

Stenholm	Tierney	Waxman
Strickland	Toomey	Weiner
Stupak	Towns	Weldon (FL)
Sullivan	Turner (OH)	Weldon (PA)
Sweeney	Turner (TX)	Weller
Tancredo	Udall (CO)	Wexler
Tanner	Udall (NM)	Whitfield
Tauscher	Upton	Wicker
Tauzin	Van Hollen	Wilson (NM)
Taylor (MS)	Velazquez	Wilson (SC)
Taylor (NC)	Visclosky	Wolf
Terry	Vitter	Woolsey
Thomas	Walden (OR)	Wu
Thompson (CA)	Walsh	Wynn
Thompson (MS)	Wamp	Young (AK)
Thornberry	Waters	Young (FL)
Tiahrt	Watson	
Tiberi	Watt	

NOT VOTING—13

Ackerman	Cramer	Hulshof
Brown, Corrine	Cubin	Radanovich
Brown-Waite,	Feeney	Ryun (KS)
Ginny	Gephardt	Smith (WA)
Conyers	Granger	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1331

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve education and entrepreneurship benefits, housing benefits, and certain other benefits for veterans, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I missed four votes in the House of Representatives on June 24, 2003. Had I been in attendance I would have made the following votes:

The Previous Question on H.R. 293, the Rule for H.R. 2555, Homeland Security Appropriations Act for FY04. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "yea."

Passage of H. Res. 293, Rule for H.R. 2555, Homeland Security Appropriations Act for FY04. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "yea."

Passage of H.R. 923, Premier Certified Lenders Program Improvement Act of 2003. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "yea."

Passage of H.R. 1460, Veterans Entrepreneurship Act of 2003. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "yea."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material on H.R. 2555.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 293 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. 2555.

□ 1334

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. 2555) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with Mr. GILLMOR 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 Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a historic day. Only 4 months after the Department of Homeland Security was stood up, we now consider in the Congress the very first ever Homeland Security appropriations bill on the House floor.

The creation of the Department is by far the largest reorganization of the Federal Government in its history. Mr. Chairman, 180,000 employees, 22 security-related agencies merged into a single unit, agencies as diverse as the new Transportation Security Administration, FEMA, the Customs Service, the Secret Service, the Coast Guard, and some 18 other agencies throughout the government.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to spend a couple of minutes talking about the breadth of the problem that we face.

On our borders, we have to protect ourselves: 2,000 miles of border with Mexico; 5,500 miles of border with Canada. There are 9,500 miles of shoreline. We have 157 ports of entry, 361 seaports. There are 440 million visitors who arrive in our country by land, sea, and air each year. There are 118 million vehicles that come here, 11 million of them trucks; 2.5 million railcars; and 17 million cargo containers that cross through our ports every year.

In transportation, there are some 768,000 commercial flights that enter the U.S. at 429 commercial airports, carrying some 635 million passengers a year. We have 18,000 general aviation airports. We have 143,000 miles of freight railways, 3.9 million miles of highways, and 550 major public transportation systems throughout our country. There are 590,000 bridges. There are 526,000 interstate trucking companies, 43,000 of them certified to carry hazardous materials.

We have 150 oil refineries, 86,000 miles of crude oil pipelines, 278,000 miles of natural gas pipelines. There are 66,000 chemical and hazardous materials plants. There are 1,800 Federal reservoirs. There are 9,300 power plants, including 104 nuclear, in our country.

And then there are all sorts of high-target, high-risk symbols of our Nation. We are speaking from one even as I talk now: the Capitol. We have the White House, the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, the Statue of Liberty, the St. Louis Arch, the Golden Gate Bridge, and on and on and on, including some 463 skyscrapers in our land.

I mention those facts, Mr. Chairman, to highlight the enormous challenge that we face as we begin to tackle our homeland security needs. Protecting American citizens from harm is the first and foremost duty of the Federal Government, and this awesome task largely falls upon the shoulders of the Department of Homeland Security.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, provides \$29.4 billion for the Department. That is an increase of just over \$1 billion above what we were asked by the President, and \$535 million more than the current-year levels.

The bill recognizes that while the Department of Homeland Security has the lead in developing our national Homeland Security strategy, implementation of that strategy requires the active participation of State and local governments and the private sector.

When it comes down to it, homeland security, Mr. Chairman, is essentially hometown security; and it requires the active engagement of all Americans and all branches of government.

The bill before us today recognizes the role each stakeholder must play in this big mission. It funds not only the Department's first full year of operations, but also anticipated efforts of State and local governments and the private sector.

As we debate this bill today, I urge my colleagues to remember everything that has been accomplished since September 11. While some might suggest that we are not doing enough, I would say we are making tremendous progress in our war on terror. The glass is not half empty; it is half full.

Since September 11, we have provided \$75.8 billion for homeland security funding across the entire government. For these 22 agencies that now make up the new Department of Homeland Security, we have provided \$43.9 billion through fiscal year 2003; and in this bill, we add an additional \$29.4 billion, bringing the total provided to the Department to \$73.3 billion for fiscal years 2002 through 2004.

Protecting the Nation's borders is our first line of defense against terrorism. We include in the bill a total of \$9 billion for border protection and related activities. That is an increase of \$400 million over the current enacted levels, including \$2 billion for the U.S.

Coast Guard homeland security activities. This bill makes innovative technology and capital investments a priority, recognizing that our borders will only be secure when we use a combination of people and technology.

Since September 11, 5,400 inspectors, special agents, and Border Patrol agents have been added to our borders, increasing coverage at ports by 25 percent. An additional 4,100 Coast Guard personnel have been hired to protect our ports and our waterways, increasing the intensity and number of inspections at ports of entry. We will continue to inspect 100 percent of all high-threat cargo and high-threat vessels coming into our waters.

We include \$388 million for port security grants. The \$100 million included in this bill is another down payment to secure critical port facilities, bringing the total funding since 9–11 to \$488 million.

Since September 11, we have provided \$263 million for technology, including radiation detectors for our ports and nonintrusive inspection technologies for cargo screening. These technologies have been deployed at our busiest land and sea ports, including Miami, Los Angeles, and Newark; and in this bill we add another \$129 million for those technologies, bringing the total since 9–11 to \$392 million.

We provide \$60 million for the Customs Container Security Initiative, fully funding that effort since its inception. We include \$62 million for that program, bringing the total funding to \$122 million to support the participation of nearly all of the 20 foreign megaports from which we receive practically all of our cargo. This initiative targets high-threat cargo before it comes into our ports.

We also place in the bill a high priority on funding our State and local first responders. I believe it is essential that our State and local governments have the resources to address the needs of our hometowns. We include \$4.4 billion for our first responders, law enforcement officers, firefighters, and emergency response personnel. And since September 11, Mr. Chairman, I want all of my colleagues to hear this: since September 11, the Congress has appropriated \$20.8 billion in assistance to our State and local governments for terrorism prevention and preparedness.

□ 1345

That, Mr. Chairman, is an increase of 1,000 percent before 9/11. Despite that significant investment, there are concerns about how and when this money gets to both State and local organizations. I agree in some instances it is taking too long for those funds to get there and the complex process is complicated and cumbersome. We tried to address that in this bill. I am optimistic that this issue will be addressed as part of the final bill that is sent to the President for his signature.

Enhancing transportation security is a continuing concern. Since 9/11 we

have provided a total of \$10.38 billion for passenger safety through the Transportation Security Administration. Passenger screening, baggage screening, cargo screening, an additional \$5.172 billion is included in this bill. Since September 11, \$1.5 billion has been spent on explosive and trace detection systems, including the development, procurement and installation in our airports. We include in this bill an additional \$335 million for the purchase and installation of these systems, as well as \$50 million for air cargo safety and \$40 million for research on next generation technologies at our airports.

Science and technology are critical to improving security, increasing efficiency and reducing costs. We include \$900 million for science and technology, including \$60 million, Mr. Chairman, to design develop and test any missile devices for our commercial aircraft. Other funds are targeted at research, development and rapid deployment of innovative technologies that our universities and other public and private organizations are already developing.

Lastly, the bill includes \$5.6 billion over 10 years to encourage commercial development and production of medical countermeasures against bioterrorism, the so-called BioShield program. Funding in fiscal year 2004 is limited to \$890 million. These funds will remove the barriers to develop next generation treatment for potential bioterror agents and will encourage the private sector to conduct the necessary research to counter bioterror threats.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is the first Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill ever considered by these bodies. I believe it presents a well-balanced approach to tackling the job ahead. It invests in people. We invest in technology. We invest in partnerships. It funds efforts to assess our vulnerabilities and capitalize on our assets.

A lot of people would want us to spend tons and tons of more money, and believe me, if we thought it was useful to do so we would have no compunction against doing that. But there has got to be somewhere where we sensibly allocate our funds to our vulnerabilities and spend those dollars, but we should not spend money just for throwing it away.

I believe this bill is responsible, and I urge my colleagues to support this historic measure.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, first let me congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) on the first homeland security bill and congratulate him on a job well done and also add my thanks to the staff, both minority and majority, for their hard work in putting this bill together. We really do appreciate their efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2004 Homeland Security ap-

propriations bill. But I must say that in many ways I think it is premature for this bill to be the first appropriations measure brought to the floor. The Department is in serious disarray, and the committee received very little support from the Department in putting together this bill and report. In fact, many of the agencies transferred to the Department were prevented by the Department from providing responsive information to the subcommittee.

Hearings could not even be arranged for four of the largest and most important of the Department's 11 major agencies. Those four agencies constitutes \$9 billion, or 31 percent, of the Department's total budget. And I must say that that is an additional reason for thanking the staff, both minority and majority of this committee, for putting a bill together with the lack of information coming from the Department.

In some ways the current state of the Department of Homeland Security reminds me of the situation we faced 1 year ago and still face today with TSA. The management failures of TSA are well known, and I fear that the Department of Homeland Security is going down the same path. The Department so far has failed to develop a useful road map of its security goals for the Nation. If anyone at the Department has a strategy for basic objectives, such as securing the northern border, tracking all vessels entering American waters, or ensuring that airline cargo is effectively screened, no one has been willing to share that information with us. I find that disturbing.

If the Department will not define its goals, it is up to the Congress to do them. This bill provides \$29.4 billion in discretionary budget authority for the Department of Homeland Security. This is only \$536 million, or 1.8 percent, above fiscal 2003 funding. The gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) has managed to fill some of the most glaring funding gaps contained in President Bush's 2004 budget, specifically funding for first responder programs contained in this bill. However, the tightness in the budget resolution restricts this bill from doing more to protect our borders, secure our ports and other critical infrastructure. This does not serve our Nation well.

In conclusion, while I support the bill overall, I have many concerns with the current abilities, or rather inabilities of the Department of Homeland Security to adequately address obvious homeland security gaps.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) seek unanimous consent to control the time of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS)?

Mr. WAMP. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time.

I rise in strong support of the bill. Mr. Chairman, as you know, when we made the recommendation to reorganize the Committee on Appropriations, it was a major reorganization, the biggest reorganization in many, many years, and it was the right thing to do. When I selected the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) to chair this subcommittee, it was the right choice. He has done a tremendous job in understanding the issues and in bringing together all of the various agencies that are involved in homeland security.

This is a good bill. There are some who will say that it is too much spending, and others who will say that it is not enough. You are going to hear that on all 13 appropriations bills. I tend to think we are just about in the right place on all of the bills.

Today we are focused on homeland security. On Friday we will consider the Military Construction appropriations bill. We have already marked up in addition to Homeland Security and Military Construction, after about a 4-week delay in getting approval on the budgetary levels, the Interior, Agriculture, Labor-HHS, Legislative and Defense appropriations bills in subcommittee.

Tomorrow we will mark up the Labor-HHS bill, the Interior bill, and the Agriculture appropriations bill in the full committee.

On Thursday we will mark up the Defense appropriations bill and the Legislative Branch appropriations bill in full committee. So for the Members' interested in having some idea of our schedule, we plan to have those bills through the House before the August recess.

The committee, once we were freed up from the hold that we had due to budgetary issues, has moved quickly and in a very responsible way, and I am happy to report, Mr. Chairman, that in addition to this good bill we are considering today, the Military Construction bill, which is also a good bill, will be considered on Friday and the Committee on Appropriations is well underway with the eleven other bills and has a very aggressive schedule.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to know how to handle the money in this bill because in my view the reorganization which took place leaves us with still a very discombobulated set of agencies, and it also I think has confused people about what our priorities are.

I am proud of the fact that on four separate occasions this Committee on Appropriations on a bipartisan basis tried to add additional funding for key homeland security items even though on each of those four occasions the White House opposed our efforts. But I want to tell you that today I think the chairman has produced a perfectly reasonable bill provided that we think that the status quo is all right given everything that has happened.

My problem is that I and my staff and the chairman of the full committee and his staff, have had extensive conversations with virtually every one of the national securities agencies in this country. And we got from them a year ago, a year and a half ago, and we have gotten from them as recently as a few weeks ago, their honest best estimates about where we need additional support in order to increase security of people on the home front.

The problem we have today is that we cannot put the resources in this bill that we ought to be putting in because the Congress, the majority party in the Congress, has decided that instead their number one and virtually only priority is tax cuts. And those are skewed mightily to the most well-off people in this country.

And the problem is that when you decide that you are going to put a trillion dollars into tax cuts, then that means that money is not available, not even a portion of it, to use to deal with our high priority needs at home, be they education or health care or, in this case, homeland security. And so what happens is that because of the way the budget process is handled, the public never gets to understand what the linkage is between the tax cut decisions that were made by this Congress and the linkage with these funding limitations for high priority security items.

So very simply, I will be trying to offer an amendment that does a number of things. We will add about \$400 million to the Coast Guard for port security grants. The Coast Guard estimates that their long-term needs are for \$4.4 billion. We think we ought to do more than just add \$100 million to it under those circumstances.

We would increase our share of funding, the share of the Federal contribution for port facility security needs. The problem is, if we stay with the \$100 million contained in this bill, it will take about 20 years to close the need in the estimate of the Coast Guard.

We also provide \$100 million to implement the Maritime Transportation Security Act to improve and analyze vessel threat information.

We also add \$100 million to the Customs inspectors so we can have 1,300 additional people inspecting containers shipped into the United States. Right now only 2 percent of those containers are checked. We think that is a needlessly reckless vulnerability. We are trying to increase by 6 percent the total number of inspector personnel. I think that is hardly out of line.

Then we add \$200 million to try to improve northern border security. As I pointed out in the Committee on Rules, during Operation Liberty Shield, 10 aircraft came across the border without clearance even while we were patrolling that northern border by air. We have no idea who or what would have been in those planes.

We proposed to pay for this funding by reducing the size of the tax cut that will go to those with incomes of more than a million dollars next year. We proposed to reduce the size of their tax cut by 6 percent so that instead of getting \$88,000 on average, they will get \$83,000 per average. That is hardly putting them in the poor house. But it would enable us to reestablish additional support for these crucial investments.

I would urge the House to allow us to consider that amendment because the public has a right to know which of us are for it and which of us are against it. They have a right to know whether we put tax cuts for wealthy people ahead of the security of this Nation.

□ 1400

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 2004 Homeland Security appropriations bill. This bill is a first of its kind but, more important, in the history that is being created with this first-ever homeland bill is the fact that this bill, simply put, makes America and my home State of New Jersey a safer place.

We in New Jersey and New York and the New York metropolitan area know better than most how vulnerable an open and free society can be. We put a very human face on the homeland security issue, as 700 New Jersey citizens went into Lower Manhattan that terrible morning on September 11, 2001, and never came home again, and many more people in New York City as well and residents from over 80 countries. This is all very personal.

These appropriations if spent and managed wisely may well prevent another catastrophic attack on American soil. While we can never really totally eliminate our vulnerabilities, this bill takes important steps to better protect our people and the infrastructure that carries them into and around New York City and over and under the Hudson River each and every day and protects people in other communities and cities around the Nation as well.

Notably, this historic bill recognizes that, while the Department of Homeland Security has the lead in developing our national homeland security strategy, implementation of the strategy requires the active collaboration

and contributions of all States and municipal governments, and the private sector as well. It also recognizes that many of the agencies merged into the Department of Homeland Security in March have traditional missions.

For these and other reasons, Mr. Chairman, I support the passage of this appropriations bill.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to participate in this first-ever debate on the Homeland Security appropriations bill. I want to commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman; and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking member, for their leadership of our subcommittee and the fine staff, majority and minority, for their good work.

Our task was to develop a budget where none had previously existed for a Department that is struggling to master its mission. Hearings could not even be arranged for many of the largest and most important of the Department's 11 major agencies. As a result, we did not have the benefit of questioning important agencies such as Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection, and Office of Domestic Programs. Those four agencies alone constitute 31 percent of the Department's total budget.

The bill before us today provides over \$35 billion for the new Department, which is \$1 billion over the administration's request. In addition to providing for big-ticket items such as \$5.6 billion for Project Bioshield, it provides \$4.4 billion in grants to our first responders, which is 25 percent more than the President requested, and \$900 million for the science and technology directorate to promote the research and development of security-related technologies.

I am also pleased with the attention paid to the equally important non-homeland security traditional missions of the many agencies now incorporated in this new Department. For example, the bill before us today rejects the administration's proposal to discontinue the section 404 postdisaster hazard mitigation program and combines it with \$200 million for predisaster mitigation activities to both learn from the past and prepare for the future.

I am also encouraged that the bill recognizes the potential of our Nation's institutions of higher learning: \$80 million is included for the rapid development of promising homeland security technologies by universities, national laboratories, nonprofit institutions and private companies, as well as \$35 million for university and fellowship programs, including \$25 million for the

creation of university-based centers of excellence.

There are, however, Mr. Chairman, ample grounds for concern: for example, the security of our Nation's ports. Despite no request from the administration, the subcommittee has appropriated \$100 million for port security grants to shore up our significant vulnerabilities there. Unfortunately, our Republican friends rejected a Democratic amendment that would have added \$500 million toward the \$4.4 billion the Coast Guard estimates is needed for port facility security improvements. We would have paid for that by a small reduction in the tax cut going to people making over \$1 million a year.

Still, the subcommittee has been assured and must continue to demand the completion of port vulnerability assessments at the Nation's 55 largest ports by the end of 2004.

I remain concerned, Mr. Chairman, with overall fiscal year 2004 appropriations for law enforcement and emergency services. Given the importance of our Nation's first responders to the security of our communities, I want to ensure that the overall funding levels for the Office of Justice Programs, Community Oriented Policing Services, (COPS), the Byrne grant programs, and related accounts remain at or above fiscal 2003 levels.

I support this Homeland Security appropriations bill with the expectation that other appropriations bills, unlike the President's budget request, will provide adequately for first responders. We cannot allow those on the front lines to fall victim to an appropriations shell game, giving with one hand, taking away with the other, to the detriment of our local communities.

Mr. Chairman, it has been over a year and a half since September 11. Much has been accomplished; yet many, many challenges remain. I rise today in support of this appropriations bill, while recognizing the progress we have yet to make in providing for the security of our homeland.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), a very valuable member of our subcommittee, who has contributed much to this bill.

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I want to make two points: one, if my colleagues like what they see with our Armed Forces and what they have seen in the last several months around the world in terms of our men and women in uniform, I want them to know that what we are trying to do with homeland security is essentially the same kind of bipartisan cooperation here in the Congress so that we adequately resource and establish the priorities for homeland security that mirror what we have done in the Congress to support national security throughout the years,

so that the technology that is deployed and the efficiencies that are created, the accountability that is instilled in the Department of Homeland Security is the same as the Department of Defense, and it is difficult. We can always spend more money, but I want my colleagues to know that this bill adequately and effectively resources the needs that we have today.

I also want to point out that a lot is going to be said about tax cuts as we debate all of the appropriations bills, it already has been, but this is not a tax bill. We cannot cut taxes or raise taxes in an appropriation bill. We are charged with spending the money within the budget agreement, and that debate was in April. It obviously lingers here, but that debate was in April. Now we have the responsibility within the budget agreement to spend the money and set the priorities; and in doing so at homeland security, we have had extraordinary cooperation.

I salute the professional staff, I think one of the best staffs that has ever been assembled here; and it was important that we put the best people on the field that we could possibly find, on both sides of the aisle. Our committee work and our chairman and our ranking member, the leadership has been extraordinary; but this is such an important issue. It needs to be the best possible.

So we are off to a good start. Let us stay focused.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, let me first simply say on a comment that we just heard on the House floor that it is related to taxes, because it is a simple mathematical equation. If we have less money to spend because we give it away to the rich, then we have less money for education, for housing, for senior citizens, and for homeland security; and this is a fact of life.

However, having said that, I want to take this opportunity, first, to thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) for this historic moment in putting together this bill. This bill, in my opinion, has some deficiencies; but on the other hand, it is a historic bill. It is the first time we have attempted to put together a bill like this and to take care of a need. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant support of H.R. 2555.

