced in their State.

Local drug enforcement teams are crucial to keeping our communities drug free. Without our amendment, our teams will not have the funding to hire the officers they need to sustain their drug enforcement teams. In my home State of Michigan, we would lose 11 of our 25 task forces. California will lose 26 of 58, Texas will lose 21 of 46 and New York will lose 34 of 76.

Fighting the war on drugs must be an inter-jurisdictional, unified effort between local, county, and State police working together. Without the necessary Federal funding, this coordination will not be possible because our local task forces will no longer be in existence.

Losing these task forces is a frightening thought considering that 90 percent of drug arrests nationwide are made by State and local law enforcement agencies.

This would have a devastating and far reaching effect in Michigan—especially on our rural communities. Let me be clear—when it comes to drug abuse, no community—urban or rural—is immune to this problem.

Congress needs to step up to the plate and show their strong commitment to law enforcement and the criminal justice system. They have that chance today by voting for our amendment and showing their support for law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line to keep our communities safe and drug free.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOSWELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOSWELL:
Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,500,000)".

Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

Page 28, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for their great work on this important piece of legislation. They both have done a fine job faced with very, very difficult budget realities. We recognize that. However, we hope that this might be considered.

Mr. Chairman, during the Memorial Day district work period, I traveled my district to announce the introduction of H.R. 2659, the Safe Children Safe Communities Act which we introduced on May 26. This legislation seeks to provide \$300 million in grants to States based on their population to implement better and more comprehensive sex offender registries and tracking systems.

Now, the amendment I have offered today does not seek \$300 million, but I believe it will help provide the States with needed resources to update their records.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to increase funding for the Criminal Records Update Program by \$2.5 million. My amendment offsets this increase in funding by reducing the Department of Justice general administration salaries and expense account by \$2.5 million.

The subcommittee has funded the Criminal Records Update Program at \$25 million for FY 2006, which is an increase of \$334,000 over the previous year. However, this falls drastically short of the administration's request by some \$33 million.

Mr. Chairman, the goal of this program is to ensure accurate records are available for use in law enforcement, including sex offender registry requirements. The program helps States build their infrastructure to connect to a national record check system both to supply information and to conduct checks.

Mr. Chairman, during my time traveling my district, I have spoken to countless law enforcement officials; and during our conversations we have agreed on many issues. This is not a Republican issue; this is not a Democratic issue, national, State or local. It is all of it together. It is all of it together to protect our children.

We are in 100 percent agreement: we must work together at the Federal, State, and local levels to ensure the safety of our children.

□ 1345

I realize times are tight when it comes to spending, but if we can spare any additional dollars to ensure communities and our children are safe, then we absolutely must do it.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a good amendment, and I have no objection. I think it should pass.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. ISSA:
Page 2, line 7, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

Page 6, line 12, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

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

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

The gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise with this amendment today in order to increase the funding to the attorneys general for trafficking in humans that is going on rapidly throughout the country. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and his committee for working to bring this legislation to the floor and to highlight these problems here today.

Illegal immigration is the number one issue in my district and in the State of California. One of the greatest reasons that Members of Congress oppose illegal immigration is the dangerous practice of smuggling human beings into the United States by practitioners known as "coyotes." Coyotes care little for the welfare of their cargo, only about the fee they will have, and have killed countless aliens in the process.

Over the past few years, the U.S. Attorney's Office has not prosecuted coyotes by any means to the fullest extent possible. As a matter of fact, in November of 2004, the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of California, Carol Lamb, set up new guidelines. Under these guidelines, the only prosecution of a coyote for bringing somebody into the United States would include that they would be prosecuted only if they committed three felonies, and two of these crimes occurred in the district in the past 5 years. At least one of these offenses should have had the result of a prison sentence of at least 13 months, and it goes on. Essentially, you have to be a three-time criminal felon who endangered either the Border Patrol or directly the lives of individuals involved in order to even be eligible for prosecution. As a result, people who have been caught and released 20 or more times continue to not be prosecuted in the San Diego district. Throughout the district and throughout the country, the Office of the U.S. Attorney claims that they have to prioritize prosecution of human smugglers because there are insufficient funds. We aim to deal with that here today.

We should not allow smugglers to go free due to the lack of resources. There is no question that we have over 11 million, by the U.S. Census, over 11 million illegals in this country. I, for one, make no claim that tomorrow we could remove them all, but certainly, while we are trying to figure out how to grapple with this vexing problem, we should have a zero tolerance for people who traffic in human beings.

My amendment is intended to begin that process. It is my sincere hope that I can work with the Committee on Appropriations in order to put an emphasis on this area of trafficking.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia Chairman Wolf.

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

Mr. ISSA. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, this is subject to a point of order, and it is un-

fortunate that it is. I would pledge to the gentleman that we will do everything we can to deal with this problem.

Several weeks ago several of us were down in El Salvador where they made the very case of the people who were involved in violent gangs had gone to coyotes who would take them up. I think the gentleman is right on target, so we will work with him, and I appreciate him bringing this to our attention, so that we can see what we can do.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's assurances.

I will at this time insert in the RECORD all of my statement and additional relevant materials.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to amend H.R. 2862 in order to increase funding for the prosecution of human smugglers, known as "coyotes." I thank Chairman WOLF for his Committee's work in bringing this legislation before us.

Illegal immigration is the number one issue I hear about from my constituents in California. Illegal immigration not only endangers our nation's security but in many cases the security of those individuals illegally immigrating. Aliens who allow themselves to be smuggled into the United States are at the greatest risk, and it is their smugglers who need to be prosecuted most expeditiously.

The U.S. Attorney's Office has stated in the past that it does not have the resources needed to fully prosecute arrested coyotes. Border Patrol agents who arrest many of the coyotes have compared their detention and prosecution to a catch-and-release program, stating that many are released within hours of arrest and caught again the next day. For example, the Border Patrol was instructed to release known coyote, Antonio Amparo-Lopez, an individual with 21 aliases and 20 arrests. Releasing a criminal such as this due to lack of funds is completely unacceptable, and is demoralizing to the Border Patrol agents who work so hard to make the arrests in the first place.

For this reason I am proposing this amendment to increase the funding for the United States Attorneys by \$5,000,000. The amendment redirects funds from the General Administration account of the Department of Justice into the Salaries and Expenses account of the United States Attorneys. I truly hope the U.S. Attorney's Office takes to heart the seriousness of this Congress' commitment to coyote prosecution.

I look forward to working with the Appropriations Committee further in efforts tied to the prosecution of alien smugglers. I also look forward to working with Chairman Sensenbrenner as we continue to address this issue within the Judiciary Committee during the Department of Justice Reauthorization process.

[From the Associated Press State & Local Wire, Nov. 2, 2004.]

FEDERAL PROSECUTORS TO BE MORE SELECTIVE ON IMMIGRATION CASES
(By Elliot Spagat)

Federal prosecutors in San Diego said a burgeoning caseload was forcing them to be more selective about charging illegal immigrants who have committed crimes.

Under proposed guidelines, the government would focus on prosecuting immigrants whose previous crimes occurred only a short time ago and happened nearby, making it easier to get police and court records.

Illegal immigrants with criminal records are often charged with re-entry after deportation, a felony offense. Federal prosecutors in San Diego file more than 2,000 re-entry cases a year.

The guidelines would also be more selective about prosecuting immigrant smugglers, concentrating on cases in which migrants are led through dangerous terrain.

Carol Lam, the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of California, asked the Border Patrol to comment on the proposals, and hasn't set a date for them to take effect, said Steve Clark, first assistant U.S. attorney. The changes would apply only to the Southern California district—which encompasses San Diego and Imperial counties.

Clark on Monday declined to discuss specifics, saying that might encourage criminals to alter their behavior in an effort to escape prosecution. But, he said, the changes are a response to "finite resources" and a growing caseload.

"(The) number of alien smuggling cases presented to our office has increased significantly over the last year," Steven Peak, an assistant U.S. attorney, wrote Paul Blocker Jr., the Border Patrol's acting San Diego sector chief. "Alien smuggling cases are manpower-intensive and often difficult to prosecute successfully."

Peak's Aug. 24 letter—first reported by KGTV—TV of San Diego—said many illegal immigrants with criminal histories committed their offenses outside Southern California or haven't been arrested for 10 years, making it difficult to get police and court documents.

Under the new guidelines, offenders with three felony convictions would be prosecuted only if two of those crimes occurred within the district in the last five years. At least one of those offenses should have resulted in a prison sentence of at least 13 months.

The new guidelines for prosecuting immigrant smugglers would require that the suspect "intentionally or recklessly created a substantial risk of death or serious bodily injury," Peak wrote. Examples include guiding migrants through remote areas in extreme weather.

A spokesman for the Border Patrol, Sean Isham, said the agency was working closely with prosecutors on the revisions and emphasized that they are still only proposals.

Shawn Moran, a spokesman for National Border Patrol Council Local 1613, which represents Border Patrol agents in San Diego, was more critical.

"We're not happy about it," he said. "It pretty much just raises the bar on the threshold for prosecution."

[From the Washington Times, June 8, 2005.]

ILLEGALS AND MURDER

Even hardened cops found it difficult to comprehend the carnage they found at 7000 Park Heights Ave. in Northwest Baltimore on May 27, 2004. There lay the bodies of Ricardo Solis Quezada Jr. and his sister, Lucero Solis Quezada, both 9 years old, and their cousin, Alexis Espejo Quezada, 10, illegal aliens from Mexico. One of the children

was decapitated, and the other two were all but beheaded with a fillet knife. The trial of the alleged "Baltimore Butchers" begins today.

Two relatives of the children—Adan Espinoza Canela, 17, who worked at a Baltimore slaughterhouse, and Policarpio Espinoza, 22, who sold food from a truck—were arrested and charged with the slayings. Both suspects are illegal aliens. Police suspect that the killings were in retaliation for the failure of the children's parents to pay off their debts to "coyotes" who smuggled the family into the country. Family members claim the defendants are innocent, and have refused to cooperate with prosecutors and police.

There are two separate issues here. The first is that three innocent children were brutally murdered. Whoever committed this crime must be severely punished. The second is the matter of illegal immigration and crime—a subject that has serious implications for people across the United States and Marylanders in particular.

To begin with, anyone who crosses the border illegally, as the defendants did, has committed a crime by doing so. But a significant minority of illegal aliens go on to perpetrate more disturbing crimes after arriving in the United States. They include such persons as Angel Maturino Resendiz, the so-called Railroad Killer, who murdered at least nine people as he traveled the country by train, and the Mexican drug dealers who killed ranger Kris Eggle, 28, at Organ Pipe National Monument in Arizona on Aug. 9, 2002. In 2003, the Federal Bureau of Prisons estimated that criminal aliens—noncitizens who commit crimes—comprise more than 29 percent of federal prison inmates.

One of the first people to arrive at the murder scene on that horrible afternoon last May was Baltimore Mayor Martin O'Malley, who denounced the crimes and vowed to bring those responsible to justice. But there is no getting around the fact that politicians like Mr. O'Malley, a Democrat, bear a measure of responsibility for the fact that illegal aliens are finding Maryland an increasingly attractive place to reside. Their number has more than doubled since 2000, a period during which the mayor, Montgomery County Executive Doug Duncan and other Democrats have fought to ensure that illegals will not be barred from obtaining driver's licenses and immigration status. Mr. O'Malley also has lobbied aggressively against legislation that would encourage better federal-state cooperation to apprehend illegal aliens. If Mr. O'Malley and the Democratic establishment get their way, Maryland will continue to be an attractive place to people like the Baltimore Butchers and the Railroad Killer.

[From the San Diego Union-Tribune, Nov. 25, 2003]

THREE MEN FOUND SLAIN IN ARIZONA DESERT
(By New York Times News Service)

Three men, believed to have been illegal immigrants from Mexico, were found slain execution-style in the Arizona desert over the weekend, the Maricopa County sheriff said yesterday.

Sheriff Joe Arpaio said the men had been kidnapped, tied up and shot. There have been nine similar killings in the county since March 2002.

All 12 bodies were found within 25 to 30 miles of remote, rural desert areas surrounding Phoenix.

Authorities blame the killings on organized gangs of "coyotes," who smuggle people across the border.

Sheriff's detectives believe the smuggling gangs are trying to cut into their competitors' business and send a message to those

who can't pay their smuggling fees of about \$1,000.

"We think they throw them right off the roadway to send a message," Arpaio said.

In the latest killings, the three bodies were found Sunday morning by a bicyclist along a dirt road on the Gila Indian Reservation.

Two of the victims appeared to have been in their 20s and the third in his 40s. Autopsies are being conducted.

There are no suspects. The earlier nine victims were immigrants from Mexico.

Local authorities and a federal task force are investigating the killings.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 5, 2005]

148 IMMIGRANTS FOUND CAPTIVE IN SOUTH L.A. HOMES

TWO ALLEGED SMUGGLERS ARE ARRESTED AFTER POLICE FIND 58 PEOPLE IN ONE HOUSE. NINETY ARE LATER FOUND IN SECOND HOME.

(By Claudia Zequeira and Jill Leovy, Times Staff Writers)

Los Angeles police found 148 immigrants held captive in two South Los Angeles houses Wednesday and arrested two suspected smugglers who were allegedly demanding payment for their release.

The discoveries are just the latest in a string of safe houses authorities have uncovered over the last two years. Officials say Los Angeles has emerged as a center of the human-smuggling business, with immigrants shipped from Latin America, across the border and to houses in Los Angeles. Often, they are eventually put on airplanes to other parts of the country.

Fifty-eight immigrants were discovered about 1 p.m. in the 800 block of West 80th Street. Ninety were discovered six hours later, about 20 blocks away in a house in the 100 block of West 59th Place.

Police discovered the first group after one of the prisoners escaped and called 911 from a nearby pay phone, said Los Angeles Police Det. Javier Lozano of LAPD's 77th Street Division.

The caller told authorities people were being held in the house and then fled. Officers arriving at the house found bars on the rear windows and a large awning or canopy screening the back.

Police said they noticed a powerful odor when they entered the house and discovered men and women shoulder to shoulder in two locked bedrooms. The immigrants were from Ecuador and Mexico, officials said.

The house "was a hot oven, and these people were just crowded in," Lozano said.

Two men, including one inside the house, were arrested.

The immigrants described being held for as long as a month as smugglers, called coyotes, demanded payments of \$3,000 for their release. Police loaded the immigrants onto a bus for transfer into federal custody. Federal immigration officials have taken over the case, Lozano said. The house was rented.

Authorities declined to say how the second house was discovered, except to say that the circumstances were similar. Immigrants taken into custody at that house were from Guatemala, El Salvador and Mexico.

At the first house, a single-story stucco home, police spent much of Wednesday questioning neighbors and the landlord. Residents said they had noticed nothing unusual at the property and were surprised to learn that so many people had been found inside.

"We thought the house was for rent. We never saw people there," said Tyrine Soil, 19. "We're shocked to hear that there were 60 people living in there."

Other residents said that they saw only one man entering the house, and said that he sometimes carried bags of groceries.

Landlord Matthew Lux of Downey said he also had no idea that there were so many people in the house. "There was no noise, no smell," Lux said. "I never saw 50 people until they brought them out."

Lux said he rented the three-bedroom house in January to a couple with two children. The man and woman told Lux that they worked for a church. They did not have credit but they gave the name of a friend who backed their \$1,300-a-month lease.

"They were great tenants," Lux said. "They always paid in cash. They were always on time. I wish I had more tenants like them."

Federal authorities have struggled to combat human smuggling. They have made arrests but they have found it hard to find those who run the operations. Federal agents have begun patrolling Los Angeles International Airport as part of a crackdown launched last year.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

Page 2, line 7, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

Page 26, line 25, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

Page 28, line 6, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)" after the dollar amount.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me commend the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Ranking Member MOLLOHAN) for the outstanding work that they have done in crafting this appropriation.

My amendment is designed, and I actually plan to withdraw it, but my amendment is designed to raise the issue and highlight the fact that 630,000 individuals, roughly 1,700 a day, will be released from prisons to return to their communities. We can expect on an annual basis that this large number of released inmates from prison will continue for the next 5 years. Also, we must be mindful of the fact that local jails are releasing 7 million people each year. Many of these individuals are never able to find a decent place to live, cannot access various entitlement programs such as public housing, financial assistance for college, and, in some instances, food stamps, and are often-times denied employment because of their past criminal convictions. Statistics show that nearly 52 percent of these individuals end up back in jail within 3 years.

As these men and women transition from incarceration to freedom, what they need most are comprehensive re-entry solutions. Prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation are just as important as incarceration. These men and women and children still have to

live in our communities. Therefore, increasing public safety is a primary concern of communities and neighborhoods all across the country.

Successful reentry is difficult to obtain because of the vast and extreme barriers that ex-offenders encounter every day of their lives. In Illinois, just a year ago, ex-offenders were prohibited from working in 57 occupational categories without some form of waiver. For example, ex-offenders were not allowed to be barbers, nail technicians; they could not be a custodian in a hospital or school. Many of these individuals were convicted of nonviolent offenses, mainly drug convictions. So it is extremely difficult for ex-offenders to find housing and get a job after they have paid their debt to society.

I would hope that as we continue to explore budgetary preparations and appropriations, that we would recognize that if we are to seriously deal with the issue of recidivism reduction, the issue of public safety, the issue of helping individuals become contributing members of society, we must put adequate funding into reentry.

Again, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) for his support of these kinds of programs. I would like to extend a little dialogue, engage in a colloquy with him, and then I would withdraw my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, would the chairman explain the kind of resources that we are putting into reentry programs this year for next year's budget?

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman raising this issue. This is really an important issue. Before I came to Congress, I was involved in a reentry program at Lorton Reformatory, so I think what the gentleman is trying to do is a good idea.

Reentry programs are critical to rehabilitating prisoners. I support the programs and will continue to work with the gentleman. The bill includes a \$6 million increase in the Bureau of Prisons and \$10 million in OJP for reentry programs. You really cannot put a man or a woman in jail for 15 years and then, at the end, just open up the cell and let them out without having any reentry programs. So what the gentleman is trying to do is exactly right. But that is the status of funding, a \$6 million increase within the Bureau of Prisons and \$10 million in OJP for reentry programs.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Ranking Member MOLLOHAN) for their sensitivity to these issues, and I look forward to working with them throughout the year as we continue to try and strengthen the possibility of reducing recidivism and helping people maintain quality life in this country.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$50,100,000)".

Page 55, line 5, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$50,100,000)".

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me thank the chairman of this subcommittee and the subcommittee ranking member for their hard work on a hard task. This bill, that includes funding for NASA, the Department of Justice, the Department of State, a number of science programs, the Equal Opportunity Commission, is a tough legislative agenda, but certainly the hard work has been evidenced.

I rise today to offer an amendment that would have added \$50.1 million to the NASA Exploration Capabilities provision, and to note to my colleagues when I arrived here in this body and was assigned to the Committee on Science, one of the comments I used to make is that science would be the work of the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, I still maintain that, that out of science will come the opportunities for this country to boost its economic engine. The sad part about it is we find ourselves in 2005 having the least number of young people going into math and sciences, the least number of graduates out of chemistry and physics. So the vision of this Congress and the President and the American people coming together and talking about space exploration is so very important. This bill allows for \$9 million to be added to this vision, and I think it is crucial that we stay focused, stay consistent, and stay determined and committed.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on humankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of people lose their lives.

Space exploration is real, and it means a lot to America. It is sad to note that America's young people do

not find hopes and dreams in the study of science and technology and space exploration. What is known is that they want to see that there is a future, that there is hope, and out of this vision to go to Mars gives us hope. There is nothing more exciting than to see our early astronauts like former Senator John Glenn land or to travel into space, nothing more exciting to be able to note that we can achieve.

So my amendment was to provide extra resources so that we could stay steady on the course. I believe, however, it is important to maintain the already existing funding. I expect to offer an amendment to provide greater funding for training legal officers dealing with child abuse under the Violence Against Women Act, or trained legal professionals such as counselors and lawyers. I would like to see more dollars for the Equal Opportunity Commission for the job that they need to do, and certainly I hope that as we look toward the Vision of Space Exploration, we will focus on safety. I want to thank this subcommittee for focusing with language in their legislation on safety and ensuring that those skilled workers who are trained in safety are not let go.

I conclude by saying there are a number of good points in this bill, and I want to thank both the chairman and the ranking member for their language on torture to ensure that we do not adhere to that, and I would be offering an amendment to suggest that the terrorism dollars that are in this bill not be used to single out one religion over another.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will support this legislation, and particularly the appropriations on the space exploration.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support my Amendment which would fund NASA Exploration Capabilities for an additional \$50.1 million, with the funds to be taken from the Department of Justice General Administration funds. This funding would restore the President's full request for NASA Exploration Capabilities. This funding would be provided for the Space Operations Missions Directorate, including the International Space Station, the Space Shuttle program, and Space and Flight Support.

The funds for NASA Exploration Capabilities are essential to the President's vision for space exploration. This appropriation comes at a watershed moment for NASA and the future of America's space exploration mission. After the tragic Columbia Space Shuttle accident we had to step back and reassess our space shuttle program. Today, NASA is preparing to return to flight, but safety is still at the forefront of our concerns. The funds being addressed here are applicable to safety as well and we must ensure that everything is done to keep our NASA astronauts from possible harm.

Under this Amendment, funding for NASA Exploration Capabilities are to be taken from Department of Justice General Administration funds. The reason funds are being taken from this specific department is because they have received a very large increase of 14 percent or \$250 million more than they did last year.

Clearly, the Appropriations Committee has worked to make this a tight bill without much excessive spending. Most Departments are funding right at the President's request or even below last year's funding level. While I am in favor of many of the funding initiatives at the Department of Justice, I also feel strongly that NASA needs to be fully funded for space exploration. In addition, this Amendment would take money from General Administration funds instead of taking money from any specific program.

This Amendment has been scored by the CBO, which has stated that my Amendment does not increase the budgetary authority and in fact decreases the outlays by \$9 million. This Amendment is important because it strengthens our Nation in ways that will pay large dividends in the future. NASA exploration missions have taught us so much about our world and it would be a shame if we no longer led the world in this great field. I will withdraw this amendment at this time and work towards keeping NASA from being cut.

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1400

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). If there are no further amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

JUSTICE INFORMATION SHARING TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses for information sharing technology, including planning, development, deployment and Departmental direction, \$135,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NARROWBAND COMMUNICATIONS/INTEGRATED WIRELESS NETWORK

For the costs of conversion to narrowband communications, including the cost for operation and maintenance of Land Mobile Radio legacy systems, \$110,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: *Provided*, That the Attorney General shall transfer to the "Narrowband Communications" account all funds made available to the Department of Justice for the purchase of portable and mobile radios: *Provided further*, That any transfer made under the preceding proviso shall be subject to section 605 of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

Page 3, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$39,126,000)".

Page 62, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$59,142,000)".

Page 84, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$13,441,000)".

Page 86, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$79,132,000)".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto, conclude by 15 minutes, and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that and would insert 20 rather than 15.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, the unanimous consent request is to limit debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto to a total of 20 minutes equally divided between the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and a Member opposed.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes on her amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, today's small businesses are having a difficult time in accessing affordable capital due to recent changes to the 7(a) program. This amendment will change that by restoring funding to its fiscal year 2004 level.

As you can see from this chart, the cost of the 7(a) program on small business has doubled, translating into an additional \$1,500 to \$3,000 in upfront costs. And for larger loans, fees are now more than \$50,000.

In addition, SBA has proposed even more fees on top of those that were implemented last year, and projections are that these fees will only continue to increase year after year.

Clearly, these actions are having a negative effect. Since the fee increase, the total dollars going into the economy has dropped, small businesses are receiving less capital, and the number of active lenders making a loan has declined by 50 percent. These actions have resulted in a highly unstable program, as you can see from this chart.

History has shown that operating loan programs without a government commitment is a recipe for failure. For proof, look at the SBA venture capital program which has been credited with investing billions of dollars in small businesses. Four years ago, it was taken to a zero subsidy rate. The argument is that it would make the program more stable. Well, today that program is shut down because it simply became too costly. By voting for this amendment, you are ensuring that the 7(a) program does not suffer the same fate.

The offsets for this amendment can come from the IT accounts of the State Department, Justice Department, and SBA. This is a small price to pay for job creation. The 7(a) program is a proven job creator. For every \$33,000 in

loans, one job is created. With just a minor investment from our government, we can empower this Nation's entrepreneurs to do what they do best, create jobs and build this economy.

This is the same amendment that was offered last year that passed with overwhelming bipartisan support. The only thing that has changed since then is that our Nation's small businesses have now had to endure a year of increased costs, and they have told us that these costs are hurting them. We cannot let this happen again.

Fifteen trade associations, including the National Small Business Association; the Independent Community Bankers of America; the Credit Union National Association; the American Hotel and Lodging Association; and the U.S. Black Chamber of Commerce, representing businesses and lenders from across the country, are supporting this amendment and calling on Congress to restore this funding.

By voting "yes" to restore the appropriations to the 7(a) loan program, you are voting to relieve our Nation's 23 million small businesses of these additional costs. This is a vote for continued job creation and economic development, two things, small businesses and our Nation's economy need now more than ever.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) will control the time in opposition to the amendment. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. If we were to pass this amendment, then you can never write to your constituents and say you really care about the deficit. And I know the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) is going to speak about this. We dealt with this program last year. We are now at a record level of loans. So if you vote for this, you will never be able to write and say that I am concerned about the deficit.

The 7(a) program has been operating at record levels without subsidy appropriations since the beginning of fiscal year 2005 when the fees on lenders and borrowers reverted to the pre-2003 level. The SBA administrator continues to assure us the program is running strong, does not require a subsidy. Since lending levels are no longer tied to appropriation, the program has been able to meet the demand.

The program is on track, Mr. Chairman, to far exceed the previous lending levels and in fact may come close to the \$16 billion authorized level.

Media reports all over the country have touted the recent success of the 7(a) lending. To highlight this, I have articles which we will put in the RECORD, if it is appropriate at this time, from the Chicago Tribune, Cincinnati Press Courier. Here are some of the headlines: "SBA programs looks

sound.” “Stable funding turns banks on to SBA lending.” In fact, lending to every segment of the population, including women and minorities is up from last year’s level.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 27, 2004]
SBA PROGRAM LOOKS SOUND
(By Rob Kaiser)

Holiday magic isn’t the likely reason the U.S. Small Business Administration and its numerous critics appear in harmony for the first time in years.

A more likely explanation is the \$16 billion stocking stuffer for the SBA’s flagship 7(a) loan program, which will likely keep it from suffering short-falls in 2005 that drew the ire of banks and small-business owners this year.

“The risk of a cap or a shutdown is basically nil,” said Tony Wilkinson, president of the National Association of Government Guaranteed Lenders and a frequent SBA critic.

Such an outlook is a vast improvement from recent years, when frequent loan limits and speculation about shutdowns sent bankers scurrying to submit loan applications and left many business owners in limbo—often with unpaid bills—when expected loans suddenly evaporated.

To achieve the peace, bankers grudgingly accepted a return to paying higher fees as the Bush administration got its wish to wipe away a nearly \$80 million subsidy that had been supporting the 7(a) program. In return, the bankers expect to inherit a more stable program.

Such stability would have saved Julie Valenza a lot of time and money.

Valenza was close to purchasing her second Jimmy John’s sandwich franchise in January when the \$250,000 loan she expected to secure through the 7(a) program was suddenly stalled when SBA stopped accepting new applications due to a funding short-fall.

To salvage the deal to purchase an existing store in Westmont, Valenza recruited her sister as an investor.

“At least I didn’t have to bring in a stranger off the street,” she said.

Still, the setback delayed the purchase by two months and means Valenza now has to split the store’s profits.

Paul Andreotti, an executive vice president at National City Bank in Chicago, said SBA loans exist so such situations are avoided.

Without 7(a) loans, many business owners would have to finance growth on their credit cards or through other expensive means.

“If the SBA wasn’t guaranteeing loans, banks couldn’t be as aggressive and provide as much capital,” said Andreotti, whose bank is putting together a 7(a) loan so Valenza can open a third Jimmy John’s location in Oak Lawn.

While he’s not happy to see the fees climbing, Andreotti said, “In the long run I think it will positively impact small businesses.”

Fees for the 7(a) program are now 2 percent on loans up to \$150,000, up from 1 percent. Loans between \$150,001 and \$700,000 carry a 3 percent fee, up from 2.5 percent. Loans for more than \$700,000 still carry a 3.5 percent fee.

The loan applicant usually pays these fees. Banks have to pay another fee, which has also increased recently.

The SBA guarantees 85 percent of 7(a) loans up to \$150,000 and 75 percent of loans for more than \$150,000.

Previously, the highest loan guarantee was \$1 million, but under the new legislation that figure was raised to \$1.5 million. This means the program will now guarantee 75 percent of a \$2 million loan, the largest 7(a) loan available.

Still, not everyone in the SBA universe is sold that the recent compromise was the best solution.

“Clearly there were members of Congress that felt this program was worthy of receiving an appropriation,” said James Ballentine, director of community and economic development at the American Bankers Association.

Ballentine said some business owners as well as leaders may be dissuaded from taking part in the program because of the fees.

Early indications, though, are that participation in the 7(a) program is at record levels.

From Oct. 1, the beginning of the fiscal year, through Dec. 10, the program has done more than 18,000 loans, worth nearly \$2.8 billion. During the same period last year, the program did fewer than 15,000 loans, worth \$2.4 billion.

In all of the last fiscal year, the 7(a) program did nearly 75,000 loans, worth \$12.6 billion. The program has \$16 billion in loans available for the current fiscal year.

“We think that should be sufficient,” said Jodi Polonet, senior vice president of Business Loan Express LLC in New York. “We are satisfied.”

Mr. WOLF. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), the chairman of the Small Business Committee who last year supported this amendment, is now supportive of the program continuing to operate without a subsidy appropriation. He has written a Dear Colleague letter, and I hope every Member has read that Dear Colleague letter in support of the status quo. This would really hit Justice Department programs and State Department programs.

So in summary, Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to provide a subsidy appropriation for 7(a) loan programs. With the legislative and appropriation changes made last year, the program is running strong. The offsets are not a good idea.

I urge Members to oppose the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, when SBA claims that the program is doing record levels I have to say that they said that they would do \$16 billion. Today they are \$2 billion behind, and they are clearly not going to achieve a record level.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by our colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee.

In my district in northeastern Ohio, locally owned small businesses are the foundation of our communities, from tool and die makers to landscapers to mom and pop corner hardware stores. The Small Business Administration 7(a) program has a proud history of ensuring that these small businesses will continue to have access to affordable financing.

As the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) has noted, changes were made to the 7(a) program last year that dramatically altered its funding structure by eliminating the Federal Government’s contribution and making the entire program self-sustaining. I have seen the data from my district on the amount of funding provided to small businesses since the program was altered, and I have heard the arguments that the program is actually more stable and that lending has not dropped off.

And while I have nothing but respect for not only the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) but also the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman MANZULLO), I have to ask myself what could have been. If a furniture maker in Middlefield, Ohio, wanted access to capital to expand his facilities but decided against it because the fees on the 7(a) loan would have been too much of a burden for his business, how many more jobs could we have created if we had continued the Federal participation in the 7(a) program?

And I listened intently and I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) when he spoke against the last amendment, the last couple of amendments on the Byrne issue when across-the-board amendment cuts are not a good idea. And I agree with that. But I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for where we found the offsets. They come from the IT accounts at the Justice Department, the State Department, and the Small Business Administration.

It is my understanding, and if I am wrong in this regard I am sure the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) can correct me, that relative to the Justice Department, it comes from a proposal to sell off and replace computer broadband and replace with narrow band, allowing them to sell the broadband, and money will actually be recouped to finance that.

Secondly, in the State Department they are charging fees on visas which would also allow those upgrades. And relative to the IT account in the Small Business Administration, the upgrade that needs to take place in the country is the small business community. And I would just indicate that, you know, on this side of the aisle we champion all the time that small businesses in this country are the backbone, the drivers of this economy. The 7(a) program needs Federal participation to not only be as good as it is today but to be better tomorrow.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), the chairman of the SBA committee, such time as he may use.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I would note that as to the gentleman from Ohio’s (Mr. LATOURETTE) district, in all of 2004, he had 185 7(a) loans totaling about \$30,400,000. For 2005, year

to date, it is 319 loans totaling nearly \$29 million in loans. So it just amazes me that the gentleman from Ohio would say that we need to spend \$79 million worth of taxpayers' money.

Last year, I led the fight to add in \$79 million for the 7(a) program. I was under the assumption that it was absolutely necessary to have the Federal Government subsidize small business people who wanted to get a loan. And I took a look at this, and I said what kind of a message does this send? There is no legal or constitutional right to have loans subsidized by the taxpayers of this country for people to get involved in businesses. And, in fact, that sends the wrong messages. People getting involved in business should realize that it is a free enterprise system that works.

And what we did last year was something epochal; 7(a) loan program last year for the first time did not depend upon a government handout. Small business people do not need government handouts to start businesses.

My dad was in the grocery store business. He was in the restaurant business. He would have never thought about applying for a loan that was subsidized by taxpayers.

And so what happened last year, the subsidy was taken away. Taxpayers saved \$80 million that was spent in areas, other areas, as important as it is. And the problem that I have is whenever you have the government subsidy, then the program is subject to shut down. That is what happened 2 years ago when the SBA 7(a) program in December ran out of money. The 7(a) program shut down. Small business people could not plan. The lenders had no idea what was going on and chaos broke loose in the 7(a) industry. We do not need the 7(a) subsidy.

As the chairman of the Small Business Committee, I have spoken to people all over the country thanking me saying, you know, we are paying a little bit more for our loan, but we realize that by the small business people paying a little bit more for their loan and the amount up front gets rolled over to the eventual length of the term of the loan, that makes not only more money available, but it makes the program predictable.

So I would encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the Velázquez amendment. Vote "no" to spending \$80 million in taxpayers' funds.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to how much time is left on each side.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 5 minutes remaining.

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

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Chairman, as a small business owner and a member of the Small Business Committee, I appreciate the need for entrepreneurs and small business owners to have access to

affordable capital. That is why I speak today in support of the Velázquez amendment to restore funding for the SBA 7(a) small business loan program.

□ 1415

Small businesses are the growth engine for our Nation's economy, and it is important for the Federal Government to encourage domestic hiring and expansion. This amendment will help achieve that goal by returning 7(a) loan fees to their previous affordable level.

Access to affordable capital is an important alternative to higher-interest personal credit cards, which, while helpful, have become the number one source of financing for U.S. entrepreneurs for lack of options.

Since October 2004, loan costs have increased by up to \$3,000, and program utilization and loan capital have dropped drastically by almost half a million dollars. We have been told today that the SBA is processing more loans than ever before, that is true, but the loans being processed are significantly smaller. After the new fees were put in place, the average amount received by individual small businesses has dropped by approximately \$75,000.

The small business community creates up to 80 percent of the new jobs in this country. The SBA estimates that a new job is created for every \$33,000 in small business loans. Thus, \$79 million in Federal investment has the potential to create 500,000 jobs in this country.

First, let us correct the rhetoric. These are not subsidies or handouts that we are talking about. These are loans at affordable interest rates, and if one is for deficit reduction, then they should support this amendment, which reduces the overall cost to the bill by \$32 million per the Congressional Budget Office.

It is time that Congress steps forward to support the small business community through access to affordable capital. The Velázquez amendment will reduce fees to small business owners and lenders and create an environment which will foster critical domestic job growth and the local economic expansion so vital to the Eighth District of Illinois and to communities across the Nation.

I urge my colleagues' support of this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, in looking at the figures for the gentlewoman from Illinois' (Ms. BEAN) district, my colleague, for fiscal year 2004, there were 193 loans, that is 7(a) loans, totaling \$31 million. So far, to date, in fiscal year 2005, 7 months, there are 177 loans at \$26 million. That is almost there.

At this rate, the number of loans in 2005 will greatly exceed the number of loans in 2004, showing that when the subsidy was cut and the taxpayers

saved \$79 million, more loans were given in the gentlewoman from Illinois' (Ms. BEAN) district than when the subsidy was in effect.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have two additional speakers, and I ask unanimous consent for 2 more additional minutes on each side.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) has 4 minutes remaining.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the Small Business Administration 7(a) loan program is a proven success. In past years it has provided 30 percent of all long-term small business loans in this country, making it the largest source of public or private financing. So one would assume that such a proven program would be supported by everyone.

However, last year we found out that when there was a choice between more tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans or helping our small businesses, the administration and the Republican leadership were all too willing to change that 7(a) program in conference, so that all expenses and risks would be borne by the small businesses themselves.

The result of this change is exactly what we predicted. Fees for loans of less than \$150,000 have nearly doubled. Fees for larger loans have risen by \$3,000 to \$5,000. Fifty lenders have dropped out of the program. It is much harder for small businesses in rural areas and small towns to get loans. Most significantly, 7(a) lending has decreased every quarter since the new fees were added, and the amount of the average 7(a) loan has dropped by \$75,000 since the changes have been put in place.