On September 11, everything changed in this country. The savage attacks on New York and Washington brought home to America that the threat of terrorism at home was terribly real. Among the responses by Congress were the creation of the Department of Homeland Security and the reorganization of the Committee on Appropriations to oversee and fund the new Department. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has ably taken up the challenge of chairing the new

House Subcommittee on Homeland Security. However, the leadership of this House has failed to give him or our ranking member the resources they need to do the job. The bill would not even provide enough funding to keep up with inflation, never mind step up the pace of improvements to our security.

As has been amply covered in other statements and is thoroughly demonstrated by the Obey amendment, which the Republican leadership through the Committee on Rules refused to make in order, there are gaping holes in our security, and at the rate we are going it will be many years before they can be filled. From ports to airport perimeters to our borders, we continue to face risk to our security that must be addressed, but cannot be, under this bill.

On a somewhat more parochial level, I am disappointed that we were unable to do more for grants to high-density urban and high-threat areas. Secretary Ridge just yesterday stated that he believed \$750 million would be "a nice place to start," not the \$500 million now in the bill.

If I sound somewhat negative in my support of this bill, one needs to understand that I was there in New York on September 11. I saw the tragedy that took place. I saw the crime committed on our country, and the scene of the crime was New York; and so New York has had a tendency to know what it is that we need to deal with this issue because we saw it firsthand. That does not take away our respect for our chairman, our ranking member, the work of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, once again, I reiterate my support for the bill in the hope that as it continues to go through the Senate, it becomes the bill it should be.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a very distinguished and very helpful member of our subcommittee who contributed greatly to this bill.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to commend the gentleman for the great job that he has done on this bill. It is the first Homeland Security appropriation bill in history. We are charting new waters here, and I also want to strongly compliment the great staff that we have on the subcommittee. They have done just an outstanding job to bring this very difficult bill together with all the ramifications that we have.

All Members here should be keenly aware of how difficult this task is and how broad the jurisdiction is, trying to combine 22 different Federal agencies into one Department, have them communicate with each other, have them function together, have them understand their role is to cooperate with States and local governments to ensure our homeland security.

This is a bill unlike any other that we have; and as the Chairman has said so many times, we are successful when nothing happens. As we are spending all this money, if the final outcome is that everything remains quiet, we have been successful, and it is very difficult to judge exactly how many dollars need to go exactly where to complete our role, but I think the chairman and the subcommittee have done an outstanding job.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and commend Chairman ROGERS for his attention to the many difficult issues we have discussed in our hearings on homeland security.

He has been given the tough job of putting together a spending bill for this new Department and this bill is a testament to his good work and the good work of the Subcommittee staff—they have done an excellent job under difficult circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, the approach the Subcommittee has taken with this bill has been one of strong support for the mission of this new Department and a scrutiny of the many requests and ideas put forth by Members and others.

I believe this has been the best approach because we are moving through uncharted territory. One of my concerns has been that—going forward with this new bill—we would put forth too much money in a way that would paint us into a corner before all of the most pressing homeland security needs became clear.

I believed early on—and still believe—the members of this Committee deserve to know the most efficient methods in which to deploy our Homeland Security resources.

We cannot appropriately fund programs that do not have understandable goals or clear justifications. Every State and Member of Congress should be aware of the pitfalls of adding monies to specific accounts because they feel they have the best answer to our Homeland Security problems.

Let me remind you. We are witnessing the infancy of a Department. There are few of us in this body who have been faced with the enormous and important task of funding a new Department of this size.

I am certain nearly every one of you has been asked to request funding for a specific appropriation for a specific homeland security project. I'm betting that most of you have been overwhelmed by the number of "potential targets" in your district.

Those of us on the Subcommittee share your concern. But, this bill is not about Congress making local security decisions—it is about making sure our local responders have a functional Federal agency to work with to solve those problems.

That said—as we move deeper into the process of providing for our Homeland Security, we are going to get a clearer picture of what our needs are. We will be in a better position to prioritize those needs.

Congress is not in a position to mess around with local funding matters. Until the Congress, the administration and our local providers have confidence in the long-term needs, I think the approach we are taking today—in this first year of funding for this new Department—is the correct one.

Again, I want to commend the Chairman for his work on this bill and I urge all of the Members of this body to support this bill.

□ 1415

Mr. SABO. How much time is remaining on both sides, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) has 14½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has 9 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), who has been a member of the subcommittee who has been extremely helpful to us in this bill.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to especially thank the chairman of the subcommittee for all his great work.

This is not just about the merging of 22 Federal agencies into one. This is not just about responding to the needs of first responders. This is not just about establishing a system that not only helps first responders but creates a system of first preventers. This has really been a monumental task undertaken to give direction to an entity, a notion, a thought about protecting the American people here at the homeland, something prior to September 11, 2001 we did not give a lot of time to and that goes well beyond anything this government has ever done. This is about first responders, this is about border security, this is about aviation and port security, it is about a Bio-Shield program, and it is about the four corners of defense.

I want to take my 1 minute to especially tell the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), how thankful I am as a New Yorker, as an American citizen, as someone who lost friends and neighbors in the attack of September 11, for the commitment that he is honoring that we all made on September 11, 2001, for the great work that he has put into this, and for the fact that I feel greatly confident that as we go forward and need to make adjustments as this process evolves, that we have the right person in place at the subcommittee level.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of H.R. 2555, the first annual appropriations measure for the Department of Homeland Security. This bill will help us equip our Nation to prepare for and respond to future disasters. But it is not enough. When it comes to protecting our citizens, we must move faster and we must be stronger.

One critical shortcoming facing us is the failure of the DHS Intelligence Director to fulfill its role as the agency's new nerve center. The effective operation of this unit is indispensable to

the success of the rest of the Department. Instead, resources are being allocated and priorities are being set without a reliable threat assessment that can be mapped against existing vulnerabilities.

We also continue to fall short of meeting our responsibility to first responders. Firefighters, police, health care workers and others on the front lines need our support to keep America safe. With dozens of States experiencing grave budget crises, first responders are more desperate than ever for Federal assistance.

In countless other areas, from port security to air cargo screening to computer interoperability, we are not moving fast enough and we have not become strong enough. We simply must make homeland security our top priority and devote the necessary resources to it.

Even at a time of mounting deficits, though, the administration and Republican leaders in Congress have found trillions of dollars for tax cuts for the wealthiest of Americans. I only wish the same determination were at evidence in this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), the hard working member of our subcommittee.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), for the tremendous job that he and his staff have done in putting together the inaugural Homeland Security appropriations bill and also for the honor of allowing me to serve on that subcommittee as well.

This bill does make a large investment in our Nation's first responders. We have added \$888 million above the President's request for the Office of Domestic Preparedness, Firefighters and Emergency Management. This also includes another \$750 million in firefighter grants, which has greatly been appreciated in Missouri and, in my judgment, is one of the most successful programs that FEMA and DHS have undertaken.

The bill also makes another important investment in intercity bus security by adding \$10 million for this critical initiative. We also include over \$5 billion for various transportation security initiatives to ensure that not only our airports continue to run smoothly but also our ports and our highways.

We make a large investment in the future by investing \$900 million for science and technology. The funds will target research, development and deployment of innovative technologies that will help us protect the Nation well into the future.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman again and also Michelle, Stephanie, Jeannie, Jeff, Brian, Tammy, and Tom for the great work they have done.

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

Mr. Chairman, one of the disappointments I had in this rule was it did not waive a point of order on what I thought was a very reasonable limitation on the development of CAPPS2. The gentleman from Kentucky graciously accepted that amendment in committee. I would hope that the folks who are objecting would not raise a point of order when we get to that in the regular bill.

The provision is a moderate attempt to make sure that this very, very large system of compiling information on the American public receives the closest of scrutiny and the closest of examination by GAO and others before it is implemented.

Our amendment left in place the money for the program, left in place the capacity of the Department to proceed with work on how they want to put the program together, but requires it be scrutinized by GAO and the Academy of Science to look at the privacy issues and also to look at its effectiveness. It has the potential to be the largest intrusion of the American government into the private lives of American people that has ever occurred. It also, on the other hand, has the ability to be a system that totally complicates our screening process if it is not done well. Rather than simplify, it may make our whole screening process more cumbersome and more costly and less effective.

If a point of order is raised, the only alternative we will have is to seek a pure limitation without the language. I would hope the House would adopt such a limitation, if that is the situation we find ourselves in, but I much prefer we preserve the language which is for new activity of the Department, one not specifically authorized with guidelines by Congress. It is a new activity that the Department is pursuing and we simply want to put some regulations in place as they move forward to make sure this whole new large complicated program is put in place in a fashion that would work.

I might remind people this is an agency that has had trouble figuring out whether their own workforce has had criminal involvement in the past. They are struggling to make sure that their personnel do not have criminal backgrounds. They have not succeeded doing that yet. So we should be a little cautious before we give them a blank check to move forward with a huge new complicated screening process of the American public.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), another hard-working member of our subcommittee.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, one of our greatest strengths as a Nation has always been our ability to move people and products more safely and efficiently than anywhere else in the world. Unfortunately, as we saw on 9/

11, this strength makes our transportation infrastructure a tempting target for terrorists.

Those hijackers that turned four planes into missiles were not just trying to kill thousands, they were also trying to restrict our freedom of movement, our way of life. As people travel more and more, and further and further for business and pleasure, the potential for a large-scale loss of life and an attack involving an airplane, boat, train or truck grows.

While protecting innocent lives is our top priority in homeland security, we all know that serious economic consequences can result after a terrorist attack when it disrupts the flow of goods and people in America's transportation network. These disruptions do not just cost money for big corporations with stranded products, they raise grocery prices for families, cut the earnings of farmers, and cause small businesses to close their doors.

In recognizing the importance and vulnerability of America's transportation infrastructure, Congress has moved quickly to strengthen transportation security. Since 9/11, we have provided more than \$10 billion to safeguard and will add \$5 million more in this legislation.

Mr. SABO. How much time do I have left, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) has 10 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York, my good friend, for a colloquy, who will then yield back to me.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I intend to do just that, and I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a colloquy as well with the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security. The chairman, who I have had the pleasure of working with, has done a great job, as I said before on this bill, and I thank the gentleman for the inclusion of high threat funds in this particular bill and actually for having created the fund in the first instance. But I wish to highlight some concerns I have with the current distribution formula.

The City of New York spends \$13.5 million a week, \$700 million a year on extra police protection during its current state of alert. That amounts to more than \$1 billion since September 11. And I am not talking about money that the city would spend anyway for police protection. I am talking about the net additional amount New York

spends to protect against terrorist attacks.

New York's needs were highlighted as recently as last week when news of an al-Qaeda operative was arrested for plotting to sever the cables on the Brooklyn Bridge. The operative said one of the main foils to his plan was the added security around the bridge which prevented him from acting.

One of the reasons terrorist prevention needs are not met by some cities is because of the formula the Department uses to distribute funds. I know this is an authorizing issue more than an appropriations issue, but no first responder discussion is complete without recognizing the current formulas, which do not provide enough emphasis on the threat information.

The President and the administration at times have said they support a threat-based distribution of first responder funds in this national strategy for homeland security, and it is my hope this Congress moves quickly to enact a new threat-based formula to apply to first responders.

I recently introduced a bill to reform the first responder formula to reflect today's realities, and that bill would lessen the impact of allocating funds based on geography in favor of a quantitative assessment of threat information, vulnerability and consequences. We are dealing with serious people and we need a serious formula.

I know the war in Iraq is over, to whatever degree, and the national threat level has decreased since then, but last week's news stories prove we must remain vigilant in our fight against terrorism, particularly in New York, and I cannot stress strongly enough the need for focusing first responder funds on high-threat areas. It is no secret where the terrorists are focusing their resources, and I would ask the gentleman from Kentucky how he can address the concerns I outlined if the gentlewoman from New York will yield time to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) for agreeing to enter into this colloquy, and I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from New York.

We in New York have been bracing for another terrorist blow since September 11, and all of America has experienced that anxiety. I know the chairman is totally committed to doing everything possible to protect our communities against any potential attack.

□ 1430

It is my understanding from both Federal and local intelligence briefings that New York is still acknowledged to be the top target for terrorism. I believe that New York City and other cities across our country, including Yonkers, New York, in my district, need dedicated resources to protect sites of national significance and critical infrastructure.

I agree with Secretary Ridge that we must distribute Federal funds on the basis of threat of terrorist attack and need, as well as population. That is not to say that States without high-density urban areas do not have important security needs. Our resources are limited, our responsibilities enormous, so we must be strategic; and I hope that the number of us who represent high-threat, high-density urban areas can work with the gentleman to examine this issue.

I appreciate the leadership of our chairman, and I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) for his hard work.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and gentlewoman for this colloquy and applaud the fight they have led for New York, which is one of the reasons we enacted a total of \$800 million for high-threat, high-density urban areas in fiscal year 2003.

Of that \$800 million, New York received \$186 million to assist first responders with the increased security costs associated with the war in Iraq and Operation Liberty Shield. I am aware of the concerns the formula has generated. I assure my colleagues I appreciate the degree to which New York is a target and the expenses New York faces. I am also aware of those rural areas that rely on the basic formula grants to fulfill their first responder requirements. I believe any reform to the formula must ensure that these rural areas are not abandoned. I will work closely with the gentlewoman and the gentleman as the bill progresses to conference on these and other matters.

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

In relationship to our latest colloquy, I understand the concern of people over the situation in New York. They clearly have unusual problems. Would the chairman agree with me that we do not know precisely how the agency sets criteria for the balance of funds in this particular discretionary program?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Only in a general sense. The presence of high-risk infrastructure, the urban intensity of the region, we leave it to the discretion of the Secretary, as I think we should, rather than some formula. As the gentleman knows, we have been working together.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, we have a little trouble getting a precise understanding of what criteria are used.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman is correct, but I think in due course of time, perhaps

before the bill finally reaches the President, we will have found out more.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we consider today, of course, for the first time the appropriations for the new Department of Homeland Security. Just as the new Department is taking its first steps to make America safer, we are also embarking on an effort to try to secure the resources that we need for the longer term to ensure victory in the war against terrorism. This bill is a good start, and I support dedicating resources above the President's request to prepare our communities by training and equipping first responders and securing our ports and our transportation systems.

However, as we have been finding in the hearings before the Select Committee on Homeland Security, serious deficiencies remain in the Department's ability to carry out its mission of protecting all Americans from those harms that could come our way through terrorism. Testimony before our Select Committee on Homeland Security revealed that there is one, precisely one, person in the Department of Homeland Security assessing the bioterror threat to America and determining how to match that threat against our vulnerabilities and then make plans to protect America from bioterrorism.

It is clear we must move faster and we must be stronger to protect America. We have learned that, while over 4,000 port facilities and 10,000 ships that enter our ports are required to undergo security reviews, there is no funding to fulfill that mission. We must move faster and be stronger. We have learned that there are serious gaps in coverage on our northern border. There is on average only one person guarding every 16 miles of our Canadian border. The PATRIOT Act called for tripling the forces to protect our northern border, and the 2002 Border Security Act goes even further, but gaps still remain. We must move faster, and our forces must be stronger.

Mr. Chairman, just a few months ago this Congress voted to spend \$65 billion to prosecute the war in Iraq. We spent those funds to make sure that our forces had the best training and the best equipment possible. We need to make the same commitment to those who fight on behalf of homeland security today.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), the chairman of the Select Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) have done an extraordinary job in bringing to the floor a bill that has

as its object the most important function of the Federal Government, protecting these United States from attack. Nothing that we do is more important.

The \$29 billion in this legislation for the coming year is nearly 4 percent more than the President requested. It is \$250 for every single taxpayer in America. It is an extraordinary amount of money to meet the new challenges of the post-September 11 world.

The \$4.4 billion in this bill for first responders is nearly \$1 billion more than the President requested. We have in fact in this Congress increased funding for first responders by more than 1,000 percent since September 11.

The Select Committee on Homeland Security, of which the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) are valued members, have had hearings and field investigations of the problems of getting these monies to our first responders on the front lines. The pipeline is the problem. That money is not getting to where it belongs.

That is why, in addition to the work that we can do in this bill as we go forward in conference, the Select Committee on Homeland Security will also be bringing to this floor legislation to unplug the pipeline and better distribute these monies on a threat basis, the way we have always done it for national security. We will streamline the grant process and base it on the principle of threat analysis.

I commend the chairman for the resources and direction provided in this legislation to ensure an intelligence analytical capacity within the Department of Homeland Security to meet not only the biothreat, but all of the threats to our homeland security that we face. This is an enormous amount of money. We now face the task of making sure that it is wisely spent. In the exercise of our oversight function, we will do just that. Our Nation's freedoms and our way of life depend upon it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to talk about the Obey amendment which will be offered shortly. The Obey amendment puts before the Congress of the United States, before our Republican colleagues and before our Democrat colleagues, the question of what options do we want to pursue. The gentleman from California (Mr. COX) has said that the most important objective is keeping our homeland secure, keeping America and Americans safe.

The Obey amendment says do you care more about giving tax cuts to those at the very upper ranks of taxpayers, or do you care about keeping

ports, airports, bridges and roads secure? It is a very simple question. It is a question, though, all of us must answer; and we must answer them with the responsibility to the American public that we have uppermost in our minds.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues, I urge this House to allow the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to offer this amendment and to support this amendment and to say to America, we are prepared to protect you.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and congratulate the gentlewoman on Rice's victory in the NCAA baseball tournament last night.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his vision and knowledge of that great sport of baseball, and let me congratulate the Rice Owls. We are excited and delighted that we have such national respect.

I rise to be able to add my support for the Obey amendment. Having just come back from field hearings in Long Beach and Los Angeles with the Committee on Homeland Security, I assure Members it is crucial to get funds in the hands of our local responders; and I use that terminology because I believe it means not only the first responders of firefighters and law enforcement, but nurses, doctors and hospitals, school districts and local government, city and county. That is why I have asked for amendments that I have offered to be made in order that in fact we expedite and simplify the regulatory maze that is required of these entities to get funding right on the ground.

It was amazing from a helicopter overview to be able to see how close residential communities are to sites of potential terrorist acts. We must act now to ensure that our first responders are the first ones that are taken care of to protect our neighborhoods. We need to move forward.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the Homeland Security Appropriations Act.

This germane amendment would direct the Secretary of Homeland Security, in conjunction with the appropriate federal agencies, such as the Federal Transit Administration, to determine the percentage of frontline transit employees who have received training in emergency preparedness and response training.

This amendment would have also directed the Secretary of Homeland Security to Report to Congress no later than 90 days after enactment of this legislation the percentage of "frontline transit employees" who have received emergency preparedness and response training.

In addition, the Secretary of Homeland Security would coordinate with the appropriate federal agencies such as the Federal Transit Administration and provide recommendations on what training on emergency preparedness and response training shall be provided to "frontline transit employees."

Mr. Chairman this amendment would have provided this new agency with guidance for years to come.

Understandably, we are all grappling with setting priorities and funding levels for new security programs and emerging threats.

By establishing a baseline of what security training our transit workforce needs, it will assist us in establishing priorities and funding levels in future years.

But make no mistake about the importance of establishing a comprehensive transit security-training program for our nation's frontline transit employee workforce.

We need to start now in order to properly plan for the future.

For years, governments around the world have recognized that public transportation is a major terrorist target.

Until 9/11 the United States has been largely spared the kinds of terrorist campaigns waged against public surface transportation.

However, we cannot wait for a tragedy to happen to prompt us to address our vulnerabilities. We must act now!

An October 2001 study released by the Mineta Institute, Protecting Public Surface Transportation Against Terrorism and Serious Crime: An Executive Overview cites that between 1920 and 2000 there have been approximately 900 terrorist attacks and other significant criminal incidents involving public surface transportation systems.

However, all but 14 of these attacks occurred after 1970, the year that marks the beginning of modern terrorism.

Attacks against transportation and transportation infrastructures accounted for 42 percent of all international terrorist attacks, according to the most recent statistics provided by the USDOT Office of Intelligence and Security in 1998.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I offer my statement for the RECORD.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, hometown security should be our number one priority to ensure the American public is safe from terrorism—both domestic and foreign.

The federal government has made significant commitments, but unfortunately these have been more show than substance. The most recent example is the budget for the homeland security appropriations. I know from my own experience that there are vast unmet needs in every community around the country, and Oregon is on exception. The federal government should be helping communities to pay for the costly precautions that local governments must take to respond to high level security alerts, the effects of which ripple through crippled local budgets. We have yet to make local governments whole from the federal government imposed shut down of airports following September 11th. There are vast and clear needs for the Coast Guard which this budget virtually ignores.

We are lavishing hundreds of billions in tax relief for those who need it the least when we are investing billions of dollars in questionable military expenditures, like theater missile defense or Star Wars. It is inexcusable that we do not do a better job of listening to and meeting the needs of our local communities around the country. I, in good conscience, find it very hard to vote for this appropriation and hope that we will send the message that Congress should step up and make its action match its rhetoric and the need.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2555, the Fiscal Year 2004 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act.

This important legislation provides \$30.4 billion in funding for the upcoming year, \$1 billion over the Administration's request, including \$4.4 billion for grants to the police, firefighter and emergency medical personnel that are on the front lines of our nation's homeland preparedness and emergency response. In addition, I am pleased to see in this legislation a timeline to expedite the allocation of these resources within 120 days of passage of this Act.