So we have a problem, and the Velázquez amendment would solve that problem, restoring funding for the 7(a) program, \$79 million for loan-loss reserves, which will leverage \$18 billion in new loans. Vote for the Velázquez amendment.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support for the Velázquez amendment to H.R. 2862. This amendment would restore funding for the Small Business Administration's 7(a) loan guarantee program at fiscal year 2004 levels.

Small businesses are the driving force behind job creation and productivity-enhancing technology. The 7(a) loan program has been a worthwhile investment for taxpayers, as statistics demonstrate impressive returns insofar as business growth and job creation, especially, Mr. Chairman, in economically disadvantaged areas like the territory of Guam that I represent.

Perhaps for this reason a similar amendment introduced last year garnered strong support from both sides of the aisle, and therefore, I urge my colleagues to send a strong message that the House continues to value the importance of this program by again voting to restore funding for the 7(a) loan program.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my firm support for the amendment offered by my colleague Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and for continuous and increased funding for the Small Business Administration 7(a) loans programs.

Designed as a public-private partnership, the 7(a) program helps small businesses that otherwise could not obtain a commercial bank loan.

By minimizing the risk to lenders, the SBA's 7(a) loans program secures access for small businesses to the affordable capital they need to start, develop and flourish.

7(a) loans are the most widely used SBA program. These loans provide critical funding for start-ups, real estate acquisition, business expansion, recapitalization, working capital, and machinery and equipment purchase.

The 7(a) loan program has proved to be an insightful and successful initiative.

Just in 2003, these loans benefited more than 70,000 small businesses. And over the last decade, they provided resources for over 424,000 small businesses.

Today, 7(a) loans provide 30 percent of all long-term loans for small business lending.

Unfortunately, the budget under consideration today, fails to provide the resources that small businesses in this country require to continue flourishing.

It fails to restore funding for the SBA's 7(a) loan program and to decrease the harsh conditions that small businesses confront to access affordable capital.

I would remind my colleagues of the critical importance and contribution that small businesses represent for our country.

Small businesses are the most important driving force of our economy. But they require access to capital in order to continue as the catalyst for the U.S. economy.

The rationale behind the 7(a) program is that of investment, cooperation and success.

It is a national partnership for growth, productivity and welfare.

For all these reasons, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, which will benefit all Americans.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to close if the gentleman does not have any other speakers.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would close when it is appropriate under the rules.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a vote for helping small businesses. Today the program is more costly, \$3,000 more, and half a billion dollars less is going into the economy. We have also seen a 50 percent drop in lenders, which has a particularly negative impact on rural communities. This is not a picture of stability, but the good news is that we can fix this. By voting "yes" on the Velazquez amendment, we can return the 7(a) program to a source of affordable capital for our Nation's small business owners.

Almost 20 national groups, from the National Small Business Association and the Hotel and Motel Association to the Independent Community Bankers and the Credit Unions, say that this is a problem, and they want us to fix it.

For the small commitment on the government's part, we can create jobs and create economic growth, two of the most important things we can do right now. That is why I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment, the same amendment that was voted last year overwhelmingly.

Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, that when SBA claims that they are doing record levels, what they do not say is that they are comparing the program's performance to a time last year when it was shut down and operating under a \$750,000 cap. When compared to the last quarter before fees were raised, the program actually shows a decline of over \$500.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote for the Velazquez amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

The numbers cited by the proponents of this amendment say that SBA's numbers are deceiving. I understand what the gentlewoman is trying to do.

I have information here on the gentlewoman's district, showing that 7(a) demand is up. Last year in the gentlewoman's district, for the entire year, there were 7,849 loans. This year, for the year to date, meaning there are still 3½ months left to the end of the fiscal year, the figure is 9,267 loans, if that trend continues, the number of loans will, almost double. It is one of the few times we have actually made a difference and rolled something back in this body.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct the record.

Mr. Chairman, yes, it might be true they are doing more loans, but they do

not say that they are rationing capital in its loan program. The average loan size for the 7(a) loan program today is \$170,000. The average for an African American is only \$86,000. The average loan for an Hispanic is \$128,000, and this is happening because the restrictions that they have imposed on the 7(a) loan program.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments as well.

Hector Barreto, the SBA Administrator, in a letter dated June 3, 2005, that he sent in opposition to the amendment says: "Through May 20, 2005, SBA guaranteed 60,266 small business loans, a 24 percent increase over the number of loans approved at the same time in 2004."

That is dramatic, and the cost of this amendment will be upwards of \$70-plus million.

I continue to read the letter, "At this time last year, SBA had guaranteed more than \$7 billion in 7(a) loans which was a record-setting figure."

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, well, the numbers that Mr. Barreto is giving my colleague is when the program was shut down, and he does not say to my colleague that they are doing \$2 billion below what they said they would be doing at this time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman.

He goes on to say: "I am proud to report that as of May 20, 2005, SBA has shattered that record by guaranteeing more than \$9.2 billion in loans to America's entrepreneurs."

Then he goes on to say: "If you go deeper into these statistics, you can see that 7(a) loan volume has increased for women and minority entrepreneurs in fiscal year 2005, up 52 percent to African Americans, up 49 percent to women, up 15 percent to Hispanics, and up 16 percent to Asian Americans."

"At this pace," Mr. Barreto goes on to say, "SBA will likely surpass the fiscal year 2004 figures for both dollars guaranteed and the number of loans approved; especially if you consider that the fourth quarter of the fiscal year traditionally witnesses the highest volume of loans."

He closes by saying, "Mr. Chairman, I believe these number speak for themselves," and they do speak for themselves, "and should serve to reassure supporters that the 7(a) program is running strong without need of a subsidy or a reduction in fees."

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO). He was on the other side last year. Not many people in this institution do that. I mean, he got up and said, yes, this is right, and I commend him for that. I think it is the right thing to do.

The thing that I worry about, if anyone is listening to this, is if we roll this

back in this tight budget, where do we find the money? I mean, if there was really a crisis with regard to small business, I would be for this amendment, but the loans are up, and if they are up, and to take all this, if I can just ask the staff how much would this amendment take, \$79 million? We just had a debate on meth. If we are going to do anything, let us put \$79 million in meth. If we are going to do anything, let us put \$79 million in fighting the drug trade.

But we are going to take \$79 million when we do not have a problem. Let us give it to the war on terrorism. Let us give it to the first responders, but not to a program that does not even need it, does not even want it, does not even ask for it.

I understand what they are saying, but if this amendment passes, I am going to go home very discouraged tonight. I think the passage of this amendment, in my own mind, if this amendment is passed, it will tell me, and it should be telling the American people, that we will never, ever be able to deal with the deficit again. There is no need for this, they are not asking for it, and the figures show that loans are up by 24 percent. The chairman for the committee who was for this amendment last year is now against it, and there is just no hope. It is a Katie-bar-the-door, we are going to spend whatever we need to spend.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If my colleague is for deficit reduction, with this amendment we will reduce the deficit by \$32 million. Then, if we pass this amendment, \$78 million we leverage, \$15 billion in loans, and create half a million jobs at a time when the economy is struggling to replace the jobs that we have lost.

□ 1430

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I just do not think the American people could ever understand that by spending \$79 million of additional money that we will help the deficit. I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Velázquez amendment and thank the gentlewoman from New York on all her efforts to help small businesses. I am pleased that this amendment will reinstate funding for the 7(a) loan program and ensure that small businesses will once again be able to benefit from its lending power.

As a former small business owner, I know the frustrations and worries small business owners have had as this program has been repeatedly targeted by the Bush administration. Small businesses are one of our Nation's leading employment opportunities but few businesses can afford to startup or expand without the help of loans.

The president likes to talk about an "ownership society," but his budget hurts middle

class Americans by denying funding for this program. How can we have a strong middle class if we don't extend opportunities for people to start their own businesses? This just doesn't make sense.

Renewing our commitment to the small business administration 7(a) loan program will not only bolster our Nation's workforce but also the economy as a whole. This program gives people a chance to start a business of their own and make a positive impact on their lives and their communities.

Mr. Chairman, I want to urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important amendment and our small business owners.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Velázquez amendment to the Science-State-Justice Appropriations bill. I thank the gentlelady from New York for her leadership and the opportunity to speak in favor of the Section 7(a) Small Business Loan Program. The 3rd Congressional District of Colorado is a large rural district with many small businesses that have benefited from the SBA's lending programs.

In 2004, the Section 7(a) provided 25.4 million dollars in loans to small businesses within my congressional district. As you know, this program helps provide capital to small business owners who are unable to access traditional financing alternatives. These small businesses provide critical jobs and are the economic engine that help drive the economy in my congressional district.

Small businesses able to take advantage of this program have added new jobs to the economy. The Section 7(a) program has created approximately 742 jobs in my district alone. It is vital that these small businesses have the resources and capital necessary to operate, otherwise rural communities will continue to fall further behind the rest of the country in economic growth.

The Section 7(a) loan program is a proven success; it provides critical assistance to small businesses and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment. I thank the gentlelady for the opportunity to speak on behalf of this important amendment.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Velázquez Amendment and in support of America's small businesses. It is vital that we as the United States Government do all we can to foster the growth of jobs in our economy. To accomplish this we must provide the businesses with enough affordable capital to start and grow. Mr. Chairman, this will create those jobs. I am sad to say that we have not done enough to help out the small businesses that need it most.

Over the last decade we have drastically reduced the appropriated amount for the Small Business Administration's 7(a) loan program, in 1995 it was funded at nearly \$200 million but last year a mere \$79 million.

Mr. Chairman, I am from Cleveland, Ohio, which at the moment is the most impoverished city in the Nation. Ninety-five percent of the private sector jobs are provided by small businesses, therefore the creation of jobs and the growth of our small businesses is vital to our economic recovery.

The Small Business Administration's 7(a) lending program is essential for small business owners who cannot access capital through conventional markets. However, the program has been and is being underfunded and the burden has been shifting increasingly

onto small business owners. Recent changes in the program have increased the fees to access the 7(a) program, which diminishes access of small business owners.

The 7(a) program was created to provide capital to those businesses that need it most. By making the program more expensive, we are defeating its original purpose.

I stand in support of restoring the FY 2004 appropriated level of \$79 million. It is the least we can do to help small businesses grow in our country.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ for her continued commitment to working on behalf of small businesses and once again bringing legislation to the House floor to save the 7(a) loan program.

Mr. Chairman, this year as in last year, the administration has requested zero funding for the premier lending program for the Small Business Administration. The 7(a) loan program has been systematically dismantled by the Administration. By eliminating funding, the program now runs only on the fees charged to small businesses and lenders—which make the program inherently unstable. The recent changes have created a less stable program and increased its lending fees. Since the fee increase, small business lending declined every quarter for a total of more than half a billion dollars so far this year.

The 7(a) loan program has been a worthwhile program, particularly to women-owned business. Women-owned businesses are just as financially strong and creditworthy as the average US firm and deserve more options to raise capital. These companies have similar performance on bill payment and several levels of credit risk, and are just as likely to remain in business—yet they still fail to receive the capital needed to grow. In FY 2004, the 7(a) loan program provided more than 15,000 loans to women-owned businesses totaling nearly \$2 billion.

A vote for Velázquez amendment would help guarantee that the 7(a) loan program would remain affordable for small businesses. Last year, the House overwhelmingly voted on a similar amendment to provide funding for this program. I urge my colleagues to once again support this amendment to rectify a wrong, and ensure that small businesses can still benefit from the program.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the reinstatement of funding for the Small Business Administration's 7(a) loan program. The 7(a) program provides crucial support for small businesses around the country, and funding should be restored immediately.

Central New Jersey has always worked hard to strengthen its position as a national leader in technological and economic innovation. For decades, the state's small businesses have led this charge, escorting communities toward independence and inspiration.

Without consistent governmental support, though, small businesses will falter and stagnate. And without consistent small business support, local communities and economies will suffer. We owe it to the state's small businesses to restore funding to the SBA's exceptional 7(a) program.

Consider that one new job is created for every \$33,000 that SBA's 7(a) program guarantees. And consider that in just the past decade, SBA has approved over four hundred thousand loans, for more than \$90 billion. You

can do the math: that's a total of 2.7 million new jobs in just the last ten years. But with the lack of appropriations in FY2005, the average origination fees on small business loans doubled, creating between \$1,500 and \$3,000 in new costs for the average small business owner. The inevitable result is less small business access to capital, less expansion, less hiring, and less economic development.

In the past decades, we've all seen that many of the country's strongest local economies are sprouting in areas famous worldwide for their technological prowess: California's Silicon Valley; North Carolina's Research Triangle; Boston's Route 128 Corridor. Central New Jersey's growing high-technology community—Einstein's Alley—belongs squarely on that list. Establishing a center of technological innovation in central New Jersey will guarantee New Jersey's continued future as one of the greatest states in the Union. Without support from the state's small businesses, though, such a technological center could never evolve.

Strengthening New Jersey's economy and reinforcing its role as an innovation leader will benefit all New Jersey residents. A research-based economy will require regional improvements in transportation and telecommunications infrastructure, which will help reduce traffic and produce more efficient transportation options for us all. A research-based economy will require a larger tax base, which will drive down individual tax rates. And a research-based economy will demand quality schools and livable communities, in order to attract the best and the brightest entrepreneurs and employees to our region.

Central New Jersey has long lived and thrived on the frontier of scientific and technological innovation. Einstein's Alley will be home to vibrant communities, cutting-edge companies, and productive workers whose unique assets and shared vision attract new, innovative industries and create many more good jobs to add to what we already have. None of that will be possible, however, without extensive small business support. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge every Member of this body to vote to restore the SBA's 7(a) program to its FY2004 funding level.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). The time of the gentleman has expired. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

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

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

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Chairman, I know where I can spend 29 million of those dollars real quick.

I regret today, and I say this because I really truly regret, because I have

great respect for the chairman of the subcommittee, but I have to oppose this legislation because it fails to include the funds necessary to implement the Pribilof Islands' environmental cleanup agreement between the State of Alaska and NOAA.

The Pribilof Islands lay in the middle of the Bering Sea. Two of the islands are inhabited today, St. Paul and St. George. Neither was inhabited until the 1780s, when the Russians forcibly relocated residents of the Aleutian Islands to the Pribis to harvest the then-valuable pelts of the North Pacific fur seal and the stellar sea lion.

The Russians retained ownership of the land and the profits from the harvest. After the United States purchased Alaska, the Federal Government treated the Pribilof residents no better. Like the Russians before us, we retained ownership of all the island property and the fur seal profits. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and its successors were the employer, municipal government, overseer, and landlord of the islands' residents.

The profits from the fur seal trade offset the entire purchase price of Alaska, \$7.5 million, in less than 20 years. However, by 1983, profits from the fur seal trade no longer offset the expense of managing the islands, when the decision was made to transfer ownership and responsibility for the islands to the residents.

This was not a humanitarian undertaking. The profits were gone, so the Office of Management and Budget saw no need to continue to own the islands. The framework for this transfer process was laid out in the 1983 amendments to the Fur Seal Act.

Unfortunately, the transition plans have not gone smoothly, quickly, or efficiently. In 2000, Congress adopted further amendments to the Fur Seal Act that were designed to get the process back on track. Since then, significant progress has been made. However, additional environmental cleanup work remains to be done.

Unfortunately, the bill before us provides no meaningful funds for the cleanup, not even the insufficient \$7.3 million requested by the President. It includes \$3.5 million to be divided between three environmental cleanup projects, one of which is the Pribis. It also allows the agency to reprogram unobligated balances for the project, something NOAA can already do.

I cannot deny that, prior to the year 2000, NOAA's project management was terrible. Right now, though, it has improved. In the year 2000, the agency brought in new project managers; and these managers, especially Dave Kennedy and John Lindsay, have defined the scope of the project, established meaningful cost estimates and timetables. From 1996 through 2000, NOAA cleaned up 11 sites. Since 2000, the agency has cleaned up 75 sites. Nine sites remain.

Of course, these timetables and cost estimates are only meaningful if suffi-

cient funds are provided to carry them out. This year, no cleanup work will be done because of the funding cuts. This means the cleanup will not be finished in 2006 as planned, but will lapse into 2007.

Congressional cuts in the administration's cleanup request in fiscal years 2003, 2004 and 2005 have been devastating. Effectively eliminating funding in fiscal year 2006 means that we are abandoning this project and saying it is okay for Federal agencies to pollute native lands with impunity.

When developing the Fur Seal Act amendments in 2000, Congress undertook a detailed review of the transition scenario established in the 1983 Fur Seal Act amendments. By 1983, the fur seal profit had diminished, and Federal expenditures on the islands had risen to \$6.3 million annually. NOAA estimates that 95 percent of those expenditures were for municipal and social services.

In 1982, NOAA proposed a scheme to transfer municipal operations on the islands to local control and end the Federal subsidy. That plan consisted of four parts: the first was a \$20 million trust fund. The trust fund was established and fully capitalized.

Second was the construction of useable harbors by the State. The State was very clear in testimony before Congress that it had made no such commitment, and in fact it did not fund harbor construction.

Third, the government would transfer most of its land to the local entities. That transfer is still not complete.

Fourth, the islands would manage and retain the income from the fur seal harvest. The government ended that commercial fur seal harvest the next year.

Given the failure to carry out two of the four pieces of the transition plan, and the complete abrogation of a third piece, Congress decided in 2000 to finish the cleanup and land transfer. Because of the chronic underfunding of the cleanup program, it will take roughly an additional \$16 million and two more years to complete the work required by the two-party agreement between NOAA and the State of Alaska. If we put it off further, or underfund the remaining work this year, it will take longer and cost more.

I know and have great respect for the chairman of this subcommittee, and I know that he cares deeply about oppressed people throughout the world. Before finishing this bill, I hope he will look at the embarrassing history of our government in regards to the citizens of the Pribilof Islands and realize the least we can do is remove the environmental contamination which occurred under NOAA.

Mr. Chairman, because of this issue, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 2862.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to this section, the Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For expenses necessary for the administration of pardon and clemency petitions and immigration-related activities, \$215,685,000.

DETENTION TRUSTEE

For necessary expenses of the Federal Detention Trustee, \$1,222,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Trustee shall be responsible for managing the Justice Prisoner and Alien Transportation System and for overseeing housing related to such detention: *Provided further*, That any unobligated balances available in prior years from the funds appropriated under the heading "Federal Prisoner Detention" shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation under the heading "Detention Trustee" and shall be available until expended.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, \$66,801,000, including not to exceed \$10,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Parole Commission as authorized, \$11,200,000.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed \$20,000 for expenses of collecting evidence, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia, \$665,821,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 for litigation support contracts shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$1,000 shall be available to the United States National Central Bureau, INTERPOL, for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 105 of this Act, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for litigation activities of the Civil Division, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to "Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities" from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to the previous proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

In addition, for reimbursement of expenses of the Department of Justice associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, not to exceed \$6,333,000, to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, \$144,451,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$116,000,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18a), regardless of the year of collection, shall be retained and used for necessary

expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2006, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2006 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$28,451,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For necessary expenses of the Offices of the United States Attorneys, including intergovernmental and cooperative agreements, \$1,626,146,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$8,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That, in addition to reimbursable full-time equivalent workyears available to the Offices of the United States Attorneys, not to exceed 10,465 positions and 10,451 full-time equivalent workyears shall be supported from the funds appropriated in this Act for the United States Attorneys.

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND

For necessary expenses of the United States Trustee Program, as authorized, \$214,402,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the United States Trustee System Fund: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, deposits to the Fund shall be available in such amounts as may be necessary to pay refunds due depositors: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$214,402,000 of offsetting collections pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 589a(b) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation and remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2006, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2006 appropriation from the Fund estimated at \$0.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$1,220,000.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Marshals Service, \$800,255,000; of which not to exceed \$6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses; and of which \$20,000,000 for information technology systems, equipment, and the renovation of United States Marshals Service prisoner holding space in United States courthouses and Federal buildings shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, in addition to reimbursable full-time equivalent workyears available to the United States Marshals Service, not to exceed 4,729 positions and 4,551 full-time equivalent workyears shall be supported from the funds appropriated in this Act for the United States Marshals Service.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For fees and expenses of witnesses, for expenses of contracts for the procurement and supervision of expert witnesses, for private counsel expenses, including advances, such sums as are necessary, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$8,000,000 may be made available for construction of buildings for protected witness safe sites: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000,000 may be made available for the purchase and maintenance of armored vehicles for transportation of protected witnesses:

Provided further, That not to exceed \$7,000,000 may be made available for the purchase, installation, maintenance and upgrade of secure telecommunications equipment and a secure automated information network to store and retrieve the identities and locations of protected witnesses.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Community Relations Service, \$9,659,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 105 of this Act, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for conflict resolution and violence prevention activities of the Community Relations Service, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to the Community Relations Service, from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to the previous proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND

For expenses authorized by 28 U.S.C. 524(c)(1)(B), (F), and (G), \$21,468,000, to be derived from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund.

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

INTERAGENCY CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for the identification, investigation, and prosecution of individuals associated with the most significant drug trafficking and affiliated money laundering organizations not otherwise provided for, to include inter-governmental agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking, \$506,940,000, of which \$50,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any amounts obligated from appropriations under this heading may be used under authorities available to the organizations reimbursed from this appropriation.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for detection, investigation, and prosecution of crimes against the United States; including purchase for police-type use of not to exceed 3,868 passenger motor vehicles, of which 3,039 will be for replacement only; and not to exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530C, \$5,741,132,000; of which not to exceed \$150,000,000 shall remain available until expended; of which \$2,288,897,000 shall be for counterterrorism investigations, foreign counterintelligence, and other activities related to our national security; and of which not to exceed \$25,000,000 is authorized to be made available for making advances for expenses arising out of contractual or reimbursable agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies while engaged in cooperative activities related to violent crime, terrorism, organized crime, gang-related crime, cybercrime, and drug investigations: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$205,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That, in addition to reimbursable full-time equivalent workyears available to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, not to exceed 31,668 positions and 30,525 full-time equivalent workyears shall be supported from the funds appropriated in this Act for the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. REICHERT:

Page 10, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$50,000,000)”.

Page 12, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$11,683,000)”.

Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$78,289,000)”.

Page 71, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$16,606,000)”.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and any amendments thereto, conclude in 15 minutes, and that the remaining time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) will control 7½ minutes and a Member opposed will control 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume and first of all would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his great work in helping local law enforcement, but I rise today to speak on an issue that is more than something I believe in; it is who I am.

The COPS program is an essential program to our local law enforcement, and I am here today in support of it. I spent 33 years of my life as a cop. I worked my way up the ladder. I served as patrol officer, jail guard, detective, lieutenant, and finally the sheriff in King County in Seattle, Washington. I became a cop because deep in my heart I believed I could make a difference in the community and that I could protect it. The COPS program enforces that ideal.

Since 9/11, we have found our local cops in an unusual dilemma. They are expected to carry out new homeland security duties as first responders, while at the same time maintaining their original responsibilities. I am a member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, and I believe our country's security is a priority, but I do not think that we should be carrying out this function as an unfunded mandate at the expense of local law enforcement.

We are seeing Federal law enforcement receive an unprecedented amount of funding, while at the same time the scope and the responsibility of first responders on the front lines is increasing without parallel funding. Even in

this amendment, restoring COPS funding to its original level of last year still allows for very significant increases to the Federal law enforcement agencies.

In my experience, local and Federal law enforcement are most effective when they are working together. Teamwork is the key. You would not play a football game by sending some of the players out onto the field with pads and helmets and others with no equipment at all. In a team, all players should be valued equally, especially in law enforcement, where our fights have to be balanced, our attacks have to be balanced both local and Federal.

In the war on drugs, in the war on terror, in the national fight against gangs, local police officers and Federal agents are all working together towards the same goal of making our country safer. According to Attorney General John Ashcroft: “Since law enforcement agencies began partnering with citizens through community policing, we have seen significant drops in crime rates.” Now that crime has dropped, we are going to cut the funding that has kept our communities safe? That is absurd.

Local cops are the ones on the front lines, they are the men and the women keeping our families safe daily, protecting our children in school, monitoring gang violence, the first responders who are there when you call 911. You do not pay a lesser price for your family's safety than you do for homeland security.

We are in a new era of both family and national security. Both our first responders play a dual role, as the first ones on the scene in the case of a terrorist attack and the first ones on the scene in everyday emergencies as well. One is not worth less than the other. Cops must be well prepared and equipped for any emergency they are sent into.

Mr. Chairman, this program is vital. Across the country it procures equipment, combats domestic violence, puts cops in schools, fights meth gangs, and much, much more. I urge my colleagues to support the COPS program and vote for this amendment today.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and yield myself 5 minutes.

My father, as I said in one of the other amendments, was a policeman. The fact is when I think of the name COPS, my dad used to tell me never to call policemen cops, and I even have a hard time saying the word cops, while I know it is the title of the bill. My father was a Philadelphia policeman for 20-some years.

I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. I understand what the gentleman is trying to do, but perhaps the most important program we fund in this bill is the FBI and its efforts to protect the Nation from terrorist attacks.

Thirty people from my congressional district died in the attack on the Pentagon. The first CIA person killed in Afghanistan was from my congressional district. This amendment cuts the FBI by \$50 million while the threat of terrorism and espionage from countries, such as China, and the spread of gangs increases.

And I would tell the gentleman that I met with a group of local law enforcement people around the country, and some were from Washington State, one police chief; and gangs are an important issue. We have a carve-out of \$60 million in this bill with regard to gangs.

We must provide the FBI, though, with the sufficient resources to combat these threats. This amendment would go the other way.

The bill funds the FBI at the requested level when you account for the Administration's proposal to reduce the FBI's appropriation by \$50 million and move it to OCDETF. The committee rejected this proposed transfer, as members on both sides asked us to do.

If you combine the requested increase for the FBI salaries and expenses and requested reimbursement for the FBI under OCDETF, this bill is equal to the request. A reduction now of \$50 million from the FBI will reduce the number of funded FBI agents by 365. Now, why would we want to reduce the FBI by 365 agents?

According to the testimony of Director Mueller, there could be, and probably is, al Qaeda sleeper cells operating in the U.S. The committee heard testimony that Hamas and Hezbollah have operatives in the U.S. In fact, as I said to the Director: “Are there Hezbollah operators in the United States?” His answer was: “Yes, there are Hezbollah.” And keep in mind, Hezbollah are the ones who blew up the 241 Marines in Beirut.

□ 1445

That group that blew up the American Embassy and the 241 marines in Beirut, that man who put that effort together, still walks the street. We know the dangers of Iran, and the Director says Hezbollah and Hamas are here, and we want to take 365 agents away.

Time Magazine reports that more than 3,000 companies in the U.S. are suspected of collecting information for China. China is spying against our companies in the United States, and I urge all Members to get that FBI briefing.

The Department of Justice estimates there are approximately 30,000 gangs with 800,000 members impacting 2,500 communities. This amendment would basically take away all of the money in the bill for gangs. If you happen to have been one of the Members who voted for the bill fighting gangs from several weeks ago, this money takes out all of the money for last year as well as this year. There is so much to

deal with on the issue of gang and gang violence.

It would also have a very negative impact on DEA. We heard earlier today about meth. This amendment cuts DEA by \$12 million. The debate conflicts. It switches back and forth. We are not doing enough to combat drugs, do this, do that. And so now this amendment runs counter to all of the other things we have discussed. We take \$12 million from DEA. The bill provides DEA with funding above the budget request in order to restore the proposed reductions to combat meth by fully funding mobile enforcement teams. Members said do not cut those teams because locally this is so important. This literally takes out those teams. They will not be there.

The amendment hurts DEA's effort to combat meth, will result in a destruction of more lives in this deadly game. Members saw the pictures that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) had.

It also reduces the Broadcasting Board of Governors by \$16 million. If we cannot broadcast into the Middle East, and into Afghanistan and into Iran and Iraq, we are in trouble. This is a bad amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) makes some excellent points. Actually, the gentleman makes some of the points I made in my initial statement.

I was the sheriff up until January 3 of this year. I have been on the front lines, as I said, for 33 years. I have kicked in doors; I have arrested drug dealers, prostitutes, pimps, murderers, robbers, and burglars. I have arrested gang members. I have been in meth houses and seen children sitting on the couches of homes where meth is cooked and made.

If the battle for homeland security is taking place across the sea in Iraq, it is also taking place right here in this country. As I partnered in the last 7 or 8 years as sheriff, as I partnered with the FBI, the DEA, the people who lead the charge in the Seattle FBI offices and DEA offices and Federal offices, the word I heard loud and clear over and over: Local law enforcement is important. Local law enforcement is a partner. Local law enforcement is key. Sharing information, working with local law enforcement is our top priority.

But in fact what happens today is we talk about a \$588 million increase to the FBI. We are talking about taking away \$50 million. They would still see an increase of over half a billion dollars in their budget this year. DEA would still see an increase of over \$55 million in their budget this year, still bringing back \$78 million to COPS.

To build that partnership, and when I talk about building a football team and

some having equipment and some not having equipment, when Congress gives \$588 million to the FBI and gives \$55-plus million to DEA and other Federal agencies, and yet is taking away \$78 million from the rest of the team. It just does not make sense.

This has to be a team effort, and if the Federal Government and Federal agencies mean what they say about team spirit and working together in partnerships, they need to show it by funding COPS fully. Bring back the \$78 million that they are suggesting be removed from their budget.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment not because I oppose the COPS program, because I know the chairman does not oppose the Community-Oriented Policing Services program. As he indicated, his family understands how important community policing is. But I rise in opposition to this amendment because of the offsets. As Chairman WOLF has pointed out, the gentleman makes unacceptable offsets here.

I would ask, does the gentleman from Washington really think that a \$50 million cut from the FBI, including funding for counterterrorism and counterintelligence programs, is something that the FBI can do without?

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I know that local law enforcement is involved in those same programs as partners with the FBI.

As sheriff in Seattle, one of the projects we were involved in is we had detectives assigned from the sheriff's office to the Washington Joint Analytical Center, which is a center that analyzes incoming intelligence data for homeland security and for other crimes in the county. We also were members as a local law enforcement agency of the Joint Terrorism Task Force, and other task forces, Federal task forces, that existed in King County.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time because I only have 2 minutes, I need a little more efficient answer. Does the gentleman think that the FBI's counterterrorism program can stand a \$50 million cut from what we have appropriated and recommend in this bill?

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I do not think the FBI counterterrorism program can afford to lose the local support that they already have.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman think that his amendment, which cuts DE mobile enforcement teams, which go out and help State and local fight methamphetamine, does the gentleman think we can afford to cut those programs?

Mr. REICHERT. Does the gentleman think we can afford to cut local police and firefighters programs?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time. My point is, Mr. Chairman, the cuts are simply unacceptable. The purpose is laudable. The offsets are unacceptable.

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

I would just restate some of the obvious here. Again, this is a partnership. The FBI is gaining a great deal of money in this budget proposal, \$500 million. I think they can work within that framework. Again, local law enforcement is getting cut \$78 million. This truly has to be a partnership. Let us bring the COPS program back to its 2005 level, increasing it by the \$78 million which is the proposed cut.

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

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

The first telephone call you would make if you found out a loved one was kidnapped would be to the FBI. We want to take \$50 million away from that first agency you would call.

Meth—why do Members want to cut the DEA when we are all concerned about meth?

International broadcasting in Afghanistan and Iraq tell the story and do a good job. You do not want to take money from law enforcement to help law enforcement. There is a different way. This is not a good idea. I urge defeat of the amendment so the FBI has the necessary resources so it can do what it wants to do.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORBERRY). All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

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

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

Mr. REICHERT. 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 Washington (Mr. REICHERT) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses to construct or acquire buildings and sites by purchase, or as otherwise authorized by law (including equipment for such buildings); conversion and extension of Federally-owned buildings; and preliminary planning and design of projects; \$20,105,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$10,000,000 shall be available for equipment and associated costs for a permanent central records complex in Frederick County, Virginia.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Drug Enforcement Administration, including not to exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530C; expenses for conducting drug education and training programs, including travel and related expenses for participants in such programs and the distribution of items of token value that promote

the goals of such programs; and purchase of not to exceed 1,043 passenger motor vehicles, of which 937 will be for replacement only, for police-type use, \$1,706,173,000; of which not to exceed \$75,000,000 shall remain available until expended; and of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That, in addition to reimbursable full-time equivalent workyears available to the Drug Enforcement Administration, not to exceed 8,371 positions and 8,270 full-time equivalent workyears shall be supported from the funds appropriated in this Act for the Drug Enforcement Administration.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BAIRD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAIRD:

Page 12, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 39, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 39, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 40, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and any amendments thereto, conclude by 10 minutes, and that the remaining time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

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

Mr. Chairman, it is no coincidence that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), as a former sheriff, spoke earlier about the problem with meth. I rise to address the same problem with a much different, but I think a more appropriate, offset.

Methamphetamine is the leading cause of crime in a number of States. It is the fastest-growing drug. It is responsible for identity theft, murders, domestic violence and horrific disfigurement of its users. We have seen a dramatic growth in methamphetamine over the years, and it is pervasive in the communities. Unfortunately, we are not winning this battle, and we must win this battle.

What I propose is fairly simple. It would provide \$10 million to the Community-Oriented Policing Service program to be used for providing training to State and local prosecutors and law

enforcement agents for investigation and prosecution of offenses. Of that \$10 million, \$3 million would be set aside for prosecutors and law enforcement agents in rural communities, and we would also provide \$10 million to DEA to combat international trafficking.

Let me explain why we need to do this. Methamphetamine comes from two sources, locally manufactured so-called clan labs where the drug is made from locally available materials, and internationally imported precursors and finished product. We must confront both of these. They are destroying our families and destroying our communities.

The offset we have offered in this bill, I think, is thoroughly appropriate. Here is where it comes from: \$20 million would be taken from 2010 census program, \$10 million in budget authority from salaries and expenses, and \$10 million in budget authority offset would come from the short form of the census.

Since fiscal year 2001, this Congress has approved close to \$2.73 billion for the census. Let me say that again: \$2.73 billion for the census. This year alone we are proposing to add \$832 million in funding for the census. And by comparison, this bill calls for only \$520 million for the COPS program.

Ask your average man and woman on the street, your law enforcement agencies, your emergency rooms, treatment centers, schools, where should we spend the money? Billions of dollars for the census, or to intercept international narco-trafficking and bringing in methamphetamine precursors and finished product?

We have a war on terror internationally, but I can tell Members the terror in our communities is being caused by methamphetamine. I used to treat meth addicts. It is a devastating drug. That is why I cofounded the Methamphetamine Caucus, a bipartisan caucus. We must get our hands around this.

This is a reasonable offset. It will provide, frankly, not enough additional funds, but a significant message that we are going to intercept international drugs and methamphetamine, and we are going to help our local law enforcement.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, much for the same reason I rose in opposition to the previous amendment. It is not that the additional funding is not needed in the program, it is that the money that is the funded to the Census Bureau is needed in the Census Bureau.

□ 1500

The chairman and I have worked very hard in trying to balance these accounts. They are delicately balanced

because of the bad allocation that we received. The Census Bureau in order to do its job has to prepare early. It looks like a lot of money. It is a big job. It is extremely important that it is done right. While I am totally supportive in increasing these local and State law enforcement assistance programs, the offsets are just untenable, this one included. I rise to oppose the amendment.

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

In the last census, I remember being given paperweights, calendars, buttons, pins, all sorts of stuff. I would wager that every Member of this body received those things. When you talk to local law enforcement, when you visit meth houses, when you treat the addicts of this horrific drug, we have to understand how bad this drug is. It is devastating. And I see the Census Bureau giving glass paperweights. Somewhere our priorities are wrong.

Let me say the numbers again: \$2.73 billion already for the census, another \$832 million this year, compared to \$520 million. I am not asking for additional expenditures of the taxpayers' money. I am asking for us to make some tough and responsible decisions. I frankly would be hard pressed to tell the constituents in my area who see their schools being corrupted, their neighborhoods being corrupted, their children being addicted, people being murdered, their identity being stolen, their financial lives being ruined that we are going to fund paperweights for the census or some awfully expensive revision.

I used to teach research design. I cannot fathom that it costs this much money to modify this census. There were some bureaucrats last time around who spent an awful lot of money buying those paperweights, and if we cut \$10 million to get rid of some of those bureaucrats in order to put more cops on the streets, more international investigators to stop the influx of methamphetamine, this Congress will have done at least one good thing today in what is otherwise, I think, a very good bill; but we need to find more funding for meth.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment which would reduce funding for the Bureau of the Census. As chairman of the House Government Reform Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census, I appreciate the important role of the census in providing information about the American people and our economy. It sounds pretty simple, paperweights versus crime fighting, and certainly the statements concerning our needs for crime fighting are compelling. But it is just not that simple.