We have heard today, Mr. Chairman, and will continue to hear that there are simply not enough funds included in this bill to achieve our goal of making our homeland secure. The fact, however, is that to date the federal government has spent \$20.8 billion for our nation's first responders, and we will continue to fund what is necessary to ensure they have the training, equipment and resources necessary to do their job.

We in this House know full well that money spend does not simply translate into increased preparedness. This is only a start, and we must continue to be vigilant in not only appropriating adequate funds, but ensuring that these funds are administered strategically as part of a comprehensive plan to address our nation's vulnerabilities and needs. We must remember that while the Department of Homeland Security develops our national homeland security strategy, the implementation and the ultimate success of that strategy rests with our state and local governments.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, the protection of the American citizens is the first and foremost duty of the federal government, and this Congress will continue to work with the Administration, and our states and localities to this end. This bill is a solid next step for our nation's emergency preparedness and response capabilities and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey amendment to add an additional \$1 billion to H.R. 2555 to help fill critical homeland security deficiencies and urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us would provide \$30.4 billion for operations and activities of the Department of Homeland Security in Fiscal Year 2004 and permit the Department to use an additional \$4.8 billion in Immigration and air passenger fees.

Whether these amounts are sufficient for the Department to successfully carry out its mission is difficult to know because the Department has provided the subcommittee and my own Select Committee on Homeland Security with very little information about their mission and overall plan of operations. In fact, budget justifications for many important activities within the Department were not submitted for months after the President's budget was released and hearings could not even be arranged for four of the largest and most important of the Department's eleven major agencies.

This is very troubling, Mr. Speaker, particularly in light of the enormity of the Department's mission to protect the country from terrorist attacks.

Equally troubling is the denial by the rules committee of an amendment which was of-

fered by our colleague the Ranking Democrat of the Appropriations committee, DAVE OBEY, to provide an additional \$1 billion to help fill critical homeland security deficiencies. The Obey amendment would have added an additional \$400 million to the bill for additional port security grants. The Coast Guard has reported that it needs approximately \$4 billion more than the \$463 million that has been appropriated since September 11th for port security improvements.

In my district, the highest priority for securing our territory against attacks has been and continues to be the establishment of a "Border Patrol" unit for the Virgin Islands.

Working in coordination with our U.S. Attorney's Office, the U.S. Customs' Service, the F.B.I., the Transportation Security Administration, and the U.S. Coast Guard, the Government of the Virgin Islands is in the final stages of developing a strategic anti-terrorism and Homeland Security plan for the territory. A critical component of any such plan will require additional resources for our federal agencies, especially the Coast Guard which has to oversee what maybe the busiest cruise ship port in the Caribbean—the port of Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas. Additionally, the Coast Guard is also called upon to inspect the several ships that visit our waters daily, as well as, the pipes that lead from the ships to the tanks on land. Their search procedure for all ships follow international law and regulations differ for each different type of ship.

In addition to being the location of the busiest cruise ship ports in the Caribbean, the U.S. Virgin Islands is also home to HVENSA, the largest oil refinery in the Western Hemisphere, which regularly receives a number of very large tankers.

The Coast Guard has requested the establishment of a Border Patrol Unit for the Virgin Islands to better enable them to meet their several mandates for protection of our coast, which includes 175 miles of unprotected open borders and is the gateway to the United States as its southern most border.

Enactment of the Obey amendment would have significantly increased the likelihood that the Virgin Islands would receive a critically need border patrol unit.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic members of the Select Committee on Homeland Security have been seeking answers to a number of fundamental questions about the Department, since the committee's inception. We have been trying to find out whether the Department is fulfilling its responsibility to better coordinate and access threat information and ensure that in the event of a terrorist attack, federal, state, local and private entities are prepared to respond to the event. These questions and others remain unanswered and the bill we are debating today unfortunately does very little to help us receive them.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the Obey amendment.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2555, the Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2004. As a member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee, it has been an honor to take part in the formulation of the new Homeland Security Department. I would like to commend our Chairman, HAL ROGERS, and our Ranking Member, MARTIN SABO, who under tight fiscal restraints did the best job possible putting together this first appropriations bill for the new Department of Homeland Security.

The Department of Homeland Security has had both success and failures. It has been successful in unifying principal border and transportation security agencies, coordinating a network of disaster response capabilities, and creating a central point for the analysis and dissemination of intelligence pertaining to terrorist threats. Beyond that however, the Department has failed to develop a useful roadmap of security goals the Department seems critical to protecting the homeland, such as securing the northern border, tracking all vessels entering American waters or insuring that airline cargo is effectively screened.

As a result, many of the windows of opportunity for terrorist organizations such as al Qaeda are nearly as wide open today as they were on September 11th. Of equal concern, is the fact that the Department seems to be stalled in its ability to put in place a program to close those windows open to terrorist attacks.

Overall this bill provides \$29.4 billion in discretionary funding for fiscal 2004. That is only about 1.8 percent above the overall funding level allocated to agencies within the Department for fiscal year 2003. The Congressional Budget Office however, forecasts that prices will increase during the current fiscal year by 2.3 percent. As a result, the bill actually provides funding for the coming year that in terms of real dollars is about \$150 million below current levels.

Mr. Chairman, cities such as my hometown of Los Angeles are the ones who must bear the brunt of this inadequate funding. Los Angeles is one of the largest cities and metropolitan areas in the country, and is considered to be one of the most "at risk" areas for terrorist attacks. With one of the world's largest port complexes and a major international airport, Los Angeles has heightened vulnerability to potential terrorist attacks.

Without adequate federal support, protecting our cities and towns is extremely costly and causes tremendous hardship on local governments. For example, Los Angeles officials have reported to me that during the days of the three Orange threat levels, the city registered \$7.2 million in additional security costs. This figure includes additional costs for areas such as our city airports, our port, our public utility centers, our convention center and our police department. Although I am pleased that today's bill provides \$500 million for "high threat urban areas" like Los Angeles, clearly this does not provide the funds needed to address the security needs of Los Angeles and other highly vulnerable urban areas.

In addition to representing the downtown portions of the City of Los Angeles, I also represent nine smaller municipalities including Downey, Commerce, Bell Flower, Huntington Park, and Vernon. Like other small cities and rural communities across the nation, these smaller cities are often overlooked in the urgent rush to protect the homeland and to establish emergency preparedness plans. These smaller cities, have increased security needs since September 11, 2001, and have also had to incur additional costs in response to our nation's heightened security alerts. Protecting our small cities is just as important as protecting our large cities, and national landmarks. To highlight this fact, I successfully included language in the bill's report which establishes a process that ensures local governments will be included in the development and

review process of each state's emergency preparedness and security response plan.

Mr. Chairman, another area of concern is the fact that the funding for our nation's commercial seaports continues to be dangerously inadequate. Our ports are one of our nation's most vulnerable assets. Yet this administration, and the leadership of this Congress continue to underfund our ports. While critics focus on the cost of providing this security, I want to highlight the cost of not providing this security. The labor shutout at the port complex of Los Angeles and Long Beach last fall is estimated to have cost \$1 billion per day nationwide. This was only one port complex and yet the daily cost was staggering. If our ports experience a terrorist attack, international commerce would grind to a standstill. The Coast Guard has estimated that the infrastructure security needs at our ports will cost \$1 billion in the first year and some \$4 billion over a ten year period. Yes, this bill provides only \$100 million in port security grants.

Congress was swift about providing funding to secure our nation's airways following the events of September 11, 2001. We must not wait for a similar tragedy at one of our ports to finally provide the necessary security funds.

Mr. Chairman, I must also express my displeasure that the Homeland Security Subcommittee was unable to hold a budget hearing with the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services. This bureau was created under the Department of Homeland Security. Its responsibility is to build and maintain a service system that provides immigration information and benefits to the more than seven million annual applicants in a timely, accurate, consistent, courteous, and professional manner.

Having never met with Mr. Aguirre, the Acting Director, this committee has no way of knowing if this bureau is fulfilling its stated mission. Consequently, I am fearful that without adequate oversight and funding this new bureau will fall into the same bureaucratic trap that made the INS inadequate to meet the needs of this nation's immigrant community. I am hopeful that the subcommittee will have a hearing and receive a full budget justification from the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services before this bill comes to the floor for a vote next year. I am also hopeful that next year the President's budget will request enough funds to realistically address the thousands of cases in backlog at this bureau. Although the committee increased the President's budget request by \$14 million, the amount is still fifteen percent less than what was provided in Fiscal Year 2003 for immigration services.

Mr. Chairman, I am also concerned about the ongoing difficulties regarding airport security screeners at Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). These difficulties stem from the poor quality of the Transportation Security Administration's (TSA) security background checks. Despite assurances from TSA that their airport security workforce had been screened, authorized at LAX and other airports discovered that some members of their security screener workforce had criminal convictions. These airports petitioned TSA for the authority to conduct their own background check of the screeners at their own expense. TSA officials at first rejected the request before finally granting approval. The ongoing background checks by these airports are con-

tinuing to identify employees with disqualifying convictions. Hopefully, this issue will be resolved once and for all when the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) completes the last of its outstanding background checks on the TSA airport screeners.

Until such time, I am pleased that the bill includes language I offered that urges the TSA to work cooperatively with airport authorities that wish to conduct their own background checks of their TSA screener workforce.

I am also pleased that the bill includes report language that provides guidance to the Department of Homeland Security on two issues critical to the immigrant community. The report language expresses concern about the pattern of harassment, excessive use of force, and racial profiling by private vigilante groups that conduct paramilitary-like operations along our Southwestern border. In San Antonio for example, the sheriff recently arrested vigilantes who were charged with assault for their illegal arrest of two migrants from El Salvador. Vigilantes taking immigration law into their own hands is illegal, and their activity can lead to serious violations of fundamental rights. It can also interfere with the legal activities of protecting our homeland. For that reason, I am pleased that the report includes language I offered expressing concern that vigilante operations against migrants along the Southwestern border should not be tolerated, and may interfere with the work of the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. Chairman, I am also pleased that the report contains language I requested directing the Department of Homeland Security to improve the processing and resettlement of refugees. Since the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks, increased security checks on individual refugee cases, combined with greater limits on the travel of refugee and immigration officers, have resulted in a slowdown of interviews necessary for U.S. resettlement. Many of these precautions are understandable, but as the Department of Homeland Security begins to shape its policy and procedures, we need to find a safe and acceptable method to quickly process legitimate refugee claims.

The world is looking to the United States for continued leadership in providing a safe environment free of abuse and persecution for many of the world's refugees. I am pleased that the report requests a plan from the Department of Homeland Security, in conjunction with the State Department, to overcome the hurdles encountered during the processing of refugee claims.

Mr. Chairman, while I am disappointed in this bill's inability to fully fund many of our countries initial national security needs, I support the efforts of the Chair and the Ranking Member to best allocate these limited resources. We have much more work ahead of us. I urge the conferees to address this issue of limited funds. In closing, I want to reiterate that I have enjoyed working with Chairman ROGERS who I know did his best given the limited resources the subcommittee was provided.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the unfolding of the appropriations process for fiscal year 2004 and the Homeland Security appropriations bill in particular. The actual appropriations process commenced on April 10 when, five days before the statutory deadline, the U.S. Congress agreed to a budget resolution that established an overall limit or

allocation on appropriations for fiscal year 2004.

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

The budget resolution provided a total allocation for discretionary appropriations of \$785.6 billion in fiscal year 2004, including the amounts held in reserve for the Bioshield initiative. This represents a 2.6 percent increase over the current year, which is slightly higher than the rate of inflation. Additionally, the budget resolution allowed an additional \$23.2 billion to be appropriated in advance for fiscal year 2005.

The Congress agreed on this number after considerable deliberations involving the Leadership, the Budget and Appropriations Committees, and rank and file Members. We started with CBO's reestimate of the President budget request of \$786.6 billion. We added \$890 million for biological and chemical threats and another \$215 million for the Iraq supplemental. At the same time, it was reduced by \$2.2 billion to reflect advance appropriations that were not part of the President's original budget submission.

302(b) ALLOCATIONS

Last week the House Appropriations Committee finally decided how to divide that allocation across its 13 appropriations subcommittees. Under these allocations, total appropriations for defense and military construction will have climbed by 7.1 percent a year between fiscal years 2000 and 2004. Somewhat surprisingly, all other non-defense discretionary spending will have increased over the same period by a robust 8.2 percent.

The Appropriations Committee appropriately exercised its prerogative to allocate funding based on Congressional priorities. The Appropriations Committee comes in under the Administration request's by \$3.2 billion for defense and \$1.8 billion for Foreign Affairs. At the same time, it would exceed the President's request by \$448 million for Labor, HHS and Education, \$400 million for VA-HUD, \$279 million for Energy & Water, \$221 million for Agriculture, and \$241 million for Commerce, State & Justice.

HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

Today we consider the first of these appropriations bills, H.R. 2555, the Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2004. This is a landmark occasion: the first separate appropriation bill for the Department of Homeland Security, which consolidates 22 Federal agencies and is expected to reach 180,000 employees.

The spending levels in this important measure are consistent with the limits for fiscal year 2004. The bill provides \$29.4 billion in appropriations for fiscal year 2004, an increase of \$8.1 billion or 38 percent above last year's level. Much of this increase is for Border and Transportation, Emergency Preparedness, Informational Analysis and the Coast Guard. With total fiscal year 2004 appropriations equal to the allocation for the Homeland Security Subcommittee, the bill complies with the Congressional Budget Act.

The bill does provide an advance appropriation for Bioshield in fiscal year 2005, however, that is not permitted under the terms of the budget resolution.

H.R. 2555 does not contain any emergency-designated BA, which are exempt from budget limits. Nor does it rescind any previously appropriated BA.

This bill demonstrates Congress' unflinching commitment to win the war against terrorism.

Consistent with the Budget Resolution, the bill provides resources above the President's request in areas like Border and Transportation Security, Emergency Preparedness and Response, and Science and Technology. This bill will enhance the Nation's ability to secure our borders, protect lives and property, and disrupt terrorist financing.

The bill also provides appropriations for the acquisition of various countermeasures against nuclear, radiological and biological threats. The authorization for these countermeasures has been reported by the Energy and Commerce and Government Reform Committees and will be acted upon by the Homeland Security Committee later this week.

BIOSHIELD

I am pleased the Appropriations and authorizing committees were able to meet a critical need in the fiscally responsible manner outlined in the budget resolution. Rather than create another entitlement program, the program was kept fully within the oversight of the Appropriations Committees. In order to give the administration the assurance of adequate funding in the outyears, the bill provides advance appropriations for fiscal years 2005 through 2013.

My only concern with this approach is that some might be tempted to exploit the fact that much of the advance of appropriations are scored in fiscal year 2005 on the expectation they will spend out over time by reducing that amount in 2005 to achieve spurious savings. I take it in good faith that the Appropriations Committee will leave these funds untouched in fiscal year 2005 so they will be available as the need arises in subsequent years.

CLOSING

As we enter the appropriations season, I wish Chairman YOUNG and all our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee the best as we strive to meet the needs of the American public within the framework established by the budget resolution.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. 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. 2555

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 Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENTAL
MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for management and operations of the Department of Home-

land Security \$221,493,000; of which not to exceed \$78,975,000 shall be for the Office of the Secretary and Executive Management; of which not to exceed \$116,139,000 shall be for the Office of the Under Secretary for Management; of which not to exceed \$8,106,000 shall be for the Immediate Office of the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security; of which not to exceed \$10,044,000 shall be for the Immediate Office of the Under Secretary for Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection and the Command Center; of which not to exceed \$3,293,000 shall be for the Immediate Office of the Under Secretary for Emergency Preparedness and Response; and of which not to exceed \$4,936,000 shall be for the Immediate Office of the Under Secretary for Science and Technology: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,000,000 may be used for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Secretary of Homeland Security: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$40,000 shall be for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FILNER:

In the item relating to "DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES" after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

In the item relating to "BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)" after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) for bringing us this bill on such an urgent matter.

I come with a small amendment that has rather big ramifications on our southern border with Mexico. I represent all of the California-Mexico border. As the President of the United States and his Secretary of Homeland Security agreed with the President of Mexico, we need a smart border, a smart border meaning security, yes, tight security, but efficiency also.

□ 1445

We need a blending at our borders of security and efficiency. In my district, I have got about a quarter of a million, that is over 250,000, legal crossings every day through the six or seven border crossings in my district. That is a lot of traffic. That traffic is very legal. It is for important purposes, important for our economy, important for our families, jobs, housing, culture, education, all that is going on in this exchange across the U.S.-Mexico border. We have shown that we can have the security we want with efficiency. We started a new program several years ago called SENTRI, meaning Secure Electric Network for Travelers Rapid Inspections. What that means in English is that we give people who have legitimate business across the border to travel, and they do it frequently, we give them as extensive a background check as is necessary to guarantee they are secure. We also give

their vehicle a background check, and that vehicle and that person is matched when they cross the border by a smart card and a transponder. That is the SENTRI system. The Customs and INS now and under Department of Homeland Security set aside certain lanes of the border crossings for that purpose, for the SENTRI crossings.

Unfortunately, the demand for those smart cards way exceeds the ability right now of the Department of Homeland Security to meet. There is a backlog of 6, 7, 8 months. The Subcommittee on Homeland Security, and I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for this, in their report said what a great program SENTRI is. They complimented the fact that it exists. What we at the border need, though, is some assurance from this Department that money will go to this incredibly important use. We are not sure given some of the problems in the organization of this new Department that people are looking at the border and will think about it. We need some accountability that the money will go into that program.

We now have 42,000 motorists using SENTRI. As I said, there are three or four times that who are waiting to participate. The backlog is over 6 months. There is no assurance that that backlog will decrease unless there is some dedication of funds to this program.

I know that there is on the part of the committee a rightful concern with, "earmarks." I just ask that the chairman think about accountability not only in the Department but for the stakeholders at the border. We have people on both sides of the border, people who are doing legal business that are so important to our economies. Mexico is now our largest trading partner. A big part of that trade goes on trucks through California, the other part through Texas. We need to move that quickly with security guaranteed.

That is what my amendment will do. The folks who are doing this at the border need to know that the money is going to be there. They need to know that their business can be carried on. They need to know that they can expand their business because they know that crossing the border will be enhanced in a positive fashion. I say to the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Minnesota, I know that there is some reluctance to specify programs in their bill. I would just hope that such an amendment with such ramifications for our whole economy, and not just in Texas and New Mexico and Arizona and California where the border crossings are, but in Kentucky where there are people waiting for just on-time delivery. They need to know that SENTRI is working. I would ask for approval of \$5 million for the SENTRI program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment by the gentleman who has been working very

hard on the issue. Originally, this program permitted those certified as low-risk travelers to cross the Mexican border on an expedited basis for 1 year. However, in order to accommodate the unexpected increases in enrollment in that program following 9-11, Customs and Border Protection in February 2003 extended the enrollment period to 2 years. That had the effect of benefiting both participants in the program and the government by reducing paperwork and made the annual enrollment fee a biennial fee. But current enrollees had their eligibility automatically extended for 2 years from the date of their last enrollment and the applications backlog that was being blamed for increased waits at the border has been greatly reduced. So I do not think the problem is as bad as it perhaps was at the outset.

Number two, we took \$333 million in the 2003 wartime supplemental and gave that to the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection. We have not received their spend plans on how they intend to use those funds. The Department, however, could, I would remind the gentleman, could use a portion of the supplemental to support the SENTRI expansion. They do have some discretion.

Number three, and the gentleman alluded to this. We have already cut the funds for the Department's administration by 25 percent. The moneys he would take with this amendment would come out of administration. We have already cut them past the bone almost. Additional reductions could reduce the basic departmental administration programs and impair their ability to fulfill management of the entire agency.

For all those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly oppose the amendment and would urge Members to reject it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Filner amendment to the Homeland Security appropriations bill. This amendment would provide the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection with critical funding to reduce the backlog of applications for the SENTRI program. I acknowledge the words that were just spoken about the need to use administrative funding; but, Mr. Chairman, we use less than 1 percent of that budget for this program. I want to tell you how important it is. The gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and I are well acquainted with the merits of the SENTRI program. I thank him for his work on this amendment and for his continued support on border management issues. The gentleman from California is a cosponsor of the SAFE Border Act, legislation that I introduced to modernize SENTRI. I would also like to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member SABO for the inclusion of report language regarding SENTRI.

So what does SENTRI do? It prescreens applicants. The program accepts only low-risk travelers who pass

a background and a vehicle check, and it focuses enforcement efforts on those travelers who are not prescreened. Moving low-risk travelers into SENTRI lanes permits border agents to concentrate on other border crossers. It allows the entry of thousands of San Diego and Tijuana residents who cross the border every day and play a vital role in the area's economic and social life as commuters, shoppers, or visitors. Unfortunately, our border infrastructure has not kept pace with the booming traffic volume, and travelers frequently encounter delays and congestion at the border. SENTRI is an innovative program. It integrates security with efficiency. In this program we have a model of best practices that enhance national security and facilitate legitimate traffic. Why would we not direct resources to this program? Why would we not take every advantage, every opportunity to increase security?