The census provides information vital to how we as a Nation operate. Every 10 years, each congressional seat

is reapportioned based on census data. The decennial census is the fundamental guarantee of fair representation. Every seat in Congress is apportioned and established according to the decennial census. Also, each year the Federal Government allocates almost \$300 billion in funds based in part on census data.

Also, census information is not just used for the decennial census. Annually, the Census Bureau produces information on international trade statistics, demographics, and important economic census information is utilized by businesses as they plan locations in how to grow. Actions taken for our economy are based upon information annually and on a regular basis that is produced by the census.

I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. An amendment to remove funds from the census budget is an amendment that would reduce the accuracy of congressional reapportionment and redistricting and impair the ability of the Federal Government to allocate funds for important programs that aid communities nationwide. Vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Some years ago, I was treating a meth addict. I asked him to tell me what it was like to be hooked on methamphetamine. He said at the time, Doctor, if my children were in a corner of this room and said, Daddy, we need you. He said, I love my children. But if methamphetamine were in the other corner and my body said I want methamphetamine, and this grown man in his 40s who looked to be about 60 because of the ravages of this drug, this grown man burst into tears and he said, Doctor, I would go for the methamphetamine because I cannot help myself.

It is about priorities. We have to stop this drug. It is killing our citizens. I think the census wastes money. I think the money could be better spent on protecting the lives of our citizens and the safety of our communities and schools. I urge a "yes" vote on this. It is a reasonable offset and the money will be well spent on interdicting international imports of this drug and on local enforcement and training.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Taking money away from the census and the American community survey is very shortsighted. I support very much the hard work and intent of the gentleman's amendment, but it truly is shortsighted and inappropriate to take money away from the census. Too many decisions that we make in government have to be based on census data. Federal and State funds for

schools, employment services, housing assistance, day care, hospitals, emergency services, programs for seniors, and much more will be distributed based on census data.

In this information age that we live in, we need reliable information in order to make good decisions for this Nation. Without good data, you cannot administer the laws of this country fairly. Without good data, money will flow to communities with powerful allies as opposed to where the need truly is. The census is important for the planning of our government.

I rise in very strong support of this amendment, the work of the committee, and the administration's and OMB's allocation for the census.

I, for one, will continue to do all I can to make sure that the Census Bureau has the capabilities to provide the Congress, and this Nation, with the ability to provide all of us with high quality data needed by the public and its elected representatives to make informed public policy decisions.

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

I rise in opposition to the amendment, but the gentleman makes a good case. On the paperweights, we are going to do a letter to the census saying no paperweights and no gifts and things like that. If that is the case, we ought to deal with it. We ought not, though, take it from the census. I think if the gentleman can work with us, and maybe the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), we really need to do something beyond what we are doing with regard to meth.

This year the bill is \$8 million above. I agree with the gentleman. I do not know how this amendment is going to come out. Hopefully, it will fail, because I do not think we want to go after the census as the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) said. But the gentleman is right. Something really has to be done almost beyond what we are doing for meth. So I commit whether you win or lose on this, we will get together and see what we can do, but I would hope that we could vote this amendment down because by helping meth, we do not want to then torpedo the Census Bureau.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. BAIRD. 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 Washington (Mr. BAIRD) will be postponed.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

As we were looking at this, it came to my attention through an article in USA Today that the FBI's entertainment office consists of five agents. They are responsible for responding to requests from Hollywood for information. When I was elected to Congress, one of the things that I wanted to be aware of the whole time that I was here is that we have a responsibility to spend taxpayers' dollars wisely. I do not think that the United States taxpayers should be subsidizing Hollywood in any way. I wanted to express to the chairman of the committee, with my gratitude for his good work and to others interested in this issue, that I hope that these agencies can be more fiscally responsible with these taxpayers' dollars, and I do not think that we ought to be subsidizing Hollywood in any way when they want information.

That was what I wanted to make very clear today. The sum total of that amount is \$250,000 each year that goes for Hollywood liaisons. I wanted to respectfully make the gentleman aware of this.

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

We will look into this. We were led to believe by the FBI that they do not have this. The gentlewoman may be right. We will look into it and work with her to see that this does not take place.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, including the purchase of not to exceed 822 vehicles for police-type use, of which 650 shall be for replacement only; not to exceed \$25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; for training of State and local law enforcement agencies with or without reimbursement, including training in connection with the training and acquisition of canines for explosives and fire accelerants detection; and for provision of laboratory assistance to State and local law enforcement agencies, with or without reimbursement, \$923,613,000, of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be available for the payment of attorneys' fees as provided by 18 U.S.C. 924(d)(2); and of which \$10,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no funds appropriated herein shall be available for salaries or administrative expenses in connection with consolidating or centralizing, within the Department of Justice, the records, or any portion thereof, of acquisition and disposition of firearms maintained by Federal firearms licensees: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay administrative expenses or the compensation of any officer or employee of the United States to implement an amendment or amendments to 27 CFR 178.118 or to change the definition of "Curios or relics" in 27 CFR 178.11 or remove any item from ATF Publication 5300.11 as it existed on January 1, 1994: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be available to investigate or act upon applications for relief from Federal firearms disabilities

under 18 U.S.C. 925(c): *Provided further*, That such funds shall be available to investigate and act upon applications filed by corporations for relief from Federal firearms disabilities under section 925(c) of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further*, That no funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to transfer the functions, missions, or activities of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to other agencies or Departments in fiscal year 2006: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated under this or any other Act with respect to any fiscal year may be used to disclose part or all of the contents of the Firearms Trace System database maintained by the National Trace Center of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives or any information required to be kept by licensees pursuant to section 923(g) of title 18, United States Code, or required to be reported pursuant to paragraphs (3) and (7) of such section 923(g), to anyone other than a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency or a prosecutor solely in connection with and for use in a bona fide criminal investigation or prosecution and then only such information as pertains to the geographic jurisdiction of the law enforcement agency requesting the disclosure and not for use in any civil action or proceeding other than an action or proceeding commenced by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, or a review of such an action or proceeding, to enforce the provisions of chapter 44 of such title, and all such data shall be immune from legal process and shall not be subject to subpoena or other discovery in any civil action in a State or Federal court or in any administrative proceeding other than a proceeding commenced by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to enforce the provisions of that chapter, or a review of such an action or proceeding; except that this proviso shall not be construed to prevent the disclosure of statistical information concerning total production, importation, and exportation by each licensed importer (as defined in section 921(a)(9) of such title) and licensed manufacturer (as defined in section 921(a)(10) of such title): *Provided further*, That no funds made available by this or any other Act shall be expended to promulgate or implement any rule requiring a physical inventory of any business licensed under section 923 of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further*, That no funds under this Act may be used to electronically retrieve information gathered pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 923(g)(4) by name or any personal identification code: *Provided further*, That no funds authorized or made available under this or any other Act may be used to deny any application for a license under section 923 of title 18, United States Code, or renewal of such a license due to a lack of business activity, provided that the applicant is otherwise eligible to receive such a license, and is eligible to report business income or to claim an income tax deduction for business expenses under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary of the Federal Prison System for the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutions, including purchase (not to exceed 768, of which 701 are for replacement only) and hire of law enforcement and passenger motor vehicles, and for the provision of technical assistance and advice on corrections related issues to foreign governments, \$4,895,649,000: *Provided*, That the Attorney General may transfer to the Health Resources and Services Administration such amounts as may be necessary for direct expenditures by that Administration for med-

ical relief for inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Federal Prison System, where necessary, may enter into contracts with a fiscal agent/fiscal intermediary claims processor to determine the amounts payable to persons who, on behalf of the Federal Prison System, furnish health services to individuals committed to the custody of the Federal Prison System: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$50,000,000 shall remain available for necessary operations until September 30, 2007: *Provided further*, That, of the amounts provided for Contract Confinement, not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall remain available until expended to make payments in advance for grants, contracts and reimbursable agreements, and other expenses authorized by section 501(c) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, for the care and security in the United States of Cuban and Haitian entrants: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Federal Prison System may accept donated property and services relating to the operation of the prison card program from a not-for-profit entity which has operated such program in the past notwithstanding the fact that such not-for-profit entity furnishes services under contracts to the Federal Prison System relating to the operation of pre-release services, halfway houses or other custodial facilities.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For planning, acquisition of sites and construction of new facilities; purchase and acquisition of facilities and remodeling, and equipping of such facilities for penal and correctional use, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account; and constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account, \$70,112,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$14,000,000 shall be available to construct areas for inmate work programs: *Provided*, That labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed under this appropriation.

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

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

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

Not to exceed \$3,365,000 of the funds of the corporation shall be available for its administrative expenses, and for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, to be computed on an accrual basis to be determined in accordance with the corporation's current prescribed accounting system, and such amounts shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, and expenditures which such accounting system requires to be capitalized or charged to cost of commodities acquired or produced, including selling and shipping expenses, and expenses in connection with acquisition, construction, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of facilities and other property belonging to the corporation or in which it has an interest.

OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN PREVENTION AND PROSECUTION PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance for the prevention and prosecution of violence against women as authorized by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 ("the 1968 Act"); the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-322) ("the 1994 Act"); the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 ("the 1990 Act"); the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to End the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-21); the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 ("the 1974 Act"); and the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-386); \$387,497,000, including amounts for administrative costs, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That except as otherwise provided by law, not to exceed three percent of funds made available under this heading may be used for expenses related to evaluation, training and technical assistance: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided—

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

(2) \$1,925,000 for child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners, as authorized by section 222 of the 1990 Act;

(3) \$983,000 for grants for televised testimony, as authorized by Part N of the 1968 Act;

(4) \$187,308,000 for grants to combat violence against women, as authorized by part T of the 1968 Act, of which—

(A) \$5,000,000 shall be for the National Institute of Justice for research and evaluation of violence against women;

(B) \$10,000,000 shall be for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention for the Safe Start Program, as authorized by the 1974 Act; and

(C) \$15,000,000 shall be for transitional housing assistance grants for victims of domestic violence, stalking or sexual assault as authorized by Public Law 108-21;

(5) \$63,491,000 for grants to encourage arrest policies as authorized by part U of the 1968 Act;

(6) \$39,685,000 for rural domestic violence and child abuse enforcement assistance grants, as authorized by section 40295(a) of the 1994 Act;

(7) \$4,415,000 for training programs as authorized by section 40152 of the 1994 Act, and for related local demonstration projects;

(8) \$2,950,000 for grants to improve the stalking and domestic violence databases, as authorized by section 40602 of the 1994 Act;

(9) \$9,175,000 to reduce violent crimes against women on campus, as authorized by section 1108(a) of Public Law 106-386;

(10) \$39,740,000 for legal assistance for victims, as authorized by section 1201(c) of Public Law 106-386;

(11) \$4,600,000 for enhancing protection for older and disabled women from domestic violence and sexual assault, as authorized by section 40802 of the 1994 Act;

(12) \$14,078,000 for the safe havens for children pilot program, as authorized by section 1301(a) of Public Law 106-386; and

(13) \$7,250,000 for education and training to end violence against and abuse of women with disabilities, as authorized by section 1402(a) of Public Law 106-386.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 19, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 20, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

Page 23, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto conclude in 10 minutes and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself as the opponent.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, if I may inquire, what was the unanimous consent request stated by the gentleman from Virginia?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that the unanimous consent request, which has been agreed to, was for 5 minutes for the gentlewoman from Texas and 5 minutes for the gentleman from Virginia as the opponent.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I just want the gentlewoman to understand it. I do not think she did understand it.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me first of all thank the ranking member for his inquiry and also thank the chairman. I think the time frame was not in agreement, but the issue is so important that I will proceed.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment speaks specifically to what I think is the devastating disease of child violence and child abuse. This is a simple amendment. It takes from the \$300 million-plus allotment for the Edward Byrne grants a simple \$2 million for child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners.

In a hearing in the Judiciary Committee just a week ago, a number of us presented bills trying to fight against sexual predators and those who would abuse children. We have discovered that the number one killer of children is now homicides. Even in the backdrop of this debate, we find a troubling set of circumstances in Aruba where a young 18-year-old still goes missing after celebrating her graduation and, of course, expressing great hope and aspi-

ration for her entry as a freshman into college. The plague on children is rampant. This is a simple way of addressing the need for ensuring that we have practitioners as well as those dealing with judicial personnel and practitioners to be able to help children to recount incidences against them.

I have introduced legislation to address the question of child predators as it relates to the DNA, but this particular amendment is important because one of the key aspects of preventing child abuse and child violence, of course, is to make sure that we can make the case, and the case is dependent upon those judicial personnel and practitioners who are sensitive enough to be able to engage a child and to understand.

□ 1515

We are always grateful when a child has been recovered, when they survive violence and abuse, but we note by a number of our States that that has not been the case. We have seen these troubling cases all across America, children that have been kidnapped, children that have been raped and killed, the Jane Does and the John Does of little babies who have suffered.

Just 24 hours ago there was a story noting the abuse of a 4-month-old, a sexual abuse of a 4-month-old. So the importance of this particular funding is to prevent child violence, prevent child abuse, and to be able to provide additional training for the vast number of practitioners and judges to be sensitive in their work dealing with children.

We can do more. I hope that we will pass a number of child predator bills that are making their way through the Committee on the Judiciary and other committees. But, frankly, it is extremely important that we look to making a national statement, we are not going to take it anymore, a national statement in protecting our children and providing them with the kind of legal protection and as well sensitive judges and practitioners who will work with them.

This is not in any way affecting this legislation inasmuch as the moneys for the Byrne grant that deal with drug task forces. That certainly has my support, even as the President zeroed it out, but my support with oversight, an amendment that I will offer at a subsequent time. But I ask my colleagues to consider their commitment to preventing child abuse and child violence, providing them with appropriate counsel and sensitive judiciary to understand their needs and to be on the front lines of saying and suggest that this is an important cause for America and making a statement.

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

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

I want to thank the gentlewoman for the amendment. I accept the amend-

ment. I want the RECORD to show that the committee did the best it could to fund the Violence against Women. The bill provides \$5.4 million over last year for these programs, and it is \$500,000 over the President's request. I think the gentlewoman's amendment is good, and I accept it. I think we should adopt it. My only concern is where she takes the money from. She takes the money from the Justice Assistance Grant, the very place that we have had Members down here arguing that there is not enough. So if as we move through, I want to do this, if we can maybe look to see a different place, but I accept the amendment, and I want to thank the gentlewoman for it.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman's reasoning, and I agree to accept the amendment.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me wholeheartedly thank the chairman and the ranking member, and I look forward to working with them if we can find an accommodating place as we move forward. But I thank them very much.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS
JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, the Missing Children's Assistance Act, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith, the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-21), and the Victims of Crime Act of 1984, \$227,466,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

Mr. STEARNS. 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. STEARNS: Page 22, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 81, line 19, after both dollar amounts insert the following: "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and any amendments thereto, conclude by 10 minutes, and that the remaining time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

I do not need a lot of time. This is pretty simple, this amendment. It is basically an amendment to help our local law enforcement community. Mr. Chairman, it basically transfers \$10 million from the Legal Services Corporation and gives it instead to the Justice Assistance Grant, or JAG, program.

I would like to thank the chairman for funding this critical program, especially in light that the administration's budget proposed a zero funding. So he is to be commended for funding this program, and I need to compliment him on that matter.

But in my district I have heard from law enforcement officials and across the State of Florida about how much this JAG funding helps them fight crime, and to protect and serve the citizens within their jurisdiction. The JAG program is set to receive about \$348 million in funding under this bill. It is my hope that an additional, just simply an additional \$10 million will help increase the numerous and substantial benefits under this program.

The Legal Services Corporation would still receive \$321 million, which I and many of my colleagues would agree is still a reasonable amount of money to provide for legal services to the poor. In addition to this Federal subsidy, there are thousands of attorneys across the country who provide thousands of hours and hundreds of millions of dollars in service pro bono for these people.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not point out to my colleagues that the Legal Services Corporation has been providing free legal services to quasi-legal immigrants, despite the fact that we passed a restriction in 1996 that barred local legal service groups from using Federal money for these activities. This \$10 million reduction in Legal Services Corporation funding would bring it more in line, of course, with the President's request, certainly in spirit.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an anti-legal service amendment, but merely a modest, a simple, modest, amendment to further help our local law enforcement combat drugs and fight crime. So I am not asking the Legal Services to justify its existence. I am just saying let us make a modest attempt here to send a message how important it is to keep the JAG program, and I urge my colleagues to support their local law enforcement and to support my amendment.

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

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

I rise in opposition to the amendment. I understand what the gentleman is trying to do. I just wanted to kind of let people know that last year's level for Legal Services was \$330 million. At last year's level, the corporation and its grantees cannot do anything new. The level provided in the bill will not even pay for inflationary costs. The corporation actually requested \$364 million, but the committee had only enough to fund the current level.

Eighty percent of the legal needs of people in poverty are not addressed. We tried to strike a balance with regard to the poor. This program helps the poor, and there have been so many good restrictions put on the Legal Services under the former leadership of former Congressman John Erlenborn. So to take more money away to cut the Legal Services Corporation could dramatically impact the ability of low-income Americans to seek and obtain justice. Justice, justice thou shall pursue, and I think this is really an amendment that would hurt the poor, so I would hope that we would not accept it. It is not as much as they wanted, but it is about where it should be. And with that I urge Members to vote "no."

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

This is awful. Can we not find a more vulnerable group in the country to take money away from? At a time when the country is rewarding wealth by huge high-income tax cuts, surely we can find money for worthy purposes someplace other than Legal Services. The fact is the poor people, if they are going to participate in the American dream, if they are going to participate in the American legal system that we all are so proud of, then they have to be able to have support in that effort. That is recognized. The whole premise of the Legal Services Corporation recognizes that, and its services are totally inadequate.

Fifty percent of the potential clients were turned away from Legal Services and not served at all last year. In West Virginia we are turning away 90 percent of the people requesting services. Legal Services requested more money than we were able to appropriate to them. This is not a place to cut for anything, for law enforcement.

And the other irony here is where the gentleman finds money to support law enforcement, he finds money from folks who are living in the communities that need this additional law enforcement. I would suggest to him that he go to the high income tax people who have received inordinate benefits from the tax cuts we have given them in the last 5 years to find his offsets to support the policing that is needed

most in the communities from where the people who are seeking legal services aid in the Legal Services Corporation come from.

This is a bad amendment. It cuts a program that is desperately needed if we expect everybody in the country to participate in the American legal system, and we should expect and want and make sure that everybody participates in the American legal system that we are all so proud of and bragging about.