To some extent SENTRI has become a victim of its own success. Enrollment increased, as we know, by more than 100 percent after September 11 and currently prospective applicants must wait several months. Next March, SENTRI will certainly need funding to handle the heavy processing demands caused by both renewals and new enrollees. Our agents at the border shoulder an enormous responsibility every single day. We owe them the appropriate resources and support they need to carry out their duties. We must also think about the technology and equipment needs of a program like SENTRI. This type of investment in our ports of entry results in greater border security and better trade flow.

Supporting this amendment, Mr. Chairman, would not only allow agents to reduce the SENTRI application backlog but means that the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection could do more background checks and improve national security. The ability to control our border is national security. It is trade and it is commerce for our region. It is an investment in the future of our ports of entry. It is communities seeking solutions to address our border management issues.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the Filner amendment.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FILNER. I just would like to point out in furtherance of both our arguments and before the gentleman from Texas speaks, that there may be a rather slow hiring at the Department and thus carryover funding may be more than anticipated. With this really small amount of money from that account, it should not influence in a negative fashion anything about the hiring for this Homeland Security Department. I would again reinforce what she was saying, that the money is there, it is just a question of saying that it is going to be available and thus everybody at the border knows what is going

on and we will have a more efficient border.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I thank the Member for pointing out the fact that this is a phased-in process, and it is true that we will be doing it in a gradual way. But it gives people a sense of hope, a sense of knowledge, a sense of commitment that they and their businesses will be cared for as they move forward and as they try and increase commerce along the border, the good commerce that we all look forward to.

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

Mr. Chairman, the vast majority of border crossings are made for legitimate purposes. As we seek to secure our borders, we cannot afford to strangle them. With 22 percent of our Nation's exports and imports crossing our land borders, we need to have adequate systems in place to ensure that legitimate trade and travel are not unduly impaired. SENTRI is one such system that has been used successfully in my district of El Paso, Texas, in putting together dedicated commuter lanes. These lanes reduce waiting times at the border for prescreened, low-risk, frequent border crossers.

The Filner amendment would provide needed funds to reduce the backlog of people applying to enroll in the SENTRI program. In my own district, we need some of these very same funds to replace equipment in our enrollment centers that often break down and other legitimate purposes to increase the legitimate flow of traffic back and forth between our borders. The sooner we can screen people out who pose no threat to our security, the more we will be able to concentrate our limited resources on those that may pose a threat to our national security.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I rise this morning to urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on the Filner amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Kentucky as well as the gentleman from Minnesota for the hard work that they have done on this bill under very difficult circumstances. Part of the problem is that there does not seem to be enough money to deal with the problems of domestic security at a time when this Nation appears to be under threat. At least that is what the administration would lead us to believe. Every other week we are going up to the orange alert code. Local governments around the Nation are responding to that. So if we are under threat, we need to be providing for the people at the local level who have to deal with that threat. This bill for all the care that has been put into fashioning it does not deal with that problem adequately. The problem seems to be that there is not enough money. I have heard people come to the floor here,

even today, and talk about the fact that this is the appropriations process, it is not the budget process. But nothing here happens in isolation. This is all of a piece. If you are going to cut taxes, if you are going to take money out of the Treasury, do not be surprised if a little while later you do not have enough money to pay for your domestic security programs. That is the situation that we are confronting in the context of this bill.

Let me be even a bit more specific. Last year, we appropriated \$2.9 billion of grants to State and local governments to help them prepare for and defend against terrorist attacks.

□ 1500

Eight hundred million dollars or about 30 percent of that was directed to high-threat areas. Some people would argue that 30 percent is not enough to be directed toward high-threat areas. They ought to have more than that. But we are getting even less in this particular bill. Seventy percent in last year's appropriation went to other places across the country. That number under this piece of legislation goes up to 83 percent, and the effective cut for areas under high threat goes from \$800 million to \$500 million, and that has to be spread all across the country in areas that constitute areas of high threat. Secretary Ridge himself has said that the \$800 million is not enough. Certainly the \$500 million is not enough.

We are not providing for the kind of national security that the administration talks about and Members of this Congress take this floor to talk about. It is one thing to express one's understanding of the need to deal with the problems of domestic threat. It is another to face up to those domestic threats and provide the resources so that the people out there on the firing line, the local government officials, the police, the firemen, emergency medical services personnel and others are able to contend with the problem when they express themselves and almost certainly they will.

So for all the care that the chairman and the ranking member have put into this bill, it remains deficient overall in the amount of money that we are spending on national security. No fault of theirs. They have been restricted in the amount of money they have to work with. There is not enough money allocated by this Congress or by the administration to deal with this problem. There is a lot of money for tax cuts. There is \$80 billion to fight the war in Iraq, but there is not enough money to provide for domestic security. And on top of that in the context of this bill, we are cutting back on the amount of money that is allocated to high-threat areas specifically. That is foolish and we need to correct it.

We are beginning a process with this appropriation bill here today, and it is

my hope that we will all work together constructively so that in the final analysis when we pass the final appropriation measure, we will have a bill that adequately provides funding for our domestic security needs and also takes into consideration those additional specific security needs that exist in areas of high threat across the country.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman that just spoke made some comments that I feel must be responded to. It is not really relevant to this amendment, but I will try to make it so, and that is whether or not we are providing enough funding for our State and local responders. I hear it every day. We hear it every day. Most people are uninformed or misinformed about how much money is going out there. In this bill we provide over \$4 billion, and added to the moneys that we put in the 2002 bill and the 2003 bill, we will have appropriated some \$20.8 billion just for State and local first responders. The money is going out in different sorts of grants. There are eight or 10 different sorts of grants, one of which goes to the high-threat urban areas such as New York, Washington, L.A., other places, and those go out at the discretion and in the decision of the Secretary.

Last year, the current year 2003, we provided \$800 million for just the high-threat/high-density urban areas. The administration in the 2004 request did not request any funds in that account. We put \$500 million back in that account, and that is in the bill as we speak. However, in the other grant accounts we have increased the grants for State and local first responders by over \$1 billion. We do not hear that talked about, but it is there. There is over \$1 billion more in those grant programs this year and next year than this year, \$203 million above what we gave this year and \$1 billion over what the President requested.

So I want to ask where is the beef? Where is the beef?

Those moneys are going out under competitive and discretionary grant programs to our States. Under this bill our States are required by law to give that money, 80 percent of it, to the locals within 60 days. The States have got to set up their own machinery for processing these applications. They have not done that yet. New York's application was almost tardy. We are just now getting the applications. And yet then we are saying you are not giving us the money. The money is there when you qualify and will be there during this year, but we have increased the amounts of money that go to State and local first responders \$203 million above what they have now and \$1 billion more than was requested by the President.

If the administration wants to submit a change in their budget request that changes these grants in some fashion, I am sure they will send us the supplement to their budget and we will give it due consideration. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to be sure that Members understand the State and local first responder grant moneys are there more than last year, \$1 billion more than the President requested. If the States will get their committees together and do their paperwork and apply for these moneys, they will be there, and if there are any delays in the pipeline, it is mainly because the States and localities have not applied for the money.

So Mr. Chairman, I rest my case.

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

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

Mr. FILNER. 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. FILNER) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COUNTERTERRORISM FUND

For necessary expenses, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended, to reimburse any Federal agency for the costs of providing support to counter, investigate, or prosecute unexpected threats or acts of terrorism, including payment of rewards in connection with these activities: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations 15 days prior to the obligation of any amount of these funds in accordance with section 503 of this Act.

DEPARTMENT-WIDE TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS

For development and acquisition of information technology equipment, software, services, and related activities for the Department of Homeland Security, and for the costs of conversion to narrowband communications, including the cost for operation of the Land Mobile Radio legacy systems, \$206,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated shall be used to support or supplement the appropriations provided for the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology system and the Automated Commercial Environment.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), \$58,118,000; of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 may be used for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated under the direction of the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security: *Provided*, That in addition, \$22,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Emergency Preparedness and Response Disaster Relief Fund.

TITLE II—BORDER AND
TRANSPORTATION SECURITY
CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection for enforcement of laws relating to border security, immigration, customs, and agricultural inspections and regulatory activities related to plant and animal imports, including planning, construction, and necessary related activities of buildings and facilities, \$4,584,600,000; of which not to exceed \$25,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed \$129,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2005, shall be for inspection technology; of which such sums as become available in the Customs User Fee Account, except sums subject to section 13021(f)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(3)), shall be derived from that account; and of which not to exceed \$5,000,000 shall be for payments or advances arising out of contractual or reimbursable agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies while engaged in cooperative activities related to immigration: *Provided*, That none of the funds available to the Directorate of Border and Transportation Security may be used to pay any employee overtime pay in an amount in excess of \$30,000 during the calendar year beginning January 1, 2004, except that the Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection may exceed such limitation as necessary for national security purposes and in cases of immigration emergencies: *Provided further*, That uniforms may be purchased without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be available for the site acquisition, design, or construction of any Border Patrol checkpoint in the Tucson sector: *Provided further*, That the Border Patrol shall relocate its checkpoints in the Tucson sector at least once every 7 days in a manner designed to prevent persons subject to inspection from predicting the location of any such checkpoint.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

In title II, in the item relating to "BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT—SALARIES AND EXPENSES", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$200,000,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—AVIATION SECURITY"—

(1) after the aggregate dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$150,000,000)"; and

(2) insert before the period at the end the following:

: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$75,000,000 shall be available only for grants to airports for perimeter security improvements, \$50,000,000 shall be available only to screen cargo carried on passenger aircraft, and \$25,000,000 shall be available only to ensure that overseas aircraft maintenance facilities that service United States aircraft comply with United States security standards

In title II, in the item relating to "TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINIS-

TRATION—MARITIME AND LAND SECURITY", after each of the dollar amounts, insert "(increased by \$400,000,000)".

In title IV, in the item relating to "UNITED STATES COAST GUARD—OPERATING EXPENSES"—

(1) after the aggregate dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$100,000,000)"; and

(2) insert before the period at the end the following:

: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$100,000,000 shall be for implementation of all of the requirements of the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-295)

In title IV, in the item relating to "INFORMATION ANALYSIS AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION—OPERATING EXPENSES", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

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

SEC. _____. In the case of taxpayers with adjusted gross income in excess of \$1,000,000 for the tax year beginning in 2003, the amount of tax reduction resulting from enactment of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 (Pub. L. 108-27) shall be reduced by 5.66 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. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment attempts to do six things. It would add \$400 million for port facility security grants. The Coast Guard says that we need more than \$4.5 billion over time to secure those operations. At the committee rate of only an additional \$100 million per year, it would take 20 years for us to get half-way to the task that is defined for us by the Coast Guard. I do not think that is fast enough. We would also add \$100 million for the Coast Guard to implement the Maritime Transportation Security Act, which passed this Congress last November, which is aimed at strengthening our ability to analyze vessel threat information.

We need simply look at the newspaper headlines yesterday about explosives bound for Sudan that were picked up by the Greek government, 680 tons of explosives and 8,000 detonators in the ship Baltic Sky, which the inspectors described as being tantamount to the power of an atomic bomb. I think that makes eminently clear why we need to protect our own ports to a greater extent.

Thirdly, we would add \$100 million to increase the inspections of containers that are being shipped to this country. Right now we inspect only 2 percent. We would add 1,300 more inspectors. We are just scratching the surface in terms of what we need.

Fourth, we would add \$200 million to improve northern border security. That border is 5,500 miles long. It is highly vulnerable. I referred earlier to the some 60 aircraft that flew across that border unannounced and unflagged over the past year.

We would then add \$150 million for aviation security to secure airport perimeters and to strengthen our ability to screen cargo on passenger planes. It is kind of strange to provide screening for passengers if we do not provide it for cargo.

Lastly, we would add \$50 million for the Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Division in the new agency that is supposed to be the nerve center, the brain, of that agency in targeting what our biggest vulnerabilities are. We would pay for that by reducing the size of the tax cut that was passed by this Congress. We would reduce the size of the tax cut for taxpayers who earn more than \$1 million a year. They are scheduled to get an \$88,000 tax cut. We would reduce that tax cut to \$83,000. So instead of getting \$17.7 billion next year, they would only get \$16.6 billion in tax reduction. I hardly think that is laying a scratch on them.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the Budget Act was to try to force the Congress to recognize the choices and the trade-offs that are attendant to any budget. The problem is that the way the budget process has been used, we have a situation in which we have a huge disconnect between actions on the tax bill and the consequences that flow in terms of reduced services and reduced security for the country. So I would simply ask that we recognize that this amendment meets essential services. It provides essential services, and it also has the added feature of demonstrating that there is a price to pay for tax cuts primarily aimed at such high-income people, especially when it means and requires that by the time we finish our action on the tax side of the ledger, we have only table scraps left to provide needed services not just for homeland security for that matter but for education, health care, and a number of other crucial items.

For those who say we are invading the jurisdiction of another committee, we did that at the expressed request of the House leadership just a few months ago on the omnibus appropriations bill. So this is nothing new, and I would urge support for the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

POINT OF ORDER

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI, which states, in part, an amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law, and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member desire to be heard on the point of order? The gentleman from Wisconsin.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I do and I would first raise a parliamentary inquiry. Could the Chair tell us what rules were waived by the Committee on Rules for consideration of the majority committee bill and its provisions?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will read the pertinent portion of House Resolution 293, the rule providing for consideration of this bill in Committee of the Whole, and that portion is: "Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with section 501 of House Concurrent Resolution 95 and clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: sections 514, 521, and 522."

□ 1515

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Is it not true that the selective waiving of the rules as cited by the Chair make clear that the DeLauro amendment and the Sabo amendment, which were offered in committee, were not protected by the rule? That is the practical effect of that language, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The sections specified in the rule, 514, 521, and 522, are not protected.

Mr. OBEY. So my understanding is that that means that the DeLauro language on corporate expatriates and the Sabo amendment with respect to CAPPS were both precluded from being considered by the House.

Would the Chair answer one other parliamentary inquiry, please. What rules are waived to enable my amendment to be offered on behalf of the minority?

The CHAIRMAN. The rule does not speak to amendments to the bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, then let me simply raise a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state it.

Mr. OBEY. Because what I think the Chair just said is that the Committee on Rules, in contrast to the way it handled majority provisions, that the Committee on Rules did not make in order a waiver for our side of the aisle.

But let me ask the Chair as a parliamentary inquiry, is it not correct that on the omnibus appropriations bill just a few months ago that we amended the Medicare Act not once, but in two separate areas, to provide a 6 percent increase in funding for providers under the Medicare Act, even though that was considered invading another committee's jurisdiction?

Is it also not true that on that omnibus legislation the committee was allowed to increase payments under division N, section 401(b) of the Medicare Act for rural hospitals? Is it not true that we waived the rules to allow the U.S. Customs Service to conduct vehicle inspections on the Canadian side of the U.S.-Canada border? And is it not also true that during the tumultuous

debate about what to do about the dilemma of the airlines, that we waived rules again to allow the committee to include in its appropriation bill the bailout for the airlines as well as the extension of unemployment benefits to those in that industry?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair stated on June 26, 2002, the Chair cannot place issues into historical context; and, therefore, the gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. OBEY. Well then, Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that I would urge the Chair to uphold my right to offer this amendment, because I cannot believe that the majority leadership would want to be so unfair as to waive provisions of our rules for the majority party's bill, but to not extend the same opportunity to those of us on the minority side, and to point out that I have just recited four instances where, just a few months ago, the majority leadership insisted that we provide these waivers for these non-appropriated purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do further Members wish to speak on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Kentucky makes a point of order that the amendment proposes to change existing law in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The amendment, in pertinent part, proposes to increase budget authority to be offset by a change in certain tax statutes under the Internal Revenue Code.

As the Chair previously ruled on September 8, 1999, and July 26, 2001, an amendment to a general appropriation bill addressing tax-rate reduction under the Internal Revenue Code constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI; and, therefore, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, on that I most reluctantly and respectfully move to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 200, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 305]

AYES—222

Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Burns
Akin	Blackburn	Burr
Bachus	Blunt	Burton (IN)
Baker	Boehert	Buyer
Ballenger	Boehner	Calvert
Barrett (SC)	Bonilla	Cannon
Bartlett (MD)	Bonner	Cantor
Barton (TX)	Bono	Capito
Bass	Boozman	Carter
Beauprez	Bradley (NH)	Castle
Bereuter	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Biggett	Brown (SC)	Chocola
Billirakis	Burgess	Coble

Cole	Issa	Portman
Collins	Istook	Pryce (OH)
Cox	Janklow	Putnam
Crane	Jenkins	Quinn
Crenshaw	Johnson (CT)	Radanovich
Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Ramstad
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Regula
Davis, Jo Ann	Jones (NC)	Rehberg
Davis, Tom	Keller	Renzi
Deal (GA)	Kelly	Reynolds
DeLay	Kennedy (MN)	Rogers (AL)
DeMint	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart, L.	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Doolittle	Kirk	Ros-Lehtinen
Dreier	Kline	Royce
Duncan	Knollenberg	Ryan (WI)
Dunn	Kolbe	Ryan (KS)
Ehlers	LaHood	Saxton
Emerson	Latham	Schrock
English	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Everett	Leach	Sessions
Feeney	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
Ferguson	Lewis (KY)	Shaw
Flake	Linder	Shays
Fletcher	LoBiondo	Sherwood
Foley	Lucas (OK)	Shimkus
Forbes	Manzullo	Shuster
Fossella	McCotter	Simmons
Franks (AZ)	McCrery	Simpson
Frelinghuysen	McHugh	Smith (MI)
Gallely	McInnis	Smith (NJ)
Gerlach	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Gibbons	Mica	Souder
Gillmor	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Gingrey	Miller (MI)	Sullivan
Goode	Miller, Gary	Sweeney
Goodlatte	Moran (KS)	Tancredo
Goss	Murphy	Tauzin
Granger	Musgrave	Taylor (NC)
Graves	Myrick	Terry
Green (WI)	Nethercutt	Thomas
Greenwood	Neugebauer	Thornberry
Gutknecht	Ney	Tiahrt
Hall	Northup	Tiberi
Harris	Norwood	Toomey
Hart	Nunes	Turner (OH)
Hastings (WA)	Nussle	Upton
Hayes	Osborne	Vitter
Hayworth	Ose	Walden (OR)
Hefley	Otter	Walsh
Hensarling	Oxley	Wamp
Herger	Pearce	Weldon (FL)
Hobson	Pence	Weldon (PA)
Hoekstra	Peterson (PA)	Weller
Hostettler	Petri	Whitfield
Houghton	Pickering	Wicker
Hulshof	Pitts	Wilson (NM)
Hunter	Platts	Wilson (SC)
Hyde	Pombo	Wolf
Isakson	Porter	Young (FL)

NOES—200

Abercrombie	Davis (AL)	Hoeffel
Ackerman	Davis (CA)	Holden
Alexander	Davis (FL)	Holt
Allen	Davis (IL)	Honda
Andrews	Davis (TN)	Hooley (OR)
Baca	DeFazio	Hoyer
Baldwin	DeGette	Inslee
Ballance	Delahunt	Israel
Becerra	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Bell	Deutsch	Jackson-Lee
Berkley	Dicks	(TX)
Berman	Dingell	Jefferson
Berry	Doggett	John
Bishop (GA)	Dooley (CA)	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Jones (OH)
Blumenauer	Edwards	Kanjorski
Boswell	Emanuel	Kaptur
Boucher	Engel	Kennedy (RI)
Boyd	Eshoo	Kildee
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Kilpatrick
Brown (OH)	Evans	Kind
Brown, Corrine	Farr	Klecza
Capps	Fattah	Kucinich
Capuano	Filner	Lampson
Cardin	Ford	Langevin
Cardoza	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Carson (IN)	Frost	Larsen (WA)
Carson (OK)	Gonzalez	Larson (CT)
Case	Gordon	Lee
Clay	Green (TX)	Levin
Clyburn	Grijalva	Lewis (GA)
Cooper	Harman	Lipinski
Costello	Hastings (FL)	Lofgren
Cramer	Hill	Lowey
Crowley	Hinchey	Lucas (KY)
Cummings	Hinojosa	Lynch

Majette	Ortiz	Skelton
Maloney	Owens	Slaughter
Markey	Pallone	Snyder
Marshall	Pascrell	Solis
Matheson	Pastor	Spratt
Matsui	Payne	Stark
McCarthy (MO)	Pelosi	Stenholm
McCarthy (NY)	Peterson (MN)	Strickland
McCollum	Pomeroy	Stupak
McDermott	Price (NC)	Tanner
McGovern	Rahall	Tauscher
McIntyre	Rangel	Taylor (MS)
McNulty	Reyes	Thompson (CA)
Meehan	Rodriguez	Thompson (MS)
Meek (FL)	Ross	Tierney
Meeks (NY)	Rothman	Towns
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Turner (TX)
Michaud	Ruppersberger	Udall (CO)
Millender-	Rush	Udall (NM)
McDonald	Ryan (OH)	Van Hollen
Miller (NC)	Sabo	Velazquez
Miller, George	Sanchez, Linda	Visclosky
Mollohan	T.	Waters
Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Watson
Moran (VA)	Sanders	Watt
Murtha	Sandlin	Waxman
Nadler	Schakowsky	Weiner
Napolitano	Schiff	Wexler
Neal (MA)	Scott (GA)	Woolsey
Oberstar	Scott (VA)	Wu
Obey	Serrano	Wynn
Olver	Sherman	

NOT VOTING—12

Baird	Cubin	Paul
Brown-Waite,	Garrett (NJ)	Smith (WA)
Ginny	Gephardt	Young (AK)
Camp	Gilchrest	
Conyers	Gutierrez	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there are less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1541

Mr. PASCARELL changed his vote from "aye" to "no".