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

I heard the argument of my distinguished colleague from West Virginia. He is arguing that a 2 percent, 2½, 2.8 percent cut in the Legal Services Corporation is bad, is terrible. Put that in perspective. They are getting \$321 million. We are just saying take \$10 million out of that and give it to the Justice Assistance Grant program, which provides grants to States. And what do these grants do? They help the local law enforcement so that they can fight crime, fight drugs, and in the end they will not need Legal Services.

So my point, Mr. Chairman, is if we cannot cut the Legal Services by 2.8 percent symbolically and give it to a program like the Justice Assistance Grant, which is going to help these people so they do not need Legal Services, they do not need the government-run legal program, because they will be free of crime, then I think we are making a mistake.

So this is a very simple amendment with great symbolic reference here that one as a Member can say, I believe in my local community, I want to fight crime, I want to give grants to the States so that they can do it so that in the end they do not need these legal services. And good golly, if we cannot cut the Legal Services Corporation by about 2.8 percent, then really, Mr. Chairman, we are really not interested in trying to even look at fiscal responsibility, much less symbolic responsibility for helping our local police sheriffs in all of our congressional districts and all the counties throughout this country.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to consider this amendment. It is both symbolism and plus it helps the local police force. And, goodness gracious, the Legal Services Corporation is going to get roughly 2.7 percent less. I think that is a small amount considering the administration decided to zero out this program. It is only by the grace of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) that this program is back in place. So I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and be on the right side of the angels.

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

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

I rise in opposition to the amendment. Former Congressman John Erlenborn did a great job of restraining and bringing some sense to the Legal

Services. Legal Services had an event years ago when I was running, and they criticized me. I mean, they were very political, very political, and they have changed that now.

The American Bar Association asked for \$364 million. We only did \$330 million. But I think we really need to in this society make sure that we are representing the poor, too, when the rich can get representation, and it is even difficult for the middle class. And I have never been a great fan of Legal Services.

□ 1530

I have had some serious problems. The fact is, I will try to find the tape where they criticized me. But I think this year it is a good balance, it is a good level; and I think on behalf of making sure that the poor have legal representation, although I understand what the gentleman is trying to do, I would ask that we do not support the amendment.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. Legal Services has been political at times. The gentleman points out cases where they have been. I think it is a commendation to the gentleman, in light of the fact of how they politicize things, he is still here arguing for a complete budget. I am asking for a 2.7 percent reduction, on behalf of the communities.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-322) ("the 1994 Act"); the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 ("the 1968 Act"); and the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-386); and other programs; \$1,001,296,000 (including amounts for administrative costs, which shall be transferred to and merged with the "Justice Assistance" account): *Provided*, That funding provided under this heading shall remain available until expended, as follows—

(1) \$348,466,000 for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program pursuant to the amendments made by section 201 of H.R. 3036 of the 108th Congress, as passed by the House of Representatives on March 30, 2004 (except that the special rules for Puerto Rico established pursuant to such amend-

ments shall not apply for purposes of this Act), of which—

(A) \$10,000,000 is for the National Institute of Justice in assisting units of local government to identify, select, develop, modernize, and purchase new technologies for use by law enforcement; and

(B) \$85,000,000 for Boys and Girls Clubs in public housing facilities and other areas in cooperation with State and local law enforcement, as authorized by section 401 of Public Law 104-294 (42 U.S.C. 13751 note);

(2) \$355,000,000 for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, as authorized by section 242(j) of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

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

(4) \$110,000,000 for discretionary grants authorized by subpart 2 of part E, of title I of the 1968 Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 511 of said Act;

(5) \$10,000,000 for victim services programs for victims of trafficking, as authorized by section 107(b)(2) of Public Law 106-386;

(6) \$871,000 for the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program, as authorized by section 240001(c) of the 1994 Act;

(7) \$40,000,000 for Drug Courts, as authorized by Part EE of the 1968 Act;

(8) \$10,000,000 for a prescription drug monitoring program;

(9) \$40,000,000 for prison rape prevention and prosecution programs, as authorized by the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-79), of which \$2,175,000 shall be transferred to the National Prison Rape Elimination Commission for authorized activities;

(10) \$25,000,000 for grants for residential substance abuse treatment for State prisoners, as authorized by part S of the 1968 Act;

(11) \$10,359,000 for a program to improve State and local law enforcement intelligence capabilities including antiterrorism training and training to ensure that constitutional rights, civil liberties, civil rights, and privacy interests are protected throughout the intelligence process;

(12) \$10,000,000 for a capital litigation improvement grant program; and

(13) \$11,600,000 for a cannabis eradication program to be administered by the Drug Enforcement Administration;

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

Mr. DREIER. 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. 3 offered by Mr. DREIER:
Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 23, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 45, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

Page 46, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

Page 46, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and any amendments thereto, conclude by 10 minutes, and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. Chairman, securing our borders is clearly the responsibility of the Federal Government. We have had a program that was initiated in 1994 called the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, SCAAP. It has done a very good job of reimbursing the States for the appropriate incarceration of illegal immigrant criminals, people who have come into this country illegally and committed crimes. We have, unfortunately, seen not the kind of increase in that level of reimbursement that we should, so this amendment proposes that we transfer an additional \$50 million from the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration to the SCAAP program.

I congratulate the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the committee for putting into place funding at the level of \$355 million. I do not believe that that is adequate.

I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), and the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), in support of this very important effort to have the Federal Government step up to the plate and ensure that we meet our responsibility.

In my County of Los Angeles alone, it costs \$150 million a year for the incarceration of these criminals, and I believe that we need to provide more resources. I hope very much that my colleagues join in support of this important amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I do not oppose the amendment, I support the amendment, so in fairness I ask unanimous consent to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (GILCREST) and 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time will be divided as stated.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California has a good point. We were down in El Salvador 2 weeks ago and they told us they were pouring across

the border, members of MS-13 and gang members. We met with gang members who told us they came across, got arrested, got into prison, and went back. It is a tremendous burden not only for my region, but also for California, Texas, Arizona, and the entire country. So I understand the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to express my appreciation to the distinguished subcommittee chairman and congratulate him on his fine work, not only on this issue but the very important NASA programs about which we spoke earlier.

I think this \$50 million amount, which enjoys the support, I know, of the distinguished chairman of the full committee, is the right thing to do. In bringing about this reduction from NOAA, we have seen a 53 percent increase in NOAA's administrative expenses over the last 3 years, and we have seen a constant reduction in the SCAAP funding. So I believe this is the appropriate thing to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

I want to compliment the gentleman from California on this amendment and I understand the gravity of the situation. I just wish the money did not come out of NOAA. If we look at NOAA's budget this year, it is millions of dollars below where it was last year.

Let us take a look at what that section of NOAA has to deal with: the effect of oceans on climate; the effect of oceans on the air we breathe; weather patterns that direct where the forests, deserts and agriculture are going to be; the effect on aquaculture and fish farming on the natural environment in the ocean; ocean currents that distribute the heat and the balance of the planet.

The ocean currents right now are beginning to slow down in the North Atlantic because of a redistribution of salt and fresh water in the ocean. The magnitude of the impact on that on the northeastern parts of the United States and Western Europe, if you look at London, on the same latitude as Labrador, the climate is like the State of Maryland. Finally, red tides, poisonous, deadly to humans, but do not impact the shellfish.

The huge magnitude of the research that is lacking now as a result of our lack of understanding of oceans on life on planet Earth is staggering. NOAA should be at the same level of funding and have the same understanding in our educational institutes as NASA.

So I compliment the gentleman in trying to fix this terrible problem with our border crossings and the criminal activity that results all across the

United States, but the issue of our oceans I do not think is adequately being addressed.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, let me compliment the gentleman on his statement. I totally concur with those goals. The gentleman has never let me forget the importance of keeping oceans as a priority.

The fact of the matter is, as we look at the \$5.7 billion budget request for the Department of Commerce, 63 percent of that budget request is for NOAA, which we know is critically important. I do not in any way undermine the importance of it. I do believe, though, if you look at this \$50 million in administrative expenses, this is something that clearly could be handled very, very easily within that massive budget of NOAA.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise only to express my strong support for the Dreier-Kolbe amendment, which recognizes that Congress has a long-standing understanding of the fact that the difficulties of immigration, the challenges of illegal immigration especially, are a Federal responsibility.

What the gentleman is proposing is not creating a grant program, but rather reimbursing for funds already spent to meet the challenge of our borders. Indeed, it is very important that we move forward in terms of funding. This \$50 million amount raises the total to \$405 million, only about 25 cents on the dollar relative to the national cost. It is a very important change.

Mr. Chairman, I urge everybody to support the Dreier-Kolbe amendment, and I thank the gentlemen for their work.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Dreier amendment, not because I am opposed to the intent of the amendment, but rather opposed because of the source of funding that he has taken. We have already increased in this bill the funding for the cause he is trying to increase, namely, incarcerating undocumented criminal aliens. We have already added \$54 million, which is an 18 percent increase over last year. At the same time, NOAA has been cut \$500 million.

Let me say that again: NOAA has been cut \$500 million below last year's number in this bill, and I fail to understand the logic of stealing more money from NOAA when it has already been cut \$500 million.

I appreciate that this comes from administrative expenses, but at a certain

point that has got to cut into the science. NOAA, as we know, provides crucial services to this country. Each year we cope with on average 10,000 thunderstorms, 2,500 floods, 1,000 tornadoes, as well as six deadly hurricanes. The National Weather Service alone pays for itself over and over in terms of the protection it gives to people and to property.

So as much as I sympathize with the intent of the gentleman from California, I think it is a poor choice of where to take the money from. Why would one take an additional \$54 million away from an entity that has already been cut \$500 million in this budget compared to last year?

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we oppose the amendment and that we defeat the amendment. I know I am up against tough company here with the chairman of the Committee on Rules and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but I would be happy to help the gentleman try to find some other areas.

Why take it out of science? The National Science Foundation was cut last year, the worst cut in almost 2 decades; and now we are proceeding to cut NASA, another science agency. At some point we have to recognize that the future of this country is directly tied to our research effort, and our research effort is dependent upon funding that we provide here.

I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the way the time was divided up, the minority got no time in opposition to this amendment. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for 8 additional minutes, to be divided equally between the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment is not a benign amendment. It is an anti-ocean amendment. Understand, it is really not an amendment fighting immigration on the border; it is a reimbursement amendment. I will be corrected if I am wrong in my interpretation, but it is a reimbursement amendment to States who have expended money on incarceration of illegal aliens. My point is that as it is a reimbursement to States, it is not for fighting on-the-line illegal immigration.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, it is not benign in a very important way: the House mark already cuts the NOAA budget by over \$486 million from the 2005 enacted levels and \$153 million from the President's request. So NOAA in this bill is already feeling the pain, along with a lot of the other accounts, because of our inadequate allocation.

This amendment is extremely difficult to NOAA for a lot of reasons.

First and foremost, just looking at it overall, this amendment would result in RIFs to NOAA. Over 100 employees, NOAA employees, government employees, would be affected, would be RIF'd by this amendment, and over 200 non-governmental researchers and staff. This comes from operations, a lot of this money, Mr. Chairman; and it would have a real employee impact.

These are some of the operations it would cut, and they include research: \$5 million from the NOAA core and program support; \$12 million from the National Marine Fisheries Service. It is certainly a very anti-ocean amendment: \$8 million from the National Oceans Service; \$3 million from the National Environmental Satellite Data and Information Service; \$7 million from the Oceanic, Atmospheric and Research Activities; and, extremely important, and we ought to understand as we deal with this amendment, it would involve a \$14.9 million, almost a \$15 million, reduction out of operations for the National Weather Service Hurricane and Other Severe Weather Warnings.

As I said in the beginning, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. It is not benign. It has a lot of very harmful effects on NOAA, an organization that has already experienced its fair share of pain as we moved this bill to the floor.

Again, this bill has been well balanced. For those agencies, the pain has been spread evenly. For us to go in and start having these kinds of severe cuts in agencies like NOAA is very harmful.

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

□ 1545

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair, I was a little confused by this unanimous consent request propounded by the ranking minority member, and I do not know how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) now has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. I began with 5 minutes, and now I have 7 minutes. That sounds like a pretty good arrangement from my perspective.

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the coauthor of this amendment and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I do rise in support of this amendment, cognizant as I am of the arguments we have just heard against it and the source of the funding, and on recognizing the importance of science. I do not think there is a more important priority than we have right now than this law enforcement.

My district in southeastern Arizona shares about 100 miles of the U.S.-Mexico border. The communities along this border suffer the brunt of our failed na-

tional immigration policies. Last year Border Patrol apprehensions within one county, Cochise County, Arizona, alone, were more than 240,000 persons. The entire county has a population of 124,000 people. It is not difficult to imagine the strain on local resources caused by the incredible traffic of people trying to enter this country illegally through this relatively small section of the border. Local law enforcement must protect communities against increasingly dangerous traffickers; detention facilities must hold criminal aliens that cannot be held in Federal facilities.

The State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, better known as SCAAP, provides reimbursements to State and local governments for part of the cost of incarcerating foreign nationals who are criminal aliens. The amendment offered by my colleague from California and me would increase the amount of funding for this critical program by \$50 million. I would point out that every dollar we do not appropriate here is a dollar that is not spent by local law enforcement in the streets on law enforcement because they are having to spend it on prosecutions or incarceration costs.

Border security clearly is a Federal responsibility, and from fiscal year 1996 through 2002, Congress appropriated over \$500 million per year for SCAAP. But over the past few years, the funding has dropped dramatically, placing greater burdens on local communities, when the population of the criminal aliens is only increasing.

I appreciate the constraints placed on my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) with the very limited allocation that he has. I strongly believe, however, that Congress has to place a high priority on border security, and we must assist States and communities who are suffering the brunt of this burden.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Dreier-Kolbe amendment and then the underlying bill.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia has 1 minute remaining; the gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from West Virginia has the right to close.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that it appears that my very good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), is going to oppose this amendment, and I share the concern that has been raised about the issue of the funding for the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration. I think that oceans continue to be a high priority.

We need to look at the funding level that we have at this point. As I was saying in my exchange with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr.

GILCREST), if you look at the \$5.7 billion request that has been made for the Department of Commerce budget, 63 percent of that budget goes towards NOAA. It seems to me that as we look at a responsible area where we can take funds and deal with this critical priority of having the Federal Government step up to the plate and secure its border, this \$50 million from administrative expenses is a minuscule amount juxtaposed to the impact that it could have on this priority.

The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and I have had the privilege of cochairing the California congressional delegation. I am very happy to say that since 1994, when the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program funding was put into place, we have been able to come together. Every single Democrat in the House and Senate from California has joined every single Republican in this House to support increased levels of funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program. In fact, just last year when we had a request for \$750 million, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle requested an additional \$100 million. It would be nice if we could provide that support, but as the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) pointed out, we in this bill, very well crafted by the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF), have \$355 million, and our sole request is that we increase that from \$355 million to \$405 million.

So I urge strong support of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), another coauthor of this amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I thank the gentlemen for bringing this forward, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). This is very important. That is why in Arizona we will find overwhelming support for this Republican and Democrat amendment. We simply in Arizona are dealing with a porous border, and we are dealing with costs that we can do nothing about in Arizona.

It is the Federal Government's responsibility to secure the border. The Federal Government has not secured the border. Hospitals are incurring costs. Education is incurring costs. Law enforcement, specifically for this, is incurring great cost, and if the Federal Government is failing to secure the border, it is the Federal Government's responsibility to pony up. This represents still just pennies on the dollar of what are spent in Arizona, California, and other border States in particular, but at least it is something. At least it is something.

President Bush, himself a former border Governor, said in 1995, "If the Federal Government cannot do its job enforcing the borders, then it owes the States monies to pay for its failure." That is what we are asking for here.

SCAAP just reimburses States and localities for incurred costs for incarcerating undocumented criminal aliens. That is what we are asking for here, simply a little fairness. We need broader reform.

Myself and my colleagues have offered broader, meaningful immigration reform that will deal with this in the long term, but, in the short term, we need to do something for the border States in particular.

I commend my colleagues for bringing this forward, and I urge support for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 1 minute remaining; the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DREIER. The gentleman from West Virginia has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. He does have the right to close.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to close on our side, but I yield 10 seconds to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, I would like to say that the oceans are an important aspect of funding, but I want to say that the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) have a very critical issue that needs to be addressed as well.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, it is very clear, if you take my State of California, the annual cost for the incarceration of those who are here illegally and who have committed crimes is about \$750 million. That is for one State alone. This is a nationwide problem, as we all know. All we are proposing is that we increase from \$355 million to \$405 million the effort to bring about reimbursement so that the resources at the State level, as the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) said, can be expended on the very important problems of dealing with the crime in the streets. We need to make sure the Federal Government secures our borders.

I thank my friends, the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS), the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) for joining me as cosponsors of this.

Oceans are a priority, but I believe we can take this minuscule amount and deal with this very, very important societal need.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of our amendment.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, as I yield to another gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) to close, I note that the minuscule amount results in 100 RIFs out of NOAA.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

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

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, not because SCAAP is not a good idea to fully fund, and I support that, but not taking it from NOAA. What you are doing here is choosing to cut California to help California, and choosing to cut California results in cutting what is essentially the largest population in the entire United States living on the California coastline. They develop, on all of the issues of the marine sanctuaries, the research that goes on, of the students that go out on the NOAA ships, all of these funds are going to be affected by this cut.

Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of things we can do about SCAAP, and I strongly support more funding, but I think California can do a better job of trying those cases in Mexico where they have been successful in incarcerating and gotten 100 percent conviction in courts in Mexico, which are a lot cheaper than incarcerating them in California. This \$50 million cut really wipes out NOAA. The committee already cut half a billion dollars from NOAA, and to add another \$50 million, which RIFs 100 people, a lot of those people live in California.

This is a bad amendment because of what it attempts to cut, and I would strongly oppose it and ask my colleagues to defeat the Dreier amendment.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Dreier/Kolbe amendment that would increase funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP) by \$50 million. This is an extremely important issue to the people of California, because now Californians pay a disproportionate amount of the costs of incarcerating criminal aliens. SCAAP reimburses state and local governments for some of these costs.

States do not hold authority over national immigration policy, and they should not shoulder the burden of paying for criminal alien incarceration. It is the responsibility of the Federal government to ensure the security of our borders. Because undocumented aliens pose a great risk to our national security, the Federal government should bear the costs.