Mr. HEFLEY changed his vote from "no" to "aye".

So the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Committee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this paragraph? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, for administrative expenses related to the collection of the Harbor Maintenance Fee, pursuant to Public Law 103-182, and notwithstanding section 1511(e)(1) of Public Law 107-296, \$3,000,000 to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and to be transferred to and merged with this account.

AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For expenses not otherwise provided for Bureau of Customs and Border Protection automated systems, \$493,727,000, to remain available until expended, of which not less than \$318,690,000 shall be for the development of the Automated Commercial Environment: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be obligated for the Automated Commercial Environment until the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection prepares and submits to the Committees on Appropriations a plan for expenditure that (1) meets the capital planning and investment control review requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget, including OMB Circular A-11, part 3; (2) complies with the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection's Enterprise Information Systems Architecture; (3) complies with the acquisition rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the Federal Government; (4) is re-

viewed and approved by the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection Investment Review Board, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Office of Management and Budget; and (5) is reviewed by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be obligated for the Automated Commercial Environment until such expenditure plan has been approved by the Committees on Appropriations.

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement for enforcement of immigration and customs laws, detention and removals, investigations, including planning, construction, and necessary related activities of buildings and facilities, \$2,030,000,000; of which not to exceed \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for conducting special operations pursuant to Public Law 99-570 (19 U.S.C. 2081); of which not to exceed \$15,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not less than \$100,000 shall be for promotion of public awareness of the child pornography tipline; and of which not less than \$200,000 shall be for Project Alert: *Provided*, That none of the funds available to the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement may be used to pay any employee overtime pay in an amount in excess of \$30,000 during the calendar year beginning January 1, 2004, except that the Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement may exceed such limitation as necessary for national security purposes and in cases of immigration emergencies: *Provided further*, That of the total amount of funds made available for activities to enforce laws against forced child labor in fiscal year 2004, not to exceed \$5,000,000 shall remain available until expended for support of such activities: *Provided further*, That uniforms may be purchased without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year.

FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operations of the Federal Protective Service, \$424,211,000 shall be transferred from the revenues and collections in the General Services Administration, Federal Buildings Fund.

AUTOMATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE MODERNIZATION

For expenses not otherwise provided for Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement automated systems, \$367,605,000, to remain available until expended, of which not less than \$350,000,000 shall be for the development of the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology system (US VISIT): *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be obligated for US VISIT until the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement prepares and submits to the Committees on Appropriations a plan for expenditure that (1) meets the capital planning and investment control review requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget, including OMB Circular A-11, part 3; (2) complies with the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement Enterprise Information Systems Architecture; (3) complies with the acquisition rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the Federal Government;

(4) is reviewed and approved by the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement Investment Review Board, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Office of Management and Budget; and (5) is reviewed by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be obligated for US VISIT until such expenditure plan has been approved by the Committees on Appropriations.

AIR AND MARINE INTERDICTION

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation, maintenance and procurement of marine vessels, aircraft, and other related equipment of the Office of Air and Marine Interdiction of the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, including operational training and mission-related travel, and rental payments for facilities occupied by the air or marine interdiction and demand reduction programs, the operations of which include the following: conducting homeland security operations; interdiction of narcotics and other illegal substances or items; the provision of support to Department of Homeland Security and other Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of laws enforced by the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and, at the discretion of the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security, the provision of assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in other law enforcement and emergency humanitarian efforts, \$175,000,000, which shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no aircraft or other related equipment, with the exception of aircraft that are one of a kind and have been identified as excess to Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement requirements and aircraft that have been damaged beyond repair, shall be transferred to any other Federal agency, department, or office outside of the Department of Homeland Security, during fiscal year 2004 without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. LOBIONDO

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. LOBIONDO: In title II, in the item "IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT—AIR AND MARINE INTERDICTION", after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

In title II, in the item "TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—AVIATION SECURITY"—

(1) after the first dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)"; and

(2) after the fourth dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

In title II, in the item "TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—ADMINISTRATION", after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$36,000,000)".

In title IV, in the item "CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES—OPERATING EXPENSES", after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$12,000,000)".

In title IV, in the item "UNITED STATES COAST GUARD—OPERATING EXPENSES", after the first dollar amount insert "(increased by \$35,000,000)".

In title IV, in the item "UNITED STATES COAST GUARD—ACQUISITIONS, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS"—

(1) after the first dollar amount insert "(increased by \$75,000,000)"; and

(2) after the sixth dollar amount insert "(increased by \$75,000,000)".

In title IV, in the item "SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, ACQUISITION, AND OPERATIONS", after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$47,000,000)".

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that continues my campaign and the campaign of many others to ensure that our maritime security efforts have as much resources available to defend against the potential disaster of an attack at one or more of our ports. My amendment would increase funding for the Coast Guard by \$110 million; \$35 million would go to fund the congressionally mandated review and approval of approximately 10,000 facilities and vessel security plans that owners and operators must submit to the Coast Guard next year; and \$75 million to help get the critically needed Deep Water Acquisition Program back on track.

My amendment would provide roughly half of what has been requested for support by the Coast Guard for these programs.

□ 1545

Tomorrow in the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure session, we will be marking up the 2004 Coast Guard Authorization Act, which provides the funding for these important programs at the level requested and supported by the Coast Guard.

I would add that over 85 Members of the House have sent the appropriators a letter in support of our authorized level of funding.

At a May 22 hearing before my subcommittee, the commandant of the Coast Guard explained that the Coast Guard would need an additional \$70 million to fund 150 full-time personnel to review and approve of the Vessel and Facility Security Plans mandated by the MTSA. If these plans are not reviewed and approved by the Coast Guard within a year of its submission, the owners will not be allowed to operate their vessels in U.S. waters, and noncompliant port facilities would be shut down.

With 95 percent of our Nation's trade entering and leaving our ports, this will have a chilling effect on our economy. Moreover, without additional funding to meet this congressionally imposed mandate, the Coast Guard will have to divert precious resources and personnel from other traditional missions, including search and rescue, drug interdiction, and fisheries enforcement. My amendment would provide \$35 million for this purpose, half of what is needed.

At a June 3 hearing before my subcommittee, the commandant announced his support for the \$702 million in funding for Deepwater. This level of funding represents what is needed to counteract 3 years of underfunding and would get the program back on track.

The Coast Guard operates the second oldest naval fleet in the world, and some assets have been commissioned since World War II. Nearly half of the

110-foot Patrol Boat Fleet is in immediate need of repair for structural deterioration and has cost over 6 months of lost patrol days on the west coast. On average, the High Endurance Cutter Fleet is having a fire in their main engineering spaces on every patrol, and the fleet's main search and rescue helicopter is equipped with radar designed and installed nearly 20 years ago. Therefore, the successful and timely implementation of Deepwater would ensure that the Coast Guard would have the modern assets necessary to respond to any threats necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the very difficult decision-making process that confronted the appropriators in drafting this bill. I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) for their work, and at this point I would indicate my willingness to withdraw my amendment if the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) would be willing to enter into a colloquy with me.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman enter into a colloquy with me on this subject?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I certainly will.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, as I have said, I am willing to withdraw my amendment if the gentleman agrees to work with me as the bill moves forward to increase funding for the Deepwater program and provide additional funding for the review and approval of the Vessel and Facility Security Plans.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for his advocacy on behalf of the Coast Guard, and he has been a champion at that for his entire career in the Congress.

While I cannot support his amendment, I do recognize the need to provide additional funding for Deepwater and for the administrative costs associated with the review and approval of the congressionally mandated facility and vessels security plans. I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman from New Jersey to ensure adequate resources are made for these priorities in fiscal 2004.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and recognize the very difficult decision-making process he was confronted with in development of this bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as Members of Congress, our first responsibility set forth in the preamble to the Constitution is to provide for the common defense. In our time, the common defense means protecting our homeland from terrorists, as well as from traditional military threats to our interests at home and abroad.

The consideration of the first-ever appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security could have been a historic opportunity to demonstrate our commitment to the common defense by addressing some of the most glaring deficiencies in our Nation's security. Sadly, it is yet another missed opportunity.

The Republican's Homeland Security bill does not provide the resources necessary to do the job. The Republican bill does not meet the broad needs of our ports, our borders, our air transportation system, and other critical parts of our infrastructure.

In determining the Nation's priorities, the Republican majority has chosen to cut taxes for those who need it least, while shortchanging the homeland security needs of everyday Americans. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the Committee on Appropriations ranking member, showed great leadership with an amendment to provide for America's security, to provide for the common defense, to protect the homeland.

The amendment would have provided an additional \$1 billion to improve homeland security by adding \$500 million to port security, everyone recognizes that is the minimum figure that is needed to protect our ports; \$100 million to assist in the development of an automated vessel tracking system; \$200 million to pay either for a year-round air and marine interdiction program at our northern border or to increase to 6,900 the number of agents patrolling the northern border by the end of fiscal year 2004; \$150 million in security grants to airports and overseas maintenance facilities; and, finally, \$50 million for vulnerable assessments at critical infrastructure locations.

Where would this \$1 billion come from? The Obey amendment would be paid for by rolling back the tax cut for millionaires, that is, people making \$1 million per year. People making \$1 million a year or more would have their tax cut cut from \$88,326 to \$83,326. For that \$5,000, for the 200,000 people making over \$1 million a year, by reducing their tax cut from \$88,000 to \$83,000, America can be much safer.

What would my colleagues choose, to protect the American people or to give \$5,000 more to people making \$1 million a year or more?

Mr. Chairman, success in both the war on terrorism and the effort to better protect our Nation and its people will require a sustained effort and a resolve lasting many years. This bill should have been a testament to that resolve; but sadly, it is not. We need to act now to protect the American people.

Recent history suggests that our security could be tested anytime and any place. We know what our exposure is, what our vulnerabilities are. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) addressed them in his amendment. We must take every step to be ready. We have that responsibility.

Providing for the common defense is enshrined in our Constitution as one of our highest responsibilities. Its importance as a national priority is not reflected in this bill.

I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his leadership, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) for his as well, and it is with the highest regard for the chairman of the subcommittee who has served in this House with great dignity that I regret opposing what has been put forth by the Republican leadership on the floor today. It again misses an opportunity for the American people.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky. I would like to address the issue of how our national emergency preparedness and response plan addresses older Americans, the disabled, and others with special needs.

Our experience with the horrible attacks of September 11, 2001, exposed gaps in our response plan as many elderly and disabled people living near the World Trade Center were trapped for days before receiving assistance. Successive evaluations have identified particular problems, including lack of coordination in city-wide community services, lack of a system to identify and locate older and disabled people, and lack of access to necessary public information both before and after an emergency.

I believe this issue is of great importance in the event of a future terrorist attack and I look forward to working with the gentleman in addressing this great need.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman for his very thoughtful comments and agree that the needs of older Americans and those with special needs should be addressed. I look forward to working with the gentleman on this important issue.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend both the majority and the minority members and the appropriations staff for their hard work on this first homeland secu-

ity appropriations bill. I realize that this has been a formidable task.

Never the less, I am concerned that we have not given enough debate to issues raised by our state and local government officials and our local first responders.

For instance, fire fighters in Kansas City have told me that we must develop and fund an infrastructure to communicate effectively with agencies in the same community as well as surrounding communities during times of crisis.

Moreover, our local public health officials must have the necessary resources to be adequately prepared to cope with emergencies, particularly bioterrorist attacks.

As the ranking member of the subcommittee on intelligence and counterterrorism of the select committee on homeland security, I question the Department of Homeland Security's ability to provide accurate and timely intelligence assessments, including bioterrorism threats to this country with the limited resources provided in H.R. 2555.

I thank the chair for the opportunity to address these important issues, and hope that in conference the additional funds called for by the ranking member, Mr. OBEY (the gentleman from Wisconsin) will be included.

The American people deserve such protection. Our first responders deserve such resources to assure the protection of the people they serve.

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

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION
AVIATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to providing civil aviation security services pursuant to Public Law 107-71, \$3,679,200,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$3,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That of such total amount, not to exceed \$1,672,700,000 shall be for passenger screening activities; not to exceed \$1,284,800,000 shall be for baggage screening activities; and not to exceed \$721,700,000 shall be for airport support and enforcement presence: *Provided further*, That security service fees authorized under section 44940 of title 49, United States Code, shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and used for providing civil aviation security services authorized by that section: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the General Fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2004, so as to result in a final fiscal year appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than \$1,609,200,000: *Provided further*, That any security service fees collected in excess of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be treated as offsetting collections in fiscal year 2005: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be used to recruit or hire personnel into the Transportation Security Administration which would cause the agency to exceed a staffing level of 45,000 full-time equivalent screeners: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided herein, \$235,000,000 shall be available only for physical modification of commercial service airports for the purpose of installing checked baggage explosive detection systems and \$100,000,000 shall be available only for procurement of checked baggage explosive detection systems.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TERRY:

Page 11, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

Page 16, line 23, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 17, line 3, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 22, line 1, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple in the sense that what it does is it provides 20 million additional dollars for our first responders, and it takes it from a flush, although well-improved, Transportation Security Agency.

I want to start off by complimenting the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the subcommittee. Most of the time when an amendment is offered, it is because that person has disagreed philosophically with the direction of that particular appropriation. I am here to compliment the chairman and say that I agree with his priorities, Mr. Chairman, and two of those priorities that he has provided are an extra \$1 billion of funding for our first responders above the President's request. He has also decreased to bring down the number of TSA agents in our airports, and I greatly appreciate both of those.

My goal here today is to improve on what the gentleman has already done, Mr. Chairman. I would like us to take an even bigger step in helping our first responders.

When we look at our homeland security today, we rely a great deal on our fire, police and emergency services; and while we talk about a new Homeland Security Department and funding that Department, most of the people receive a vision of a top-down system that comes from Washington, D.C., down to the local levels. But the reality is when an emergency occurs, when a terrorist attack occurs, whether it is in Oklahoma City or Omaha or New York City or Washington, D.C., the first people on the scene, to take control of the scene, to rescue those that have been injured or killed in the security area are our first responders.

□ 1600

I do not think we can do enough to provide them the proper training and the proper equipment. I have talked to our police officers, who call themselves blue canaries, because they know that when an emergency occurs, when they run into those buildings to secure the areas, they say they know it is biological or chemical or deadly when they keel over. Well, I think when we have a national security policy, a homeland security policy that relies on them, I would like to provide them additional dollars.

Now, why the TSA? I think most of us that go through airports can tell of personal examples with what appears

to be a very flush budget in the respect of seeing the number of white shirts with patches standing around. In fact, at my airport in Eppley, just a few months ago, there was an extremely long line, as there was on Monday morning, but they only had one of the stations open. And I asked the person why there was only one security station open when there were as many as 10 twelve white shirts standing around, and I was told, quote-unquote, they are on break. I called our new security administrator for Eppley and he told me it was broken down. Now, the people on the scene had a different opinion. But that is just one example.

Unfortunately, over the last few months what we have also seen is not only the vast number of employees standing around but the vast number of passengers standing in extremely long passenger lines. Last week, at Reagan National, it literally went out the door. It literally went out the door, yet there were many employees there working. How does that happen, when there is more employees than there were before and the lines are two or three times longer? We are having record numbers of people standing in lines and a number of complaints coming into our office about our own airport.

Now, I go through a lot of airports, and I have talked, Mr. Chairman, to several people in charge of these airports. I get really extremely harsh critique of TSA from airport administrators. In fact, one told me that he wanted to find out the background of the security administrator appointed to their airport to see if this person had any experience with civil airports. TSA denied the request, so a Freedom of Information Act was filed and that was denied on PATRIOT Act grounds. So we do not even know if the people being appointed have any experience in providing security.

At least in Omaha, Nebraska, I know there were two or three people that would have been grade-A-plus in security, yet they were denied for someone we do not even know the background of. And how many of us have similar experiences to tell?

So, Mr. Chairman, I understand your position and I respect it, but I stand by my amendment to help our first responders.

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

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly, very reluctantly rise to oppose this amendment. The gentleman is a good Member, and he has expressed heartfelt thoughts here. And, goodness knows, I have expressed very serious and long-standing reservations about the number of screeners that TSA has deployed in airports throughout the country. But in the bill before us we already reduce the number of screeners by another 4,600 in fiscal 2004, and that is on top of the 6,000 screeners that will be laid off between now and September

of this year. That would be a reduction from current levels, roughly, of some 10,600 less than we have now.

In the 2002 bill, when it was in Transportation, we capped the number of screeners at 45,000. This cut the gentleman would make would take us well below that cap. This further reduction of \$20 million from the screener fund would require them to lay off another 500 to 1,000 screeners on top of what I just mentioned. That would take us well below the 45,000 level that we had set now for the 2 or 3 years in the Congress as the maximum level at TSA.

The monies the gentleman would take from TSA he would give to the first responders, and heavens knows we want to give them all we can, but in this bill, as the gentleman mentioned, we are already \$1 billion for first responders above what the President requested, and some \$200 million plus above what the current level of spending for first responders is. So I just think that it would be unwise to adopt this amendment, as much as I sympathize with the gentleman's philosophy in offering it.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I would join the chairman in opposing the amendment. The committee and the chairman have been very tough task masters of TSA when it comes to the number of screeners. We have been urging them for a long time to use more part-time people and to make more efficient use of their personnel. On the other hand, if we get too harsh, there may be imbalance around the country in terms of where there are vacancies and where there are an overabundance. So if we get too tough, we can be very counterproductive.

I agree with the chairman that first responder money is important, but the committee has been very disciplined in dealing with TSA, and I would join the chairman in opposing this additional cut.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I would rather that we let the TSA absorb these cuts that we already have in place, which will cut 10,600 screeners by the end of 2004. Let us do that before we take further steps. We can assess it at that time. If we still have a problem, I would be supportive of the gentleman's amendment. But for the moment, I think we have done just about enough.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was intending to offer an amendment to this title of the bill, but the amendment is to increase the appropriation in the bill by \$5 billion for the purpose of stationing American inspectors in every foreign

port from where ships leave for the United States in order to inspect every container before it is put on a ship bound for the United States. Unfortunately, I could not find a \$5 billion offset in this bill. What I wanted to do, obviously, was to reduce the tax cuts, the hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars of tax cuts, by \$5 billion to offset this. But the rules of the House do not permit that, so my hands are tied.

Let me address for a moment the necessity of this amendment, if not in this bill then elsewhere. The greatest danger this Nation faces, which we are not addressing in any real shape or form, is that some foreign terrorist group, al-Qaeda, whoever, or some rogue nation, will get hold of a nuclear bomb and attack the United States. We are spending about \$100 billion on an anti-ballistic missile system ostensibly to meet that threat. But think about it a minute. The leader of any rogue nation who had a few atomic bombs and wanted to attack the United States would not put them on a missile, because a missile has a return address. We would know from where the missile came, if God forbid someone attacked American cities. That leader would know that if he launched nuclear-tipped missiles at American cities, his country would cease to exist, along with his regime and him, would cease to exist a half-hour later. So he would not put the atomic bombs on a missile, he would put them in a ship.

Mr. Chairman, six million shipping containers come into this country per year. We inspect less than 2 percent of them. Ninety-eight percent of those six million containers, for all we know, have atomic bombs in them. It does not do any good to inspect them in Newark or New York or Los Angeles where they might explode. I know Secretary Ridge and others are saying we are going to set aside a few hundred million dollars and send some inspectors to foreign ports to look at some high-risk containers. High risk? Well, if we look at the high-risk containers, the bombs will be in the low-risk containers, or at least those that used to be low risk.

Mr. Chairman, the catastrophe that could be caused from one atomic bomb in an American city would make 9/11 look like child's play. That catastrophe would cost half a million lives immediately, probably trillions, trillions in economic damage. We cannot afford to risk one nuclear explosion in an American city. President Bush said, when he was trying to motivate a war with Iraq, that we could not wait for the mushroom cloud. Well, I am not so sure the facts justified that reference with respect to Iraq, but they most certainly justify that reference with respect to six million shipping containers coming into this country with God knows what inside.

So, Mr. Chairman, my amendment that I would have offered, if the majority did not prevent me from offering this amendment, would have appropriated \$5 billion, which is little

enough for this purpose, and would have sufficed to enable an American inspection team to see to it that no container, not one container, is put on any ship bound for the United States in a foreign port until that container is searched and sealed and certified by an American inspection team in the foreign port to say there is no weapon of mass destruction on board that.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not do this, during the war that we are engaged in now and maybe for the next 10, 20, 30, or 40 years with the terrorists, then we ought to have our collective heads examined. Any American city could be destroyed, millions of lives lost by one atomic bomb in any container in any ship. We cannot afford not to spend the money to search and inspect every single container, whether our intelligence people think it is a high-risk or a low-risk container, every container in a foreign port with an American inspection team to make sure there is no weapon of mass destruction on board that container.