I thank Congressmen DAVID DREIER and JIM KOLBE for introducing this amendment, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

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

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

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin; amendment offered by Mr. TERRY of Nebraska; amendment offered by Ms. VELAZQUEZ of New York; amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. REICHERT of Washington; amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. STEARNS of Florida; and amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. DREIER of California.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 230, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

AYES—196

Abercrombie	Etheridge	McCollum (MN)
Ackerman	Evans	McCrery
Allen	Farr	McDermott
Andrews	Fattah	McGovern
Baca	Filner	McIntyre
Baird	Fitzpatrick (PA)	McKinney
Baldwin	Ford	McNulty
Barrow	Fossella	Meehan
Bean	Frank (MA)	Meeke (FL)
Becerra	Gerlach	Meeks (NY)
Berkley	Gibbons	Melancon
Berman	Gohmert	Menendez
Berry	Green (WI)	Michaud
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Millender-
Bishop (NY)	Gutierrez	McDonald
Blumenauer	Harman	Miller, George
Boswell	Hastings (FL)	Moore (KS)
Boucher	Hereth	Moore (WI)
Boyd	Higgins	Moran (VA)
Brown (OH)	Hinchee	Nadler
Brown, Corrine	Holden	Napolitano
Butterfield	Holt	Neal (MA)
Camp	Honda	Obey
Capps	Hoolley	Olver
Capuano	Hoyer	Owens
Cardin	Inslee	Pallone
Cardoza	Israel	Pascarell
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Carson	Jefferson	Payne
Case	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Chabot	Kaptur	Peterson (MN)
Chandler	Kennedy (RI)	Platts
Clay	Kildee	Pomeroy
Cleaver	Kilpatrick (MI)	Price (NC)
Clyburn	Kind	Rahall
Conyers	King (NY)	Ramstad
Cooper	Langevin	Rangel
Costello	Lantos	Renzi
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Ross
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Cummings	Latham	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Lee	Rush
Davis (FL)	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
DeFazio	Lipinski	Salazar
DeGette	Lofgren, Zoe	Sánchez, Linda
Delahunt	Lowe	T.
DeLauro	Lungren, Daniel	Sanchez, Loretta
Dent	E.	Sanders
Dicks	Lynch	Schakowsky
Dingell	Maloney	Schwartz (PA)
Doggett	Markey	Scott (GA)
Edwards	Marshall	Scott (VA)
Emanuel	Matheson	Serrano
Engel	Matsui	Shays
Eshoo	McCarthy	Sherman

Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner

NOES—230

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrist

NOT VOTING—7

Cox
Hinojosa
Oberstar

Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky

Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schiff
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN
The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1622

Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, BARRETT of South Carolina, CONAWAY, BASS, MURPHY, MILLER of North Carolina, COSTA, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BOREN and Mr. ORTIZ changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”
Messrs. HONDA, SIMMONS, FOSSELLA, MCCRERY, CUELLAR, RAHALL, DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, FATTAH and LARSON of Connecticut changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

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

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 252, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 245]

AYES—175

Ackerman
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Brown (OH)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burton (IN)
Cannon
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carmahan
Carson
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Chocolla
Coble
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (IL)

Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reichert
Renzi

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carter
Castle
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner

Reyes
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Stearns
Stupak

NOES—252

Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Higgins
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matsui
McCaul (TX)
McCullum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney

Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Watt
Weiner
Weller
Westmoreland
Wu
Wynn

Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Northup
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Owens
Oxley
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Pombo
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Spratt
Stark
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry

Tiahrt Wasserman Whitfield
Tiberi Schultz Wicker
Tierney Waters Wilson (NM)
Turner Watson Wilson (SC)
Velázquez Waxman Wolf
Visclosky Weldon (FL) Woolsey
Waldon (PA) Young (AK)
Walsh Wexler Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Cox Oberstar Sessions
Hinojosa Rothman Strickland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).
Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1632

Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. BEAN, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. WAXMAN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. ORTIZ and Mrs. EMERSON changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

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

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 189, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 246]

AYES—234

Abercrombie Case Fattah
Ackerman Chandler Filner
Allen Clay Ford
Andrews Cleaver Frank (MA)
Baca Clyburn Gohmert
Baird Cole (OK) Gonzalez
Baldwin Conaway Gordon
Barrow Cooper Graves
Bean Costa Green (WI)
Beauprez Costello Green, Al
Becerra Cramer Green, Gene
Berkley Crowley Grijalva
Berman Cubin Gutierrez
Berry Cuellar Harman
Bishop (GA) Cummings Harris
Bishop (NY) Davis (AL) Hastings (FL)
Blumenauer Davis (CA) Hayes
Boren Davis (FL) Herseth
Boswell Davis (IL) Higgins
Boucher Davis (TN) Hinchey
Boyd DeFazio Holden
Bradley (NH) DeGette Holt
Brady (PA) Delahunt Honda
Brown (OH) DeLauro Hooley
Brown, Corrine Dicks Hoyer
Brown-Waite, Dingell Hulshof
Ginny Doggett
Butterfield Doyle Israel
Capito Edwards Jackson (IL)
Capps Emanuel Jackson-Lee
Capuano Engel (TX)
Cardin Eshoo Jefferson
Cardoza Etheridge Johnson, E. B.
Carnahan Evans Jones (OH)
Carson Farr Kanjorski

Kaptur Michaud Sanders
Kelly Millender Schakowsky
Kennedy (MN) McDonald Schiff
Kennedy (RI) Miller (NC) Schwartz (PA)
Kildee Miller, George Scott (GA)
Kilpatrick (MI) Mollohan Scott (VA)
Kind Moore (KS) Serrano
King (NY) Moore (WI) Sherman
Kline Moran (KS) Skelton
Kucinich Moran (VA) Slaughter
Kuhl (NY) Murtha Smith (WA)
Langevin Nadler
Lantos Napolitano
Larsen (WA) Neal (MA)
Larson (CT) Ney
LaTourette Obey
Leach Olver
Lee Ortiz
Levin Owens
Lewis (GA) Pallone
Lipinski Pascrell
LoBiondo Pastor
Lofgren, Zoe Paul
Lowey Payne
Lynch Pelosi
Maloney Peterson (MN)
Marchant Platts
Markey Pomeroy
Marshall Porter
Matheson Price (NC)
Matsui Rahall
McCarthy Ramstad
McCollum (MN) Rangel
McCotter Renzi
McDermott Reyes
McGovern Ross
McIntyre Roybal-Allard
McKinney Ruppertsberger
McMorris Rush
McNulty Ryan (OH)
Meehan Sabo
Meek (FL) Salazar
Meeks (NY) Sánchez, Linda
Melancon T.
Menendez Sanchez, Loretta

NOES—189

Aderholt English (PA)
Akin Everett
Alexander Feeney
Bachus Ferguson
Baker Fitzpatrick (PA)
Barrett (SC) Flake
Bartlett (MD) Foley
Barton (TX) Forbes
Bass Fortenberry
Biggert Fossella
Bilirakis Foxx
Bishop (UT) Franks (AZ)
Blackburn Frelinghuysen
Blunt
Boehlert Garrett (NJ)
Boehner Gerlach
Bonilla Gibbons
Bonner Gilchrest
Bono Gillum
Boozman Gingrey
Boustany Goode
Brady (TX) Goodlatte
Brown (SC) Granger
Burgess Gutknecht
Burton (IN) Hall
Buyer Hart
Calvert Hastings (WA)
Camp Hayworth
Cannon Hefley
Cantor Hensarling
Carter Henger
Castle Hobson
Chabot Hoekstra
Chocola Hostettler
Coble Hunter
Crenshaw Hyde
Culberson Inglis (SC)
Cunningham Issa
Davis (KY) Istook
Davis, Jo Ann Jenkins
Davis, Tom Jindal
Deal (GA) Johnson (CT)
DeLay Johnson (IL)
Dent Johnson, Sam
Diaz-Balart, L. Jones (NC)
Diaz-Balart, M. Keller
Doolittle King (IA)
Drake Kingston
Dreier Kirk
Duncan Knollenberg
Ehlers Kolbe
Emerson LaHood

Schwarz (MI) Sodrel Walsh
Sensenbrenner Souder Wamp
Shadegg Sullivan Weldon (FL)
Shaw Sweeney Weller
Shays Taylor (NC) Westmoreland
Sherwood Terry Wicker
Shimkus Thomas Wilson (SC)
Shuster Thornberry Wolf
Simmons Tiahrt Young (AK)
Simpson Tiberi Young (FL)
Smith (NJ) Upton
Smith (TX) Walden (OR)

NOT VOTING—10

Conyers Oberstar Strickland
Cox Rothman Tancredo
Hinojosa Ryan (WI)
McCrery Sessions

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).
There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1640

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT
The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 297, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 247]

AYES—130

Ackerman Gerlach Michaud
Allen Green (WI) Moore (WI)
Baca Green, Al Moran (KS)
Bachus Green, Gene Moran (VA)
Baldwin Grijalva Murphy
Barrow Harris Murtha
Bilirakis Hastings (WA) Musgrave
Bishop (NY) Hayes Myrick
Bishop (UT) Hayworth Nadler
Boucher Holden
Brady (PA) Honda Neal (MA)
Brown (OH) Hooley Olver
Brown (SC) Inslee Osborne
Burgess Jefferson Otter
Carnahan Johnson (IL) Owens
Chandler Jones (NC) Pallone
Chocola Kanjorski Pastor
Clay Kaptur Paul
Conyers Keller Payne
Costa Kelly Peterson (MN)
Costello Kennedy (MN) Petri
Crowley King (IA) Platts
Cubin Larsen (WA) Poe
Davis (KY) Lee
DeGette Lewis (GA) Porter
Doyle Lipinski Rahall
Duncan LoBiondo Ramstad
Ehlers Matheson Reichert
Engel Matsui Renzi
English (PA) McCrery Reynolds
Etheridge McHenry Ryan (WI)
Evans McKinney Sánchez, Linda
Fattah McMorris T.
Filner McNulty Schakowsky
Fitzpatrick (PA) Meehan Schwartz (PA)
Ford Meek (FL) Shimkus
Fortenberry Meeks (NY) Simmons
Frank (MA) Melancon Slaughter

Smith (WA) Tierney
 Souder Towns
 Stark Upton
 Stearns Walden (OR)
 Tanner Wamp
 Terry Waters

NOES—297

Abercrombie Everett
 Aderholt Farr
 Akin Feeney
 Alexander Ferguson
 Andrews Flake
 Baird Foley
 Baker Forbes
 Barrett (SC) Fossella
 Bartlett (MD) Foxx
 Barton (TX) Franks (AZ)
 Bass Frelinghuysen
 Bean Gallegly
 Beauprez Garrett (NJ)
 Becerra Gibbons
 Berkley Gilchrest
 Berman Gillmor
 Berry Gingrey
 Biggert Gohmert
 Bishop (GA) Gonzalez
 Blackburn Goode
 Blumenauer Goodlatte
 Blunt Gordon
 Boehlert Granger
 Boehner Graves
 Bonilla Gutierrez
 Bonner Gutknecht
 Bono Hall
 Boozman Harman
 Boren Hart
 Boswell Hastings (FL)
 Boustany Hefley
 Boyd Hensarling
 Bradley (NH) Herger
 Brady (TX) Herseth
 Brown, Corrine Higgins
 Brown-Waite, Hinchev
 Ginny Hobson
 Burton (IN) Hoekstra
 Butterfield Holt
 Buyer Hostettler
 Calvert Hoyer
 Camp Hulshof
 Cannon Hunter
 Cantor Hyde
 Capito Inglis (SC)
 Capps Israel
 Capuano Issa
 Cardin Istook
 Cardoza Jackson (IL)
 Carson Jackson-Lee
 Carter (TX)
 Case Jenkins
 Castle Jindal
 Chabot Johnson (CT)
 Cleaver Johnson, E. B.
 Clyburn Johnson, Sam
 Coble Jones (OH)
 Cole (OK) Kennedy (RI)
 Conaway Kildee
 Cooper Kilpatrick (MI)
 Cramer Kind
 Crenshaw King (NY)
 Cuellar Kingston
 Culberson Kirk
 Cummings Kline
 Cunningham Knollenberg
 Davis (AL) Kolbe
 Davis (CA) Kucinich
 Davis (FL) Kuhl (NY)
 Davis (IL) LaHood
 Davis (TN) Langevin
 Davis, Jo Ann Lantos
 Davis, Tom Larson (CT)
 Deal (GA) Latham
 DeFazio LaTourette
 Delahunt Leach
 DeLauro Levin
 DeLay Lewis (CA)
 Dent Lewis (KY)
 Diaz-Balart, L. Linder
 Diaz-Balart, M. Lofgren, Zoe
 Dicks Lowey
 Dingell Lucas
 Doggett Lungren, Daniel
 Doolittle E.
 Drake Lynch
 Dreier Mack
 Edwards Maloney
 Emanuel Manzullo
 Emerson Marchant
 Eshoo Markey

Watson Thomas
 Weiner Thompson (CA)
 Wilson (SC) Thompson (MS)
 Woolsey Thornberry
 Young (AK) Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Van Hollen

Cox Oberstar
 Hinojosa Rothman

Velázquez Westmoreland
 Jones (NC) Wexler
 Walsh Whitfield
 Wasserman Wicker
 Schultz Wilson (NM)
 Watt Wolf
 Waxman Wu
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller

NOT VOTING—6
 Sessions Strickland
 ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN
 The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).
 Members are advised 2 minutes remain
 in this vote.

□ 1649
 Mr. GRAVES and Mr. KUCINICH
 changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”
 So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BAIRD
 The CHAIRMAN. The pending busi-
 ness is the demand for a recorded vote
 on the amendment offered by the gen-
 tleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the noes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amend-
 ment.
 The Clerk designated the amend-
 ment.

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

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 260, noes 168,
 not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]
 AYES—260
 Abercrombie Cleaver
 Ackerman Clyburn
 Allen Coble
 Baca Cooper
 Baird Costa
 Baldwin Costello
 Barrow Crowley
 Bartlett (MD) Cubin
 Bean Cuellar
 Beauprez Cummings
 Becerra Davis (AL)
 Berkley Davis (CA)
 Berman Davis (FL)
 Bilirakis Davis (IL)
 Bishop (NY) Davis (KY)
 Blumenauer Davis (TN)
 Boehlert Davis, Jo Ann
 Bonner Deal (GA)
 Boozman DeFazio
 Boren DeGette
 Boswell Delahunt
 Boucher DeLauro
 Boyd Dent
 Bradley (NH) Dicks
 Brady (PA) Dingell
 Brown (OH) Doggett
 Brown, Corrine Doyle
 Brown-Waite, Drake
 Ginny Edwards
 Butterfield Ehlers
 Capito Emanuel
 Capuano Emerson
 Cardoza Engel
 Carnahan Eshoo
 Carson Etheridge
 Case Evans
 Castle Everett
 Chabot Farr
 Chandler Fattah
 Chocola Ferguson

Johnson (IL) Melancon
 Jones (NC) Mica
 Jones (OH) Michaud
 Kanjorski Millender-
 Kaptur McDonald
 Keller Miller (NC)
 Kennedy (MN) Miller, George
 Kennedy (RI) Moore (KS)
 Kildee Moore (WI)
 Kilpatrick (MI) Moran (KS)
 Kind Murphy
 King (IA) Musgrave
 King (NY) Nadler
 Kingston Neal (MA)
 Kline Ney
 Kuhl (NY) Norwood
 LaHood Nussle
 Langevin Obey
 Lantos Olver
 Larsen (WA) Ortiz
 Larson (CT) Osborne
 Leach Pallone
 Levin Pastor
 Lewis (GA) Paul
 Lewis (KY) Pelosi
 Lipinski Peterson (MN)
 LoBiondo Peterson (PA)
 Lofgren, Zoe Pickering
 Lowey Platts
 Lynch Poe
 Markey Pombo
 Marshall Pomeroy
 Matheson Price (GA)
 Matsui Price (NC)
 McCarthy Radanovich
 McCaul (TX) Rahall
 McCollum (MN) Ramstad
 McCotter Reichert
 McCrery Renzi
 McDermott Reyes
 McGovern Rogers (AL)
 McHugh Ross
 McIntyre Ruppertsberger
 McKinney Rush
 McMorris Ryan (OH)
 McNulty Ryan (WI)
 Meehan Sabo
 Meek (FL) Salazar
 Meeks (NY)

NOES—168

Aderholt Feeney
 Akin Flake
 Alexander Foxx
 Andrews Franks (AZ)
 Bachus Frelinghuysen
 Baker Gallegly
 Barrett (SC) Garrett (NJ)
 Barton (TX) Gilchrest
 Bass Gillmor
 Berry Gonzalez
 Biggert Goode
 Bishop (GA) Goodlatte
 Bishop (UT) Granger
 Blackburn Gutierrez
 Blunt Hall
 Boehner Hart
 Bonilla Hayes
 Bono Hensarling
 Boustany Hobson
 Brady (TX) Hoekstra
 Brown (SC) Hostettler
 Burgess Hoyer
 Burton (IN) Hunter
 Buyer Hyde
 Calvert Inglis (SC)
 Camp Issa
 Cannon Istook
 Cantor Jefferson
 Capps Jenkins
 Cardin Johnson (CT)
 Carter Johnson, E. B.
 Clay Johnson, Sam
 Cole (OK) Kelly
 Conaway Kirk
 Conyers Knollenberg
 Cox Kolbe
 Cramer Kucinich
 Crenshaw Latham
 Culberson LaTourette
 Cunningham Lee
 Davis, Tom Lewis (CA)
 DeLay Linder
 Diaz-Balart, L. Lucas
 Diaz-Balart, M. Lungren, Daniel
 Doolittle E.
 Dreier Mack
 Duncan Maloney
 English (PA) Manzullo

Marchant
 McHenry
 McKeon
 Menendez
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Mollohan
 Moran (VA)
 Murtha
 Myrick
 Napolitano
 Neugebauer
 Northup
 Nunes
 Otter
 Owens
 Oxley
 Pascarell
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pence
 Petri
 Pitts
 Porter
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Rangel
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Reynolds
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ryan (KS)
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Saxton
 Schakowsky
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Shays
 Sherwood
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (TX)

Sodrel	Tiberi	Whitfield
Spratt	Turner	Wicker
Stark	Visclosky	Wilson (SC)
Sullivan	Walsh	Wolf
Sweeney	Waters	Wynn
Tancredo	Watt	Young (AK)
Taylor (NC)	Weldon (FL)	Young (FL)
Thomas	Weller	
Tiahrt	Westmoreland	

NOT VOTING—5

Hinojosa	Rothman	Strickland
Oberstar	Sessions	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1658

Mr. SERRANO and Ms. LEE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. REICHERT and Mr. DENT changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 112, noes 316, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 249]