For \$5 billion, Mr. Chairman, we could do that. Five billion dollars a year. Compare that to trillions of dollars in tax cuts that we have passed in these last 2 years. Where does the risk lie for the American people? I would urge, and I would challenge the Bush administration to make the \$5 billion a year available and to institute this and to say to foreign countries that no container gets put on a ship in their port without being inspected first by an American inspection team.

And, by the way, if they did not want an American inspection team in their ports, that is fine, they are sovereign, but they cannot ship anything to the United States. We must hermetically seal this country from nuclear bombs possibly contained in ships, and this is the only way to do it. The failure of this Congress and of the administration to deal with this subject seriously is one that I hope will not result in cataclysmic catastrophe for the American people.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I could not let the gentleman's statement go unanswered. We cannot talk in this forum about all that we are doing at our ports in searching container freight and other freight. I would be happy to talk to any Member privately about it, but we cannot talk about all that we are doing in a public forum because it is sensitive information.

However, the Customs and Border Protection Agency tells me that they are inspecting 100 percent of all high-risk cargo based on collecting advanced information such as manifests, intelligence, and targeting systems. I have had the experience of going to some of those ports myself and watching the operation. Watching as we use the equipment on these containers that we do search and then the ones that we physically search.

The 2003 spending bill had monies in it for a thing called the Container Se-

curity Initiative, essentially operating at about 20 megaports and several smaller ports all over the world. The idea is to push the perimeter of defense off of our shores. We all know if a bad container gets to us, it is too late. If you catch it only when it comes to your port, it is too late. So we have moved offshore to 20 megaports now, places like Rotterdam, Singapore, and the like, and inspecting and searching and securing containers before they ever sail for America.

□ 1615

Mr. Chairman, the bill provides \$62 million to expand that to 30 megaports around the world and especially those in very sensitive parts of the world.

Now we already have in place \$165 million from the wartime supplemental that we passed for additional inspectors, agents, technology and \$129 million for additional inspection technology in this bill. Those monies will be used to push the border out to these 30 foreign seaports through the Container Security Initiative, but there is also \$12 million for government-private partnerships to tighten security in private facilities and \$3 million to continue what is called the Operation Safe Commerce to make smart containers and our supply chain even more secure.

I want Members to know that we are focusing exactly on what the gentleman has talked about, and that is container freight. There are more than 17 million containers a year, there is 17 million a year; 7 million comes by sea, 12 million by land across our borders with Mexico and Canada. It is a huge problem to deal with.

However, if we stop and search physically every single container regardless of whether or not it looks to be suspicious for some reason, we would absolutely shut down commerce in the world. So much of our commerce depends on the container freight business. I think we are going about it the sensible way. I am convinced after having visited several ports, spending a lot of time with the folks that are doing this, looking at the machinery and the results and how they go about doing it, that we are doing as good as we can in the span of time that we have had. Obviously it is going to get better. We are going to keep pushing at it. That is the reason we have loaded this bill down with money for that very purpose. I thank the gentleman for bringing this issue to us so we can discuss it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to pick up where the last two speakers spoke, and that is the question of port security and what we know or do not know about the 20 million containers that come across America's borders every year, come by truck and train traffic, and the rest through ports.

I have to say that I appreciate that the committee is doing a lot. The question is when will the committee be

done doing its work, and when will the Nation say that it knows enough about the containers coming into its ports. I am not sure that we can inspect every port, but what is very clear is the amount of information that we have to have about these containers from the point of origin to the time that they embark for the United States is incomplete. Even the effort to go into the megaports, which I think is important since some 80 percent of the commerce is shipped through those ports, that does not tell us, that does not give us the kind of information about the containers even coming to the megaports. That is what has to be established. A system, a credible system has to be established so those individuals responsible for the security of this Nation and the movement of those containers across the borders of this Nation are able to make an assessment as to the security of this Nation posed by those individual containers.

We are not going to be able to inspect every one of them because commerce is not going to allow us to do that. It would break down the system. But we can require a great deal more information about the contents of that container, the sealing of that container, the movement of that container, through electronic locks, through GPS systems, so we can start to trace that. Then we can make our decision upon risk. But by the time that container gets into the port of Hamburg or Hong Kong or Long Beach or Oakland, California, it is too late. If one of these container goes up with a dirty bomb, you will shut down the globalized container system in this world because we then will have to inspect every container. That is too late. That is far too late.

The terrorist does not just have to strike. As we saw, terrorists now understand that beyond the initial act are the economic consequences. They now see what that means. But if they are going to come to the United States and they want to do our people harm, they put in a nuclear device, they put in a dirty bomb, inspecting it in the Port of New York, the Port of Long Beach or the Port of Oakland is far too late. It does not matter if it goes up on the ship once it comes through the Golden Gate, if it goes up on the port property, or it goes up on the railroad train, that is too late. Of those, we are inspecting 2-4 percent of the containers.

At some point we have to establish a deadline so that people will know, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) said, if they want to engage in commerce in the United States, an inspection system has to be in place going back to the point of origin to follow that container all of the way.

We did this in the oil spill liability provisions after the Exxon Valdez. We said in 25 years if you want to continue to have access and ship petroleum products to the United States, you will do it in double-hulled ships. We should

be saying to the shippers, to international commerce, by 2004 or 2005 if you want to continue to have access, you have to provide for this monitoring of cargo, for the transparency of the system and the monitoring of the ships.

We have some 40,000 ships roaming around the world with containers on them. This is the kind of system that the American public is entitled to, and why so. As the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) pointed out, many of the experts which have been briefing Congress since September 11, 2001, have been telling us we are more likely to have a dirty bomb come into this country by way of container than we will ever have the risk of it coming in by way of missile. That is the threat to the home front. That is the major threat.

What we see here, while we are taking these incremental steps and I applaud many of them, we do not have a plan for deciding at what point this is going to be a secure system. We have to start putting deadlines on the transparency of this system, on the security of this system, and access to the American markets. That is how we are going to get unified system.

The gentleman from New York is right. The Container Security Initiative, the Operation Safe Commerce, the Customs Trade Partnership Against Terrorism are all important initiatives, but they are taking too long. They are taking too long. What is the price of security? What is the price of the home front? What is the price of a secure port system and a secure transportation system? Those are the questions we have to start asking ourselves, not whether we have put in another \$100 million or \$200 million; is the system secure. Right now we cannot tell the American public that in the foreseeable future that our system is secure.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to this paragraph?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL AIR MARSHALS

For necessary expenses of the Federal air marshals, \$634,600,000, to remain available until expended.

MARITIME AND LAND SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to maritime and land transportation security grants and services pursuant to Public Law 107-71, \$231,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, \$100,000,000 shall be available only to make port security grants, which shall be distributed under the same terms and conditions as provided for under Public Law 107-117.

INTELLIGENCE

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to transportation security intelligence activities, \$13,700,000, to remain available until expended.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration for research and development related to transportation

security, \$125,700,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration for administrative activities, including headquarters and field support, training, and information technology, \$487,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the necessary expenses of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, \$136,629,000, of which \$26,635,000 shall be for material and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training and shall remain available until September 30, 2006, and of which not to exceed \$12,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Center is authorized to expend appropriations for the purchase of police-type pursuit vehicles without regard to the general purchase price limitation; student athletic and related recreational activities; conducting and participating in firearms matches and the presentation of awards for such matches; public awareness and enhancing community support of law enforcement training, including the advertisement and marketing of available law enforcement training programs; room and board for student interns; short-term medical services for students undergoing training at Center training facilities; travel expenses of non-Federal personnel attending course development meetings; services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; support of Federal law enforcement accreditation; and a flat monthly reimbursement to employees authorized to use personal cell phones for official duties: *Provided further*, That (1) funds appropriated to this account may be used at the discretion of the Center's Director to train United States Postal Service law enforcement personnel, State and local law enforcement personnel, foreign law enforcement personnel, and private security personnel; (2) with the exception of private security personnel, the Center's Director is authorized to fully fund the cost of this training, including the cost of non-Federal travel, or to seek full or partial reimbursement for this training; and (3) such reimbursements shall be deposited in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Center is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from agencies receiving training at the Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available at the end of the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Center is authorized to accept and use gifts of property, real and personnel, and to accept services, for authorized purposes: *Provided further*, That the Center is authorized to harvest timber and use the proceeds from timber sales to supplement the Center's forest management and environmental programs: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, students attending training at any Center site shall reside in on-center or center-provided housing, to the extent available and in accordance with Center policy.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

For expansion of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, for acquisition of necessary additional real property and facilities, and for ongoing maintenance, facility improvements, and related expenses, \$32,323,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is authorized to

accept reimbursement to this appropriation from government agencies requesting the construction of special use facilities on training centers operated by the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all facilities shall remain under the control of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, which shall be responsible for scheduling, use, maintenance, and support.

OFFICE FOR DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other activities of the Office for Domestic Preparedness, as authorized by the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296) and the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-56), \$3,503,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading—

(1) \$1,900,000,000 shall be for basic formula grants;

(2) \$500,000,000 shall be for grants to State and local law enforcement for terrorism prevention activities;

(3) \$200,000,000 shall be for critical infrastructure grants;

(4) \$500,000,000 shall be for discretionary grants for use in high-density urban areas and high-threat areas; and

(5) \$35,000,000 shall be for grants for Centers for Emergency Preparedness:

Provided further, That the application for grants appropriated in subsections (1), (2), and (3) under this heading shall be made available to States within 30 days of enactment of this Act; States shall submit applications within 30 days of the grant announcement; and the Office for Domestic Preparedness shall act on each application within 15 days of receipt: *Provided further*, That 80 percent of the funds appropriated in subsections (1), (2), (3), and (4) under this heading to any State shall be allocated by the State to units of local governments and shall be distributed by the State within 60 days of the receipt of funds: *Provided further*, That section 1014(c)(3) of Public Law 107-56 shall not apply to funds appropriated in subsections (4) and (5) under this heading: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used for construction or renovation of facilities: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in subsections (3) and (4) under this heading shall be available for operational costs, including personnel overtime as needed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. MALONEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mrs. MALONEY:

In title II, in the item "OFFICE FOR DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS—DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS", in paragraph (4) after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$300,000,000)".

In title III, in the item "DISASTER RELIEF (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)", after the first dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$300,000,000)".

Mrs. MALONEY (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 gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) reserves a point of order.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, the al Qaeda has not gone away, and we know al Qaeda does not choose its targets at random, it chooses targets to inflict the greatest numbers of casualties, to do the greatest damage economically, and to get the most publicity. Just last week, we were reminded that New York is still a target when the Attorney General announced that an al Qaeda terrorist was targeting the Brooklyn Bridge. He was deterred from attacking the bridge by the efforts of the New York Police Department.

This is just one example of how since 9/11 a large share of the burden of providing for the national defense has fallen on our cities. In Congress we have provided some funds to help. We even sent part of the money to where the need is. In fiscal year 2003, we provided \$2.9 billion for grants to State and local governments to help them prepare for and defend against terrorist attacks. We even said that \$800 million of that should be directed to where the threat is greatest. That is about 30 percent. The rest of the fund went out under a formula that is entirely unrelated to where the terror threat is.

Under this bill as it is currently drafted for the next fiscal year, that 70 percent will increase to nearly 83 percent. Our effort to protect the most likely targets of terrorism is moving backwards. We are cutting the funds to the Nation's most threatened cities by almost 40 percent, by \$300 million, from \$800 million to \$500 million, and we are increasing the percentage that will go under the formula that is unrelated to potential threat, a formula that Secretary Ridge has repeatedly said is inappropriate and must be changed.

This formula sends the money where the threat is not. Just yesterday Secretary Ridge himself said of the high threat money and I quote, "I would like to see the number significantly higher than \$500 million." He went on to say, "At the end of the day, I do believe that there are some communities and regions that need more money."

My amendment will simply follow Secretary Ridge's advice and restore funding for high-threat cities. I understand that this approach is subject to a point of order. I originally had wanted to shift money from another account, but the fact is this bill severely underfunds our security needs. Resources are too scarce to shift between accounts, but our cities need more funding. New York City spent more than \$200 million over the last year on counterterrorism. The grants so far amount to \$220 million for New York, but very little of that can offset the personnel costs that the city has identified at more than \$900 million.

The assistance provided after the September 11 attacks paid for cleanup and replacement of equipment. It did not cover the security costs. This is not just an issue for New York and Washington, but it is a high-priority issue for many cities, including L.A.,

Chicago, San Francisco, New Orleans, Kansas City, Cincinnati, Houston and any city with a port or a mass transit system.

Mr. Chairman, it is our responsibility to appropriate the funds needed to protect the American people and this bill falls dangerously short. Respecting the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), who has worked very hard in a bipartisan way for New York City and State, I am withdrawing my amendment, also at the request of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), and I appreciate the commitment from the New York delegation, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) along with help from the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to restore this in conference.

□ 1630

I appreciate very much the leadership of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to quote Secretary of Homeland Security Ridge from an Associated Press article yesterday. This is what he said:

"At the end of the day, ladies and gentlemen, if you take a look at the population, the density of population, the critical infrastructure and the threat, there's one city that no matter how you move those factors around or weigh those factors, there's one city at the top of the list and it's New York City."

I want to associate myself with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), the things that she said. We will have other people from the New York delegation speaking about this as well, because we feel very, very strongly about getting the money for homeland security for New York City which is obviously, as Secretary Ridge said, the number one threat.

In fiscal year 2003, we provided \$2.9 billion for grants to State and local governments to help them prepare for and defend against terrorist attacks. \$800 million, or about 30 percent of that, was directed to high-threat areas. The rest of the fund went out under a formula that is entirely unrelated to where the terror threat is. Under this bill, as it is currently drafted for the next fiscal year, the 70 percent that is not related to high-threat areas will increase to nearly 83 percent. I believe that that is wrong.

Just last week a plot was uncovered, as my colleague said, to blow up the Brooklyn Bridge. Our intelligence agencies continue to say that New

York remains a top target for terrorists and common sense would tell anybody the same thing. New York has been hit twice by radical terrorists. Thousands have died. We continue to rebuild; but to better ensure our safety and the safety of the world's financial capital, we need to better spend Federal tax dollars. When New York is hit by attacks, all Americans are hurt. The economic impact is all over the country. People in Montana, Oklahoma and Oregon, it affects everyone in this country when New York is hit by attacks.

I also had intended to offer an amendment to move \$500 million from the State grant program to the high-threat program. I will not do that because I understand that there are needs across the country for assistance. Thus, it is obvious that this bill is not adequate to our needs as a Nation. I hope that we can somehow get around to the fact that we desperately need more money for high-threat areas. I would hope that in the negotiations between us and the other body that we would rectify this.

Why is this bill underfunded in my opinion? The answer is simple math. We have cut our revenues by trillions of dollars to pay for tax cuts. There is a trade-off, I believe, tax cuts or security. We believe that security is more important. My friend from Wisconsin wants to add an amendment to limit the tax cut for millionaires to just over \$83,000 this year instead of the \$88,000 they are set to get. I do not think it is too much to ask that people who have benefited the most in this great Nation pay \$4,000 more for the security of all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I again hope that when we have our negotiations, when we have our conferences that we will be able to put more money where it belongs to protect high-threat areas like New York City.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I am compelled again to talk about New York. All of us here are sympathetic, understanding, we want to help; but I feel compelled to lay out some facts that have not been laid out here. The fiscal year 2003 bill, we gave \$800 million in that bill for the high-threat, high-density urban area grants and the discretion of the Secretary. \$100 million of that was in the omnibus; \$700 million was in the supplemental. However, that money has not been spent. There is \$800 million laying there. Why? Because the grant application deadline for that first \$100 million just ended on June 16, a couple of weeks ago, and has not been processed. The application deadline for the \$700 million that was in the supplemental is not up until July 7. We have not processed the applications yet. Those monies will be going out there, to New York and the other cities.

In addition to that, what I am saying is, I guess, have a little patience. Number two, when the President's request

came up to us for fiscal year 2004, there was no request for high threat, high-density urban grant moneys. Zero. The subcommittee worked on it, and we put in \$500 million. Now people call that a cut. Boy, that is a strange use of the word. We increased it \$500 million. If the Secretary thinks we ought to change that, then he needs to send us a budget supplemental and amend his request and we will consider it.

However, all of the other grant programs, and there are six or seven of them, there are basic formula grants, there are law enforcement terrorism prevention grants, there are critical infrastructure grants, there are firefighter assistance grants, there are emergency management performance grants, there are emergency operations centers grants, all of which New York is eligible to apply for. We increased those funds over what the President wanted us to by \$1 billion. So that now there is \$4.04 billion available in those grant programs immediately. I would guess just by the odds and by the importance of New York that when you apply for those grants with the increased numbers there, all of these grants, you are probably going to wind up with more money than you got this year. But, please, have patience and understand that the rest of the country is interested in this as well. We want to help you, but I ask for your patience and understanding.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments offered by the Members from New York. While it is true that we do not know where the next attack may be and that the entire Nation is vulnerable, I believe that it is important to recognize those areas considered as high-threat and high-density. The gentleman mentioned that there are other cities involved and, of course, we know that. Take my own city of San Diego as an example. San Diego is home to nearly 3 million residents and hosts millions of tourists annually. It is one of the regions that I believe Secretary Ridge has spoken about. In fact, he voiced those concerns when he visited San Diego recently. We have an international border and ports of entry, a coastline, a seaport, a busy airport, several major highways, a mass transit system, large public venues such as SeaWorld and Qualcomm Stadium, site of the Super Bowl. We have numerous military bases and military housing areas, and even a nuclear power plant. Protecting such an extensive list of vulnerable areas requires significant resources. Yes, we are applying for a lot of that money. We are trying. We are doing our best.

Like all of my colleagues, I have heard from my first responders, from the sheriff's department, the police department, the fire department, the Coast Guard, the port authority, the Navy, the Marines and others about their struggle to protect our critical

infrastructure. I believe that they are doing a fabulous job. But they need more, and they need our help. This is an important amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRADY OF TEXAS

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRADY of Texas:

In title II in the item "OFFICE FOR DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS—DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS"—

(1) in paragraph (1), after the dollar amount insert "(reduced \$200,000,000)"; and

(2) in paragraph (4), after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$200,000,000)".

Mr. BRADY of Texas (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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for their leadership and hard work on homeland security. I rise today in support of the Weiner-Brady-Fossella amendment to make our homeland security budget smarter and more targeted to high-threat areas. We are at war in this war on terrorism. In war, there are likely targets and there are less likely targets. You protect them both. I know that Chairman ROGERS and Chairman YOUNG have fought hard to make sure we do exactly right, protect both likely targets and less likely targets.

What this amendment does is focus on those communities, on those States that will likely be and have been identified as high-threat, high-density urban areas. The States that have these high-threat communities include much of our country, New York and California, Texas and Illinois, Arizona and Colorado, Florida, Hawaii and Georgia, Massachusetts and Maryland, Michigan and Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio and Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington and the District of Columbia, all States that are host to urban areas that are at high risk and high threat of a terrorist attack. This amendment targets \$200 million and shifts it to the high-threat, high-density urban area funding. Part of the community that I represent, Houston, Texas, is on that list of top 10 communities. It is, I would imagine, as a result of both communications from al Qaeda terrorists, from information received from interviews with al Qaeda operatives and Houston is, of course, the energy capital of the world. It is home to more than 50 percent of the oil and gas refining in this country. If you chose to target America's energy supplies, if you chose to bring this country down by taking down our energy pipelines or our oil and gas facilities, this

is where you would start. But we are not the only community at high risk and high threat of a terrorist attack. There are many throughout this country.

What we seek from this amendment is making sure that these communities have a pool of money with that threat. More importantly, we make sure that when other communities are added to this list, when they suddenly become at high threat and a high-risk community, that when they come to the Federal Government for help, they are not told, we're sorry, we sent this money to other regions, less likely, less at risk, but that was the money we had. Unfortunately for all our efforts, and I know our government moves so slowly, even with the best intentions, I am afraid our communities do not understand our grant application process. I do not think they understand our time line. I think our communities are at risk today. We offer this amendment in good faith, recognizing just how diligent our chairman is in trying to protect communities of all size and all risk.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), and others with whom we have consulted on trying to come up with a way to answer some of the fundamental questions. First of all, I think that we can be of agreement because, frankly, every Member, including the distinguished chairman and ranking member, have said that yes, the total number of dollars is probably not enough and this is going to be an ongoing process to see to it that we do allocate enough money to this because, frankly, we have no choice.