AYES—112

Aderholt	Garrett (NJ)	Miller (FL)
Akin	Gibbons	Musgrave
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey	Myrick
Barrow	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Bartlett (MD)	Goode	Norwood
Barton (TX)	Goodlatte	Nunes
Bilirakis	Graves	Nussle
Bishop (UT)	Green (WI)	Otter
Boehner	Gutknecht	Paul
Boozman	Hall	Pence
Boren	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Brady (TX)	Hefley	Pitts
Burton (IN)	Hensarling	Poe
Buyer	Herger	Pombo
Camp	Hostettler	Porter
Chabot	Hunter	Price (GA)
Chocola	Hyde	Putnam
Coble	Issa	Radanovich
Cole (OK)	Istook	Reynolds
Cox	Jindal	Rogers (MI)
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Cunningham	Jones (NC)	Royce
Davis (KY)	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Davis (TN)	Kennedy (MN)	Ryun (KS)
Davis, Jo Ann	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Deal (GA)	Kline	Shadegg
DeLay	Kuhl (NY)	Shimkus
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Sodrel
Drake	Linder	Souder
Duncan	LoBiondo	Stearns
Everett	Lucas	Sullivan
Feeney	Lungren, Daniel	Tancredo
Flake	E.	Terry
Foley	Mack	Thornberry
Forbes	Marchant	Thornberry
Fortenberry	McCaul (TX)	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Wilson (SC)
Galleghy	Mica	

NOES—316

Abercrombie	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Millender-
Ackerman	Ford	McDonald
Alexander	Fossella	Miller (MI)
Allen	Foxx	Miller (NC)
Andrews	Frank (MA)	Miller, Gary
Baca	Frelinghuysen	Miller, George
Bachus	Gerlach	Mollohan
Baird	Gilchrest	Moore (KS)
Baker	Gillmor	Moore (WI)
Baldwin	Gonzalez	Moran (KS)
Bass	Gordon	Moran (VA)
Bean	Granger	Murphy
Beauprez	Green, Al	Murtha
Becerra	Green, Gene	Nadler
Berkley	Grijalva	Napolitano
Berman	Gutierrez	Neal (MA)
Berry	Harman	Ney
Biggart	Harris	Northup
Bishop (GA)	Hart	Obey
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Olver
Blackburn	Hayes	Ortiz
Blumenauer	Hayworth	Osborne
Blunt	Herseth	Owens
Boehler	Higgins	Oxley
Bonilla	Hinche	Pallone
Bonner	Hobson	Pascrell
Bono	Hoekstra	Pastor
Boswell	Holden	Payne
Boucher	Holt	Pearce
Boustany	Honda	Pelosi
Boyd	Hooley	Peterson (MN)
Bradley (NH)	Hoyer	Peterson (PA)
Brady (PA)	Hulshof	Pickering
Brown (OH)	Inglis (SC)	Platts
Brown (SC)	Inslee	Pomeroy
Brown, Corrine	Israel	Price (NC)
Brown-Waite,	Jackson (IL)	Pryce (OH)
Ginny	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Burgess	(TX)	Ramstad
Butterfield	Jefferson	Rangel
Calvert	Jenkins	Regula
Cannon	Johnson (CT)	Rehberg
Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Reichert
Capito	Johnson, E. B.	Renzi
Capps	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Capuano	Kanjorski	Rogers (AL)
Cardin	Kaptur	Rogers (KY)
Cardoza	Kelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Carnahan	Kennedy (RI)	Ross
Carson	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Carter	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ruppersberger
Case	Kind	Rush
Castle	King (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Chandler	Kingston	Sabo
Clay	Kirk	Salazar
Cleaver	Knollenberg	Sánchez, Linda
Clyburn	Kolbe	T.
Conaway	Kucinich	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	LaHood	Sanders
Cooper	Langevin	Saxton
Costa	Lantos	Schakowsky
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cramer	Larson (CT)	Schwartz (PA)
Crenshaw	Latham	Schwartz (MI)
Crowley	LaTourrette	Scott (GA)
Cuellar	Leach	Scott (VA)
Culberson	Lee	Serrano
Cummings	Levin	Shaw
Davis (AL)	Lewis (CA)	Shays
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Davis (FL)	Lipinski	Sherwood
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Shuster
Davis, Tom	Lowe	Simmons
DeFazio	Lynch	Simpson
DeGette	Maloney	Skelton
Delahunt	Manzullo	Slaughter
DeLauro	Markey	Smith (NJ)
Dent	Marshall	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Matheson	Smith (WA)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Matsui	Snyder
Dicks	McCarthy	Soils
Dingell	McCollum (MN)	Spratt
Doggett	McCotter	Stark
Doyle	McCrary	Stupak
Dreier	McDermott	Sweeney
Edwards	McGovern	Tanner
Ehlers	McHugh	Tauscher
Emanuel	McIntyre	Taylor (MS)
Emerson	McKeon	Taylor (NC)
Engel	McKinney	Thomas
English (PA)	McMorris	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
Etheridge	Meehan	Tiahrt
Evans	Meek (FL)	Tiberti
Farr	Meeke (NY)	Tierney
Fattah	Melancon	Towns
Ferguson	Menendez	Turner
Filner	Michaud	Udall (CO)

Udall (NM)	Waters	Wilson (NM)
Upton	Watson	Wolf
Van Hollen	Watt	Woolsey
Velázquez	Waxman	Wu
Visclosky	Weiner	Wynn
Walden (OR)	Weldon (FL)	Young (AK)
Walsh	Weldon (PA)	Young (FL)
Wamp	Weller	
Wasserman	Wexler	
Schultz	Wicker	

NOT VOTING—5

Hinojosa	Rothman	Strickland
Oberstar	Sessions	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1707

Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. SODREL changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 195, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 250]

AYES—231

Akin	Cox	Gerlach
Baca	Crenshaw	Gibbons
Barrow	Cubin	Gillmor
Bartlett (MD)	Cuellar	Gingrey
Barton (TX)	Culberson	Gohmert
Bass	Cunningham	Gonzalez
Becerra	Davis (GA)	Goode
Berman	Davis (KY)	Goodlatte
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Jo Ann	Granger
Blackburn	Davis, Tom	Graves
Blunt	Deal (GA)	Green (WI)
Bonilla	DeFazio	Green, Gene
Bono	DeLay	Grijalva
Boozman	Dent	Hall
Boswell	Diaz-Balart, L.	Harman
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Harris
Brown (OH)	Doggett	Hart
Brown-Waite,	Doolittle	Hastings (WA)
Ginny	Drake	Hayes
Burgess	Dreier	Hayworth
Burton (IN)	Duncan	Hensarling
Buyer	Emerson	Herger
Calvert	Engel	Herseth
Camp	English (PA)	Higgins
Cannon	Evans	Hobson
Cantor	Ferguson	Hoekstra
Capito	Filner	Hostettler
Cardoza	Flake	Hulshof
Carnahan	Forbes	Hunter
Carter	Fortenberry	Hyde
Chabot	Fossella	Issa
Chandler	Foxx	Jenkins
Chocola	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (CT)
Conaway	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, E. B.
Costa	Galleghy	Johnson, Sam
Costello	Garrett (NJ)	Jones (NC)

Kelly	Nadler	Sánchez, Linda
Kennedy (MN)	Napolitano	T.
King (IA)	Neugebauer	Schiff
King (NY)	Ney	Schwartz (PA)
Kingston	Northup	Sensenbrenner
Kline	Norwood	Shadegg
Knollenberg	Nunes	Shaw
Kolbe	Nussle	Sherman
Kuhl (NY)	Ortiz	Sherwood
LaHood	Osborne	Shimkus
Larsen (WA)	Otter	Shuster
Latham	Oxley	Simpson
Lewis (CA)	Pastor	Smith (NJ)
Lewis (KY)	Paul	Smith (TX)
Linder	Pearce	Smith (WA)
Lipinski	Peterson (MN)	Solis
LoBiondo	Peterson (PA)	Souder
Lungren, Daniel	Petri	Stark
E.	Pickering	Stearns
Mack	Poe	Sullivan
Manzullo	Pombo	Sweeney
Marchant	Porter	Tancredo
Marshall	Price (GA)	Thomas
McCaul (TX)	Pryce (OH)	Thompson (MS)
McCotter	Putnam	Thornberry
McCrary	Radanovich	Tiahrt
McHenry	Ramstad	Turner
McHugh	Regula	Udall (NM)
McIntyre	Rehberg	Walden (OR)
McKeon	Renzi	Walsh
McMorris	Reyes	Wamp
McNulty	Reynolds	Waters
Meek (FL)	Rogers (AL)	Waxman
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Weiner
Millender-	Rogers (MI)	Weller
McDonald	Rohrabacher	Westmoreland
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Miller (MI)	Roybal-Allard	Wicker
Miller, Gary	Royce	Wilson (NM)
Moore (KS)	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (SC)
Murphy	Ryan (WI)	Wolf
Musgrave	Ryun (KS)	Young (AK)
Myrick		

NOES—195

Abercrombie	Dicks	Lewis (GA)
Ackerman	Dingell	Lofgren, Zoe
Aderholt	Doyle	Lowey
Alexander	Edwards	Lucas
Allen	Ehlers	Lynch
Andrews	Emanuel	Maloney
Baird	Eshoo	Markey
Baker	Etheridge	Matheson
Baldwin	Everett	Matsui
Barrett (SC)	Farr	McCarthy
Bean	Feeney	McCollum (MN)
Beauprez	Fitzpatrick (PA)	McDermott
Berkley	Foley	McGovern
Berry	Ford	McKinney
Biggart	Frank (MA)	Meehan
Billirakis	Gilchrest	Meeks (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Gordon	Melancon
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	Menendez
Blumenauer	Gutknecht	Michaud
Boehler	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)
Boehner	Hefley	Miller, George
Bonner	Hinchey	Mollohan
Boren	Holden	Moore (WI)
Boucher	Holt	Moran (KS)
Boustany	Honda	Moran (VA)
Boyd	Hooley	Murtha
Bradley (NH)	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Brady (PA)	Inglis (SC)	Obey
Brown (SC)	Inslee	Olver
Brown, Corrine	Israel	Owens
Butterfield	Istook	Pallone
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Pascarell
Capuano	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Cardin	(TX)	Pelosi
Carson	Jefferson	Pence
Case	Jindal	Pitts
Castle	Johnson (IL)	Platts
Clay	Jones (OH)	Pomeroy
Cleaver	Kanjorski	Price (NC)
Clyburn	Kaptur	Rahall
Coble	Keller	Rangel
Cole (OK)	Kennedy (RI)	Reichert
Conyers	Kildee	Ross
Cooper	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rothman
Cramer	Kind	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Kirk	Rush
Cummings	Kucinich	Sabo
Davis (AL)	Langevin	Salazar
Davis (FL)	Lantos	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Sanders
Davis (TN)	LaTourette	Saxton
DeGette	Leach	Schakowsky
Delahunt	Lee	Schwarz (MI)
DeLauro	Levin	Scott (GA)

Scott (VA)	Taylor (MS)	Wasserman
Serrano	Taylor (NC)	Schultz
Shays	Terry	Watson
Simmons	Thompson (CA)	Watt
Sensenbrenner	Tiberi	Weldon (FL)
Slaughter	Tierney	Weldon (PA)
Snyder	Towns	Wexler
Sodrel	Udall (CO)	Woolsey
Spratt	Upton	Wu
Stupak	Van Hollen	Wynn
Tanner	Velázquez	Young (FL)
Tauscher	Visclosky	

NOT VOTING—7

Bachus	Hinojosa	Strickland
Fattah	Oberstar	
Gutierrez	Sessions	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1716

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I was briefly absent from this Chamber today and inadvertently missed rollcall vote 250. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote 250.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). Are there further amendments to this section of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$21,947,600)".

Page 23, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$21,947,600)".

Page 65, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$21,947,600)".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the budget of the United Nations currently stands at \$3.7 billion. The contribution from the United States, or actually the contribution from the United States taxpayers, is almost a quarter of that, \$439 million. The amendment that is before us deals with just less than 1/10 of 1 percent of that entire U.N. budget.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to simply take that .6 percent of the U.N. budget from the U.S. assessments towards the U.N. and put those funds into a program that we have talked about earlier, the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Grant Program. As we have talked previously on this floor, this is a law enforcement assistance grant program that works in partnership with Federal, State, and local govern-

ments with the objective of creating a safer community for all of us. It does that by awarding grants to States and local communities and counties and local governments to help improve their functioning of their criminal justice systems, and it does it with an emphasis on violent crime and serious offenders.

What can this money be used for? It can go to provide for personnel, equipment, training, technical assistance, and information systems for more widespread apprehension, prosecution, adjudication, detention, and rehab of offenders who violate both State and local laws.

Since September 11 this grant program has been a significant program for law enforcement. As the chairman knows, I represent the Fifth District of New Jersey, an area just outside of Ground Zero in New York City, an area that is all too aware of the need to have increased law enforcement and to deal with the prospects of terrorist attack.

How much money are we talking about? The total sum of this transfer is a little under \$22 million. And as I said before, the entire United Nations budget is \$3.7 billion. So we are talking about .6 percent, a little less than 1 percent, of the overall U.N. budget to do this. But with that little tiny bit of money, it will translate into a 6.3 percent increase for this purpose, not enough for every law enforcement need throughout the country, but enough to meet the numerous needs that are not being met right now.

Mr. Chairman, later in this week we will be dealing with U.N. reform and pointing out that the U.N. has not lived up to its original charter. That charter sets out that the U.N.'s job is preventing war and maintaining world peace. There have been over 300 wars since 1945, when the U.N. was created. Twenty-two million people have died. Obviously, it is not living up to its full potential. In part it is because of its bloated bureaucracy, its inefficiency, and its bad management in so many different ways, an untold amount of wasted dollars at the U.N. The United Nations cannot even come up with the definition of what terrorism is. But let me tell the Members, Mr. Chairman, after September 11, local law enforcement agents in my district in New Jersey can tell us what terrorism is because they have seen it firsthand.

So I offer this amendment today to make sure that they have all the tools necessary to keep our citizens safe at home.

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

I am going to accept the amendment, but I know there is going to be another amendment later that cuts \$200 million out.

Secondly, I think the membership should know that in our bill last year, we had language setting up the Gingrich-Mitchell Reform Task Force, which is making their report, I believe,

tomorrow or the next day, and they had some fairly dramatic recommendations to reform the U.N., and I think that is really the way to go.

Thirdly, while it is true the U.N. has failed in Srebrenica, they failed in Sarajevo, they failed in Rwanda, and they are failing in Darfur, the recommendations of the Gingrich-Mitchell can make a large difference.

Lastly, the peacekeepers that we have in some places, for instance, the peacekeepers in Sudan, keep American men and women, military, from being on the ground. So I would urge Members, where we are going to accept the amendment, to look at the Gingrich-Mitchell recommendations which will be coming out this week which will be dramatically reforming the U.N. on a bipartisan basis.

So having said that, I accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have amendment at the desk, and I will offer it and withdraw it.

My amendment designates \$1.2 million out of the overall census budget for research on migration to improve demographic analysis and population estimates.

When the 2000 census count was announced, there was a great deal of confusion at Census Bureau. Demographic analysis, which has been the gold standard for measuring error in the census, and which had showed a substantial net undercount in the census for 50 years, showed an overcount. The population estimates, which had been used to distribute funds throughout the decade, missed almost 8 million people. There was a simple explanation for this. The Census Bureau assumptions on net migration into the country were wrong. The Census Bureau is now asking Congress for additional funds to do the research necessary to correct these estimates.

Measuring error in the census and providing population estimates for the distribution of funds are part of the core mission of the Bureau. Improvements in those activities should be funded before anything else. I am disappointed that this research has not been funded. I will, however, withdraw this amendment, and I hope that the chairman and ranking member will work to see that the necessary research gets done before the 2010 census.

The Census Bureau has at times wasted money on gadgets and promotional items instead of basic research. We need to direct their efforts back to basic research, such as the demographic analysis.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which would increase the

funding for investigation and prosecution of consumer identity fraud.

Approximately 10 million people a year are being victimized by identity theft. Last year's business and financial institutions lost about \$52 billion, and consumers lost about \$5 billion due to identity theft.

Too little is being done to effectively address consumer identity theft and credit card fraud. Presently what happens is the credit card companies just simply wipe out the debt, but the fees are not never appropriately pursued. The problem is that the laws we have on the books are not being adequately enforced due to insufficient investigative and prosecutorial resources. While the Department of Justice devotes some resources towards identity theft, it is not a high priority due to inadequate resources, and so the thieves practice their wares with impunity.

Mr. Chairman, last year we passed legislation which authorized money for consumer identity theft enforcement. We have not properly funded that, and this amendment would go a long way into properly funding it. I understand, however, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) has expressed some concerns about the offsets and the funding level in the bill already, and I would ask the chairman if he would work with us to make sure that the funding of identity theft is properly done under the bill between now, over in the Senate, and in conference.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, he has my commitment to that. This is a very important issue, and we can work together.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his commitment.

And with that, I will not offer the amendment, but will be working to make sure that consumer identity theft investigation and prosecution is properly funded under the bill.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1730

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2862, SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2862 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 314, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

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

amendments printed in the RECORD and numbered 1, 4, 10, 11, 17, 18, 19 and 21;

amendment printed in the RECORD and numbered 2, which shall be debatable for 15 minutes;

amendment printed in the RECORD and numbered 6, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. WOLF, regarding funding levels;

an amendment by Mr. HINCHEY, regarding implementation of laws on medical marijuana, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. MARKEY, regarding limitation on funds for torture, which will be debatable for 15 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. NADLER, regarding health insurance records under the PATRIOT Act, which shall be debatable for 15 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. SANDERS, regarding FISA applications under the PATRIOT Act, which shall be debatable for 40 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. SCHIFF, regarding protection of the Federal judiciary;

an amendment by Mr. CARDIN, regarding WTO action against China for currency manipulation;

an amendment by Mr. MICA, regarding U.S. and Commercial Service Funding;

an amendment by Mr. SHIMKUS or Ms. ESHOO, regarding NTIA funding;

an amendment by Mr. INSLEE, regarding NOAA Coastal Zone Management Program;

an amendment by Mr. FOSSELLA or Mr. KING of New York, regarding U.S. fugitives residing in Cuba;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE, regarding educational cultural exchanges;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE, regarding goods to Cuba, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, regarding data on racial distribution of convictions;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, regarding affirmances by immigration judges;

an amendment by Mr. MORAN of Virginia, regarding export licenses for firearms;

an amendment by Mrs. MUSGRAVE, regarding NASA Hollywood liaison;