I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky, the gentleman from Minnesota, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and others who have worked so hard to get that number as high as we can get it. There also, I believe, can be no other answer but yes to the question, do some areas have greater costs than others? Are there greater costs in ports of California, in States like New York? I will give Members an example. It is costing New York City \$13 million a week to deal with the needs of homeland security. A week. If you drive over the Brooklyn Bridge at 3 o'clock in the morning on a weekday morning, you will find both lanes inside closest to the stanchion with a fixed patrol car sitting there all day, all night, because of the national security threat that exists. That is more police man-hours than many police departments, and that is something that New York is absorbing because of these risks.

Another question that is a little tougher to answer, but I know how I would answer it, is who should decide how homeland security funds get divided? Should it be my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations and those of us in this body,

or should it be Secretary Ridge and the administration? I vote for the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Minnesota and others here in this body, but I think we should keep in mind what Secretary Ridge has said.

□ 1645

Secretary Ridge has said very clearly, in fact, just within the last 24 hours, that he believes that the present way we are distributing the money should be changed. He said "distributing those dollars according to the old formula, I don't believe we get maximum security for the dollars that are expended at the national level."

This is continuing the quote: "I'd like to see the numbers significantly higher than \$500 million."

He goes on to say, "I think every State should be given a certain amount of money," a sentiment that I agree with, "but at the end of the day, I do believe that there are some communities and regions that need more money."

Continuing the quote: "I have concerns about the distribution formula, [where] We just basically send out dollars to States and localities on a formula that doesn't consider infrastructure, doesn't consider anything other than population." I do not believe that is where we are at this House, and frankly I do have great confidence in my colleagues deciding how to distribute the money, but we do have to recognize that this is not just a New York City issue, as the chairman alluded to previously. This is an issue that affects about 30 different States and localities all around the country. The gentleman from Texas articulated the needs of his district. Others have come to this floor and talked about their cities and States. The fact remains that there are certain places that unfortunately are more likely today to be targets of terrorist attack than others and have to take steps that cannot be avoided. If for no other reason, many of the trials that are being held of those that are accused of terrorism are being held in New York City. Just the enforcement costs in Washington, D.C. and suburban Virginia, in New York City, in Chicago, Illinois in one case, just those costs are much higher than they are elsewhere. There has been a large increase in the overall basic formula grant, and I think the committee deserves great credit for this. What this amendment seeks to do is take the \$700 million that was allocated last year, increase the \$500 million to that \$700 million. That still provides a \$700 million increase in the basic formula grant, and I believe that that is a healthy step.

I, however, want to say in closing, I want to close the way I began, I do believe that the chairman in his colloquy that he entered into earlier has clearly articulated his desire to get the money where it needs to go. I do believe that this is an amendment that gets the

chairman and gets our House to that place.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) a question.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to answer a question.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, did I just hear correctly a little while ago that the Secretary's request of our committee for the high-threat urban grant was zero?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. That is correct.

Mr. SABO. And our committee has recommended what?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Five hundred million.

Mr. SABO. Five hundred million. And this goes to a limited number of communities in the country?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. It goes to the so-called high-threat/high-density urban areas of the country, and I think they are talking probably of 20 cities or less, in the complete discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. SABO. Which criteria that many of us have trouble understanding yet. The balance of the money flows by formula to the States, including the States that are eligible for this additional \$500 million?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. That is correct.

Mr. SABO. Reclaiming my time, for those of us who come from the heartland of the country, we are having discussion over how much money should go to ports. We have allocated a significant amount, and others would like to allocate more. My assumption is most of that goes along the coast.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I would guess so. But there are not many ocean ports in Minneapolis, I do not think.

Mr. SABO. No. We do have a river one but fairly small. So I think it would be fair to say we made a special effort to try to allocate more money to ports, that that will go to a limited part of the country.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. That is correct.

Mr. SABO. But we find that when we raise threat levels in this country, the law enforcement and local responders are expected to respond throughout the country and they have the same problem over time, training, teaching people how to use new equipment, wondering what it means, increasing pressure on local law enforcement. What I hear from all of them is that their expenditures exceed whatever revenue they are getting from the Federal Government. I expect the gentleman hears the same thing.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I hear the same thing every day.

Mr. SABO. And this amendment, as I understand it, would take some of this little money that we distribute throughout the country and say we are going to cut that from everyone. Where they are working, trying to coordinate expenditures to make most efficient use of it, take it from that and give them to a few areas where we have already increased the administration's budget by \$500 million; am I right?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. That is the way I understand the amendment. It would take \$200 million away from all the States in order to beef up this cap from \$500 million to \$700 million just for the high-density/high-urban area grants.

Mr. SABO. Reclaiming my time, and this is money that local responders can use for buying new equipment in a coordinated fashion, in a State plan or for training to have them become equipped to meet the threats that may occur in this country?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. The gentleman is correct. In addition to that, as we have previously said, the subcommittee increased the amount of money for all of the grant programs of which there are seven, for firefighter grants and for infrastructure grants, emergency management grants, formula grants to States and cities and the like. All those grant programs, we increased by \$1 billion above what the President wanted and \$203 million more than the 2003 levels. So all of the States that have these high-density urban areas that would be eligible for the high-density grants will also be eligible for very larger pots of money that everyone else is trying to share with, and yet this amendment would take from that moneys and put it into the high-density/high-urban areas. We have gone through this in our subcommittee and in our full committee and we have labored with it and wrestled with it with the gentleman and in a bipartisan fashion from big cities and small, big States and small, and this was the best we could do. We think it is a fair way to do it. And to take the moneys from one area now and give it to another would open us up to an ugliness that I do not think we need to see in this battle.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I think he has given good advice to the body.

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

Mr. Chairman, in spite of the wonderful exchange, I rise in support of the amendment, and I have great respect for the Members here on both sides and what they go through in this process. It is a difficult one to question and constantly evaluating and balancing priorities.

My number one priority, as far as I am concerned, is to protect the American people. I think everybody in this Chamber supports that proposition. The question is how you would do that

the best way? We could do it in a lot of different ways. We can root out the terrorists overseas as our great brave men and women are doing in Iraq and Afghanistan and around the globe. That is one way. We have great local police departments and Federal law enforcement officials, intelligence officials who try to root out evil before it pops its head, and we can allocate funding to the places that need it the most. And I know there may be a fundamental difference as to where that money should go, and that is okay. But if the Members asked me how I stand up here and proclaim that not just New York City but those areas that we have defined as high-threat areas should get a disproportionate amount of this money, Exhibit A is September 11. Exhibit A demonstrates that the terrorists sought out places like New York City. Why? Because it is the capital of finance, the capital of the world in some people's minds, and, indeed, as we hope and pray they are not, but, indeed, they are out there trying to do the same thing right now. So if the Members ask me why we are here to try to shift the money to what we think is a priority, I think I would say I do not ever want to see something like September 11 happen again. And with all due respect to the towns and villages around the country that wrestle with this problem every day, I think it is common sense to suggest that some areas could be more targeted than others. I do not think there is an American who would not say every town is equal in that respect. So I would hope, and I take the chairman at his word because I have immense respect for him, for the people who he has around him, to work with us to ensure that not just New York City, but those urban areas full of American citizens get that funding they need.

It has been brought up before what Secretary Ridge says. I am not going to rehash it. I will submit it for the RECORD. New York City, counterterrorism, intelligence and public safety, \$200 million; training for first responders, police, fire, \$99 million; security enhancement for facilities, \$187 million; emergency preparation response equipment, \$189 million; communications and information technology, \$223 million. Total loan, \$900 million.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), who offered this, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), and I know the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) has worked hard. He mentioned the Brooklyn Bridge. Go to any bridge in New York City, any tunnel, 24 hours a day, people scanning cars, checking cars, checking trucks. Why? So that anybody coming into the city can feel more free and secure. That is what this debate is about. And I am hopeful that the good chairman once again, and I believe him, will follow through and use all existing systems to ensure that these cities and

urban areas get what they deserve and get what they need.

TOM RIDGE. Well first of all, I share both the Governor's and the Mayor's concern to reduce distributing those dollars. According to the old formula, I don't believe we would be at maximum security with the dollars that are being expended at the federal level. We are going to work to get that number as high as possible. Having been a member of Congress for twelve years, that's the beginning of the process. The House has had a number in mind. They've passed that and we'll be working with the Senate. There's still a long way to go, but I would like to see the number risen, significantly higher than the \$500 million.

REPORTER. Mr. Secretary, have you given the Governor and the Mayor a specific limit, a specific amount of money?

TOM RIDGE. No, I think we are all in agreement that it would have been a nice place to start with the 750. If we can get the Congress to restore that quarter of a billion dollars, that would be a great place to start. To finish there, that would be at least preserving the status quo. As for the supplemental, we got about \$700 million and I think at least preserving what we are able to distribute before. At the end of the day ladies and gentlemen, if you take a look at the population, the density of the population, the equivocal infrastructure and the threat, there is one city that no matter how you move those factors around and weigh those factors it ends up at the top of the list and its New York City. I think every state should be given a certain amount of money and they build up a capacity to protect the infrastructure, and the capacity to respond, and the capacity to prevent a terrorist attack. But at the end of the day, I do believe there are some communities and regions that need more money because of the multitude of factors, not just population.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate, as do other speakers, the hard work of the members of the Committee on Appropriations and of the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations subcommittee. The bill before us provides \$500 million for 47 high-threat/high-density areas, 47 cities. People are talking about New York. We are talking about 47 cities that are high-risk areas, \$500 million. The bill also provides, as I understand it, \$1.9 billion for the rest of the country. Low risk or less than high-risk areas. The amendment would change that somewhat to make it \$700 million for the 47 high-risk areas, \$700 million for all 47 high-risk areas combined, and \$1.7 billion the low-risk areas or less-than-high-risk areas in the rest of the country. By way of comparison, just keeping police officers on duty costs the City of New York, one high-risk area, \$676 million a year. This amendment would make \$700 million available to all 47 high-risk areas. So we are talking about a small fraction of what any of these high-risk areas are spending.

There is not enough being allocated, there is not enough that we could allocate, for all the high-risk areas and the rest of the areas. All some of us are saying here for New York, for Pennsylvania, for Illinois, for Houston, for

Texas, for other high-risk areas is that we should be a little more rational in allocating the funds a little more on the basis of where the heavier expenditures are necessary because of where the risks are and how much it costs to guard against those risks and a little less on the uniform geographic basis which is the other half of this allocation.

□ 1700

Now, I understand, of course, that in the end the committee and the conference committee are going to make this allocation. What we are saying now is we want to bring to the attention of the body some of the considerations that say that there should be a little more rationale, rationality, to put a little more of the money for high-risk areas where so much more is necessary.

I appreciate the work that has been done by the committee and the work that will be done. I hope the committee will see its way clear to balancing this a little better, not for New York alone, but for the other 46 high-risk areas which have billions of dollars that have to be spent on this, not hundreds of millions.

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

I would simply like to observe one fact, Mr. Chairman. I understand that one of the reasons why so many members of the New York delegation are exercised on this issue today is because Mr. Ridge, who is the head of the Homeland Security agency, was quoted in the newspapers saying that, yes, it was absolutely true, there ought to be more money for high-threat areas. That is very nice to hear him say that.

The problem is, his budget, the budget presented by the President on behalf of his agency, had not one dime in for that purpose, and this committee put in \$500 million. It was \$700 million that was put in in the omnibus just a few months ago.

So I appreciate the sentiments being voiced here today, but I would point out that since this House passed a tax package which has taken away this committee's ability to provide funding that we ought to be providing for this and other high-priority areas in this bill, it seems to me that at this point, rather than asking this committee to get a double hernia trying to do something which is fiscally impossible, given the budget caps that we have been provided, it seems to me what he ought to do is march down to the White House and tell the President to amend his budget and his tax bill so we can afford his legitimate request. Without that, to me, at this point, we are just flap-jawing and we are not going to have any real opportunity to help the areas of the country you are talking about, except by hurting other areas of the country.

The Republican tax package which my colleagues voted for on that side of the aisle has put us in this position

where, if we are going to deal with problems in one section of the country, we have to beggar thy neighbor. I am not very enthused about that. I think New York and other high-impact areas deserve this money, but I think the rural areas do too; and I would simply say that short as this bill is on this item, it does a whole lot better by that part of the country than the President's recommendation.

So the first thing I would say to Mr. Ridge is, go back to Washington and lobby your President, to ask him to put in the money that you told the New York folks was necessary.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am going to probably not take the full 5 minutes because, in part, I am going to reiterate some things that have already been said here on the floor: in part, the colloquy that the chairman of the subcommittee engaged in and, in part, in reflection of the last two amendments in particular, which I think point out the real difficult task this subcommittee, this chairman, and the ranking member faced in the course of putting together this plan.

In stating the obvious, I will agree with the ranking member of the overall committee. It is quite clear that there apparently has been a change at the administration; that the current plan or the current structure of the plan that was sent forward has changed significantly, certainly overnight, and it is somewhat reflective in the fact that my colleagues in the New York delegation have come to the floor and have argued vehemently. But they are not new to that argument. We have all been making the case that we are not quite sure whether there is enough money in high-risk, high-density funding in this particular program. But I can tell my colleagues that not anyone, Mr. Chairman, in this Chamber, in this House, and in this Nation can tell us whether we have appropriated enough at this point in time. That is exactly the point, exactly the point that I think the chairman of the subcommittee has been making.

Given the information we have now, given the money that has been appropriated and flowed out, given what we know in terms of the expenses, and we talked about it in that colloquy earlier, we are trying to meet those needs, that this House has recognized that needs exist in specific areas that rise to a certain level above what the rest of the community is, and that it is somewhat grossly unfair for us to have to make those determinations on where exactly all of this goes, taking possibly from one area unequally and giving to another area.

But it is absurd to make the point or argue that there is not enough money there. We have appropriated billions and billions of dollars, and what we see here in place is a work in progress.

I would say to my friends from New York especially, but to those from

other parts of the country who have introduced the last couple of amendments who would like to see us take from one fund to the other, that that is not the appropriate course at this time, given the information that we have. I actually trust the notion that when we go to conference, the very people who created the high-risk, high-density fund, the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS), this subcommittee, are in the best place to determine what that appropriate funding is going to be; and I have every bit of confidence that we are going to be able to meet that need.

There has been an acknowledgment on this floor by the chairman, by this committee, that the work is incomplete; that there are needs that are going to be met. It is not just here in high-risk; it is in a lot of other places. But given the opportunity to examine that, I hear the call from the chairman, and I have every bit of confidence that we are going to be able to do that, equally covering the needs of the rest of the communities in our Nation to ensure the safety of the American people.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, based upon the gentleman's comments, the hard work that the gentleman has done, and I know that this is a key issue and I appreciate the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) and others who are involved in this, and I also appreciate the strong leadership of our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS); and based upon this discussion today, based upon the hard work, because we all try to raise the level of funding for our communities, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE

ADMINISTRATIVE AND REGIONAL OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for administrative and regional operations of the Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate, \$168,589,000, including activities authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), sections 107 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404-405), Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, and the Homeland Security Act of 2002; of which not to exceed \$3,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

PREPAREDNESS, MITIGATION, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY

For necessary expenses for preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery activities of the Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate, \$363,339,000, including activities authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), sections 107 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404-405), Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, and the Homeland Security Act of 2002; of which \$25,000,000 shall be for emergency operations centers grants: *Provided*, That the aggregate charges assessed during fiscal year 2004, as authorized by Public Law 106-377, shall not be less than 100 percent of the amounts anticipated by the Department of Homeland Security necessary for its radiological emergency preparedness program for the next fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the methodology for assessment and collection of fees shall be fair and equitable, and shall reflect costs of providing such services, including administrative costs of collecting such fees: *Provided further*, That fees received pursuant to this section shall be deposited in this account as offsetting collections, shall become available for authorized purposes on October 1, 2004, and shall remain available until expended.

PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses for countering potential biological, disease, and chemical threats to civilian populations, \$484,000,000, including \$400,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the Strategic National Stockpile.

BIODEFENSE COUNTERMEASURES

For necessary expenses for securing medical countermeasures against biological terror attacks, \$5,593,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,418,000,000 may be obligated during fiscal years 2004 through 2008, of which not to exceed \$890,000,000 may be obligated during fiscal year 2004.

GRANT PROGRAMS

For activities designed to reduce the risk of flood damage to structures pursuant to the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), notwithstanding sections 1366(b)(3) (B)-(C) and 1366(f) of such Act, and for a pre-disaster mitigation grant program pursuant to title II of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5131 et seq.), \$200,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$20,000,000 shall be derived from the National Flood Insurance Fund, and shall remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided*, That grants made for pre-disaster mitigation shall be awarded on a competitive basis subject to the criteria in section 203(g) of such title II (42 U.S.C. 5133(g)): *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 203(f) of such title II (42 U.S.C. 5133(f)), grant awards shall be made without reference to State allocations, quotas, or other formula-based allocation of funds.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER

To carry out an emergency food and shelter program pursuant to title III of Public Law 100-77 (42 U.S.C. 11331 et seq.), \$153,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That total administrative costs shall not exceed 3½ percent of the total appropriation.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to, first of all, before I enter into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman, thank the chairman of the subcommittee. Even before it was created, the leaders on this subcommittee were instrumental in helping our first responders.

There has been a lot of rhetoric about this Congress not doing enough for the first responders. Let me say to my colleagues in this body that before 9-11 occurred there was no program to assist our first responders nationwide, nothing. And Congress has, over the past years, had plenty of opportunities, but never saw fit. And disasters were not new. We had them all during the history of this country.

It was this Congress in 2000, with the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the full committee and the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, who saw fit to create a grant program for our 32,000 fire and EMS departments in America. That was created in 2000, the year before 9-11. Initially, it was funded at \$100 million. It went to \$300 million, and this year, because of the leadership of the distinguished chairman from Kentucky and the support of the ranking member, the support for our firefighter grant program is at \$715 million.

Many of our colleagues have said it is the most popular and most successful program that Congress has created. We are doing good work on behalf of the Nation's first responders. I want to applaud this subcommittee for their outstanding efforts and let them know, as the founder and chairman of the Fire Caucus and a former fire chief myself, they have done outstanding work; and it is paying dividends all over the country.

So, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member, thank you for your strong support of the Nation's first responders.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to engage in a colloquy with my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, regarding a very important program called FIRESAT.

Mr. Chairman, one need not look further than the news reports of the destructive and violent wildfires in Arizona. In 2000, over 8 million acres of pristine wilderness burned, and Federal agencies expended more than \$1.3 billion in fire suppression costs. Last year, in 2002, wildfires scorched over 7 million acres. Hundreds of homes were destroyed and firefighters gave their lives.

FIRESAT is a satellite system that is able to detect wildfires in their early stages while they are still less than 1 acre in size. While the tools are at our disposal to save lives and billions of dollars, the equipment for this program remains boxed in offices in Reston, Virginia. This project can be fully activated with the necessary security up-

grades and software upgrades in time for the fire season this year for \$7.5 million. In relation to the billions of dollars lost in these wild land fires every year, this is truly a smart investment. Finally, Mr. Chairman, we have the technology and the means to do something about this.

FIRESAT was originally labeled the Hazard Support System and developed by Ratheon with funds which I obtained from the Department of Defense in 1997. The system was subsequently transferred to the U.S. Geological Survey and NOAA who, for unknown reasons, did not request funds for the program in their budget. At the request last year of Joe Albaugh, the director of FEMA, we successfully transferred the system, now named FIRESAT, within the Homeland Security Act to the Department of Homeland Security's Directorate for Emergency Preparedness and Response.

Today is our opportunity to install a commonsense solution to the annual wildfires that wreck havoc to communities and forests all over America and place countless firefighters in danger. I hope that under the leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) an opportunity will present itself to fund this economical and much-needed program.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me return the thanks. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been our leader in the Congress for first responders, not just firefighters, but first responders in general; and he brings an expertise to this job not just from an educational point of view, but he is back there with them. So I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on these issues and for bringing this very timely subject to our attention.

Considering the devastation that wildfires cause to our Nation each year, I look forward to working with the gentleman during conference so that we can address this important matter.

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

Mr. Chairman, the House is set to pass a Homeland Security appropriations bill that falls well short of where our country needs to be to effectively combat our greatest vulnerability: the threat to our Nation's port facilities.

Today, in the Democratic Caucus Task Force on Homeland Security, we had the opportunity to hear from Rand Beers, who recently resigned from President Bush's National Security Council because he said that "the administration wasn't matching its deeds to its words in the war on terrorism. They are making us less secure, not more secure."

He told us that our Nation's port facilities are crying out for protection

and that the administration's neglect of the issue was a cause of great concern and puzzlement for him.

The Coast Guard says that the cost of infrastructure improvements to secure our ports for fiscal year 2004 would run around \$963 million. This bill only appropriates \$100 million. Welcome funding, yes, but far short of where we need to be.

The Coast Guard also says that it will need \$70 million to evaluate the security plans for ports across America by the July 2004 deadline mandated by the Maritime Transportation and Security Act. This bill does not provide any of the \$70 million the Coast Guard says it needs.

The Obey amendment would address these and many others needs, yet we cannot consider the Obey amendment here today.

Why is it that we continue to neglect port security funding when the CIA tells us we are more likely to be attacked by a weapon of mass destruction smuggled aboard a ship than we are by an intercontinental ballistic missile? The fact that our ports are threatened might come as a surprise to millions of Americans who watched as Secretary Ridge announced that the Department of Homeland Security was releasing millions of dollars in port security grants.

□ 1715

But it does not come as a surprise to those of us in Congress who listened as administration officials told us that those scant few dollars appropriated for port security grant programs and Operation Safe Commerce would probably be rerouted to aviation security.

Mr. Chairman, in light of recent world events, this is simply unacceptable. We are not giving port security the funding it needs just weeks after an Egyptian sailor attempted to smuggle anthrax aboard a ship bound for North America. We are not giving port security the funding it needs the day after 600 tons of explosives were discovered aboard a ship bound for a fictitious company in Sudan. And we are not funding port security the same day my hometown paper, the Houston Chronicle, says that al Qaeda might be targeting oil and port facilities in Houston during the Fourth of July holiday.

We cannot afford to ignore the Obey amendment. Like Rand Beers said, "America's ports are crying out for protection."

Mr. Chairman, it is about time we start listening.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for programs as authorized by section 33 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), \$750,000,000 to remain available through September 30, 2005: *Provided*, That up to 5 percent of this amount shall be transferred to

"Preparedness, Mitigation, Response, and Recovery" for program administration.

DISASTER RELIEF

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), \$1,800,000,000 and, notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 5203, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$22,000,000 may be transferred to the Office of Inspector General for audits and investigations.

FLOOD MAP MODERNIZATION FUND

For necessary expenses pursuant to section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, \$200,000,000, and such additional sums as may be provided by State and local governments or other political subdivisions for cost-shared mapping activities under section 1360(f) of such Act; to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, not to exceed \$32,761,000 for salaries and expenses associated with flood mitigation and flood insurance operations, and not to exceed \$77,809,000 for flood mitigation, to remain available until September 30, 2005, including up to \$20,000,000 for expenses under section 1366 of such Act of 1968, which amount shall be available for transfer to Grant Programs until September 30, 2005, and which amounts shall be derived from offsetting collections assessed and collected pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4014, and shall be retained and used for necessary expenses under this heading: *Provided*, That no funds, in excess of \$55,000,000 for operating expenses; \$565,897,000 for agents' commissions and taxes; and \$40,000,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings, shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund without prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For direct loans, as authorized by section 319 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act: *Provided*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$25,000,000: *Provided further*, That the cost of modifying such loans shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, \$558,000.

TITLE IV—OTHER DEPARTMENTAL ACTIVITIES

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for citizenship and immigration services, including international services, \$248,500,000.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for; payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377 (42 U.S.C. 402 note); and recreation and welfare; \$4,703,530,000, of which \$1,300,000,000 shall be for defense-related activities; of which \$25,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund; and of which not to exceed \$3,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be available for pay of administrative expenses in connection with

shipping commissioners in the United States: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for expenses incurred for yacht documentation under section 12109 of title 46, United States Code, except to the extent fees are collected from yacht owners and credited to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the Coast Guard's environmental compliance and restoration functions under chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, \$17,000,000, to remain available until expended.

RESERVE TRAINING

For all necessary expenses of the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; maintenance and operation of facilities; and supplies, equipment, and services; \$94,051,000.

ACQUISITIONS, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary expenses of acquisition, construction, renovation, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto, \$805,000,000, of which \$23,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund; of which \$66,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 2008 to acquire, repair, renovate, or improve vessels, small boats, and related equipment; \$138,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 2006 for other equipment; \$70,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2005 for personnel compensation and benefits and related costs; and \$530,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2008 for the Integrated Deepwater Systems program: *Provided*, That the Commandant of the Coast Guard is authorized to dispose of surplus real property, by sale or lease, and the proceeds shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and shall be available until September 30, 2006 only for Rescue 21 (the National Distress and Response System Modernization program): *Provided further*, That upon initial submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2005 President's budget, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall transmit to the Congress a comprehensive capital investment plan for the United States Coast Guard that includes funding for each budget line item for fiscal years 2005 through 2009, with total funding for each year of the plan constrained to the funding targets for those years as estimated and approved by the Office of Management and Budget.

ALTERATION OF BRIDGES

For necessary expenses for alteration or removal of obstructive bridges, \$19,500,000, to remain available until expended.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation; and maintenance, rehabilitation, lease and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law; \$22,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$3,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund: *Provided*, That there may be credited to and used for the purposes of this appropriation funds received from State and local governments, other public authorities, private sources, and foreign countries, for expenses incurred for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

RETIRED PAY

For retired pay, including the payment of obligations therefor otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose, payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plans,

payment for career status bonuses under the National Defense Authorization Act, and for payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependents Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C. ch. 55), \$1,020,000,000.

INFORMATION ANALYSIS AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Directorate of Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection of the Department of Homeland Security as authorized by law, \$776,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, ACQUISITION, AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of activities of the Department of Homeland Security in carrying out the purposes of title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296), for basic and applied research, development, test and evaluation, construction, procurement, production, modification and modernization of systems, subsystems, spare parts, accessories, training devices, operation of the Science and Technology Directorate and its organizations and activities, including the Homeland Security Advanced Research Projects Agency, for cooperative programs with States and local governments to enable the detection, destruction, disposal, or mitigation of the effects of weapons of mass destruction and other terrorist weapons, and for the construction, maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of buildings and other facilities, and equipment, necessary for the activities of the Directorate, \$900,360,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Secret Service, \$1,148,700,000, including purchase of American-made side-car compatible motorcycles; hire of aircraft; services of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Director; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia, and fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control, as may be necessary to perform protective functions; for payment of per diem and subsistence allowances to employees where a protective assignment during the actual day or days of the visit of a protectee require an employee to work 16 hours per day or to remain overnight at his or her post of duty; the conducting of and participating in firearms matches; presentation of awards; for travel of Secret Service employees on protective missions without regard to the limitation on such expenditures in this or any other Act; for research and development; for making grants to conduct behavioral research in support of protective research and operations; not to exceed \$25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; not to exceed \$100,000 to provide technical assistance and equipment to foreign law enforcement organizations in counterfeit investigations; for payment in advance for commercial accommodations as may be necessary to perform protective functions; and for uniforms without regard to the general purchase limitation for the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That \$1,633,000 shall be available for forensic and related support of investigations of missing and exploited children: *Provided further*, That \$4,783,000 shall be available as a grant for activities related to the investigations of exploited children and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That up to \$18,000,000 for protective travel shall remain

available until September 30, 2005: *Provided further*, That subject to the reimbursement of actual costs to this account, funds appropriated in this account shall be available, at the discretion of the Director, for the following: training United States Postal Service law enforcement personnel and Postal police officers, training Federal law enforcement officers, training State and local government law enforcement officers on a space-available basis, and training private sector security officials on a space-available basis: *Provided further*, That the United States Secret Service is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from agencies and entities, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, receiving training sponsored by the James J. Rowley Training Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available under this heading at the end of the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the James J. Rowley Training Center is authorized to provide short-term medical services for students undergoing training at the Center.

Mr. LATHAM (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 37, line 13 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 31, line 6, through page 37, line 13, is as follows:
ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS,
AND RELATED EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of construction, repair, alteration, and improvement of facilities, \$3,579,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

(TRANSFERS OF UNEXPENDED BALANCES)

SEC. 502. Subject to the requirements of section 503 of this Act, the unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this Act. Balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 503. (a) None of the funds provided by this Act, provided by previous appropriation Acts to the agencies in or transferred to the Department of Homeland Security that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2004, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that: (1) creates a new program; (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity; (3) increases funds for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress; or (4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either the House or Senate Committees on Appropriations for a different purpose, unless both Committees on Appropriations are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided by this Act, provided by previous appropriation Acts to

the agencies in or transferred to the Department of Homeland Security that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2004, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for programs, projects, or activities through a reprogramming of funds in excess of \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that (1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities; (2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity, or numbers of personnel by 10 percent as approved by the Congress; or (3) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel that would result in a change in existing programs, projects, or activities, as approved by the Congress; unless the Committees on Appropriations are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(c) Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Homeland Security in this Act or provided in previous appropriation Acts may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds and shall not be available for obligation unless the Committees on Appropriations are notified 15 days in advance of such transfer.

SEC. 504. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2004 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2004 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2005, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines.

SEC. 505. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, funds may be used for hire and purchase of motor vehicles as authorized by section 1343 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided*, That purchase for police-type use of passenger vehicles may be made without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year.

SEC. 506. The Federal Emergency Management Agency "Working Capital Fund" shall be available to the Department of Homeland Security, as authorized by sections 503 and 1517 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, for expenses and equipment necessary for maintenance and operations of such administrative services as the Secretary of Homeland Security determines may be performed more advantageously as central services. Such fund shall hereafter be known as the "Department of Homeland Security Working Capital Fund".

SEC. 507. The Federal Emergency Management Agency "Bequests and Gifts" account shall be available to the Department of Homeland Security, as authorized by sections 503 and 1517 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, for the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts and bequests, including property, to facilitate the work of the Department of Homeland Security: *Provided*, That such fund shall hereafter be known as "Department of Homeland Security, Gifts and Donations": *Provided further*, That any gift or bequest shall be used in accordance with the terms of that gift or bequest to the greatest extent practicable.

SEC. 508. Funds made available by this Act for intelligence activities are deemed to be

specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2004 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2004.

SEC. 509. The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is directed to establish an accrediting body that will include representatives from the Federal law enforcement community, as well as non-Federal accreditation experts involved in law enforcement training. The purpose of this body will be to establish standards for measuring and assessing the quality and effectiveness of Federal law enforcement training programs, facilities, and instructors.

SEC. 510. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to plan, finalize, or implement regulations that would establish a vessel traffic safety fairway less than 5 miles wide between the Santa Barbara Traffic Separation Scheme and the San Francisco Traffic Separation Scheme.

SEC. 511. None of the funds in this Act may be used to make a grant unless the Secretary of Homeland Security notifies the Committees on Appropriations not less than 3 full business days before any grant allocation, discretionary grant award, or letter of intent totaling \$1,000,000 or more is announced by the department or its directorates from (1) any discretionary or formula-based grant program of the Office of Domestic Preparedness; (2) any letter of intent from the Transportation Security Administration; or (3) any port security grant: *Provided*, That no notification shall involve funds that are not available for obligation.

SEC. 512. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no agency shall purchase, construct, and/or lease any additional facilities, except within or contiguous to existing locations, to be used for the purpose of conducting Federal law enforcement training without the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations, except that the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is authorized to obtain the temporary use of additional facilities by lease, contract, or other agreement for training which cannot be accommodated in existing Center facilities.

SEC. 513. The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is directed to ensure that all of the training centers under its control are operated at their highest potential capacity efficiency throughout the fiscal year. In order to facilitate this direction, the Director is authorized to schedule basic and advanced law enforcement training at any site the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center determines is warranted in the interests of the Government to ensure the best utilization of the Center's total capacity for training, notwithstanding legislative prohibitions.

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

SEC. 514. Section 114 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(t) FEE AUTHORITY FOR TRANSPORTATION CREDENTIALS.—

"(1) Subject to the provisions of this subsection, the Secretary of Homeland Security may impose reasonable fees and charges on an individual or an individual's employer, where such an individual requires a credential or background records check under Federal law for an activity in the field of transportation, to cover the costs of providing the credential or performing the backgrounds records check, including—

"(A) conducting or obtaining a criminal history records check and a review of available law enforcement databases and records

of other governmental and international agencies;

“(B) review and adjudication of requests for waiver and appeals of agency decisions with respect to providing the credential, performing the background records check, and denials of requests for waiver and appeals; and

“(C) any other costs of the Transportation Security Administration related to providing the credential or performing the background records check.

“(2) The Secretary shall ensure that the fees are reasonably related to the costs of the Transportation Security Administration for providing services rendered. The amount of costs imposed under this subsection shall be determined by the Secretary and shall not be subject to judicial review.

“(3) Notwithstanding section 9701 of title 31 and the procedural requirements of section 553 of title 5, the Secretary may impose a fee under this subsection through the publication of notice in the Federal Register.

“(4) Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, any fee collected under this section—

“(A) shall be credited as an offsetting collection to the account in the Treasury from which the expenses were incurred and are available to the Secretary for these expenses; and

“(B) shall remain available until expended.”.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 514.

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against section 514 on page 37, line 14 through page 39, line 10. This particular section violates clause 2 of rule XXI. It changes existing law and therefore constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill in violation of the House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other Members desiring to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that section 514 proposes directly to change existing law, to wit: section 114 of title 49, United States Code, and as such it constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(b) of rule 21, and the point of order is sustained. Section 514 is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 515. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the production of customs declarations that do not inquire whether the passenger has been in the proximity of livestock.

SEC. 516. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available for any activity or for paying the salary of any Government employee where funding an activity or paying a salary to a Government employee would result in a determination, regulation, or policy that would prohibit the enforcement of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

SEC. 517. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to allow—

(1) the importation into the United States of any good, ware, article, or merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured by forced or indentured child labor, as determined pursuant to section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307); or

(2) the release into the United States of any good, ware, article, or merchandise on which there is in effect a detention order,

pursuant to such section 307, on the basis that the good, ware, article, or merchandise may have been mined, produced, or manufactured by forced or indentured child labor.

SEC. 518. Appropriations to the Department of Homeland Security in this Act shall be available for purchase of insurance for official motor vehicles operated in foreign countries; purchase of motor vehicles without regard to the general purchase price limitations for vehicles purchased and used overseas for the current fiscal year; entering into contracts with the Department of State for the furnishing of health and medical services to employees and their dependents serving in foreign countries; and services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 519. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used for expenses of any construction, repair, alteration, and acquisition project for which a prospectus, if required by the Public Buildings Act of 1959, has not been approved, except that necessary funds may be expended for each project for required expenses for the development of a proposed prospectus.

SEC. 520. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to pursue or adopt guidelines or regulations requiring airport sponsors to provide to the Transportation Security Administration without cost building construction, maintenance, utilities and expenses, or space in airport sponsor-owned buildings for services relating to aviation security: *Provided*, That the prohibition of funds in this section does not apply to—

(1) negotiations between the agency and airport sponsors to achieve agreement on “below-market” rates for these items, or

(2) space for necessary security checkpoints.

SEC. 521. Section 835 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296; 6 U.S.C. 395) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting before the period “, or any subsidiary of such an entity”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting “before, on, or” after the “completes”;

(3) in subsection (e)(1)(B), by striking “which is after the date of enactment of this Act and”;

(4) in subsection (d) by striking all after “in the interest of” and inserting “national security.”.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against section 521 on page 41, line 15 through line 25, of H.R. 2555 on the grounds that this provision changes existing law in violation of clause 2(b) of the House rule 21 and therefore is legislation included in a general appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Do further Members desire to be heard on the point of order?

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut may proceed.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my serious opposition to this point of order and point out the hypocrisy of what my friends on the other side of the aisle are doing here.

I offered this amendment during the Committee on Appropriations consider-

ation of this bill. It was accepted by the chairman and it was passed on a voice vote. Yet, today they use a technical excuse to justify stripping it from the bill. Just another gimmick.

This amendment would do nothing more than restore the law to the form it held when 318 Members of this House voted for a motion to recommit that I offered to prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from contracting with corporate expatriates on July 26, 2002. But before that bill became law, loopholes were added that exempted most of the expatriate companies from the provision.

Expatriate companies are those that go offshore solely for the purposes of not paying taxes in the United States. At the time the majority leadership said publicly that those loopholes would be closed. Last November 19 the former leader of the other body told reporters that he had received a commitment from the Speaker and the majority leader that this would be fixed. Unfortunately, we have yet to do that.

We have an obligation to address this issue. American companies, particularly those contracting with our government, ought to be paying American taxes just like every citizen and corporation in this country. By this action, the Republican majority is demonstrating that they do not hold those same values. Since the majority leadership has failed to act, I offered an amendment in the Committee on Appropriations to close those loopholes added to the law last summer. Let me stress again that this amendment was accepted by the chairman of the subcommittee and passed on a voice vote.

The amendment would simply prohibit Federal agencies from contracting with a domestic subsidiary of any company that has moved overseas. This will prevent corporations from setting up a shell company overseas but then continue to exploit the tax loophole by obtaining government contracts here at home.

One high ranking Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means said about closing this loophole that “business does not like that.”

Is that how we decide how to solve our problem? This amendment would further make the contract ban retroactive so it applies to existing corporate expatriates.

Finally, the amendment includes a waiver solely for the purposes of national security, which is what was included in the original ban passed on the floor. That waiver was unnecessarily expanded last year for all intents and purposes, making the entire provision meaningless.

Evidence shows that corporate expatriates cost our government about \$4 billion in revenue, funds that we sorely need. Yet they continue to receive \$2.7 billion in government contracts after they have abdicated their most basic responsibility as citizens. We should not reward these companies with contracts from the very department that

is charged with safeguarding our homeland security.

We should not use procedural sleight of hands to disguise the fact that some in this body want to condone that very practice. I am not calling for a vote at this time, but I would hope that the House leadership will seriously revisit this issue. It is wrong. It is un-American, and it is a travesty to think about these companies who refuse to pay taxes to this country and yet want to be the beneficiaries of the dollars and the contracts in order to deal with homeland security. Let us live up to the commitment that 318 of us made last year.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further Members desiring to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, the DeLauro amendment adopted by the Committee on Appropriations as part of the Homeland Security Appropriations Bill is in fact a significant change in the procurement policy of the United States, a subject clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Reform under House Rule 10.

The DeLauro amendment calls for a broad sweeping contracting ban for so-called inverted domestic corporations and is clearly a change in existing law. As such, this section is in clear violation of clause 2(b) of House Rule 21, providing that no provision changing existing law shall be reported in any general appropriations bill.

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

The Chair is prepared to rule and will so rule.

The Chair finds that section 521 proposes directly to change existing law, to wit: section 835 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, and as such it constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(b) of rule 21, and the point of order is sustained. Section 521 is stricken from the bill.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for the better part of 2 years now we have been promised a vote on closing the Bermuda loophole, an effort to amend this process on the floor where the Republican leadership has accepted by a margin so lopsided that it rivals any vote that we will take in any given legislative year. I believe 318 members of this House voted to do something about these corporate expatriates who not only leave the United States to avoid paying taxes but then have the unmitigated gall to bid on defense work in homeland security legislation. Ingersoll Rand, TYCO, these companies are avoiding billions of dollars in taxes, joint taxes estimated that we would garner, an additional \$5 billion if we would simply close the Bermuda tax loophole.

Now, I know what the talking points of the Republican Party are on this. It is the corporate tax structure that is at

fault. Well, if that is the case after 9 years why have not we done something about it? It is unbelievable where we had a chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means who used to say he was going to pull the Tax Code up by its roots. Well, America tonight knows that that tax system is more complicated and more unfair than ever.

We were going to drive a stake through the heart of the Tax Code. We were going to have tax simplicity. You know what we have had? We have had the rewarding of rich friends by our failure to address this issue.

For the Americans that are viewing this evening, I would ask you what would happen if you moved to Bermuda and declared that by renting a post office box you had taken citizenship on that island nation.

□ 1730

The IRS would be after you the next day. There would be no avenue of retreat, no opportunity to do what these corporations are doing. We have got 150,000 troops in Iraq tonight; and we talk about patriotism, while these guys renounce their citizenship and everybody knows that they continue to do substantial business and have their real corporate addresses here in the United States? And yet we cannot get a vote in this House of Representatives on that matter.

Two years ago, David Rogers in the Wall Street Journal was promised by the leadership of this House "there would have to be a vote on the Bermuda tax loophole." We are no closer to doing that this evening than we were 2 years ago; and that argument, again it galls everybody. It is the corporate tax structure that is at fault, not these folks moving offshore to avoid their responsibilities to live in this great Nation. That is patriotic, to pay our taxes and the \$82 billion that Iraq is costing and \$42 billion for homeland security.

We define patriotism by allowing these guys to move their corporate address to Bermuda for one exclusive purpose, to avoid taxes. What does that say about this great Nation and our principles? Yet the intransigence of the leadership on the majority side month after month after month is to do nothing about it. Put that question on the floor here about whether or not these folks should pay their taxes and I tell my colleagues what we would get, 350 votes for it and everybody knows it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today with my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), in support of providing domestic sourcing preferences for the Department of Homeland Security. As we take steps to protect our homeland security, an integral part of the process is strengthening our national and economic security. Through applying provisions that support the American industrial defense base to the Department of Homeland Security we can

help ensure that American companies are able to provide the crucial goods needed by the agency to promote homeland security.

The American taxpayer provides the dollars which Congress then appropriates. It is only right that those same dollars are reinvested back into our economy. These dollars are reinvested back into our companies and workers and not those of a foreign country who could be an opponent or, at worst, a non-ally.

It is wise to provide for the livelihood of American citizens while funding government agencies. Homeland security starts at home, just as the name implies, in the homes and paychecks of American families. One of the most frequent questions I am asked by constituents is how they can sell their products or goods to the U.S. Government.

Today we have the ability to ensure that U.S. companies will be able to pursue and win contracts with the Federal Government. We have the opportunity to safeguard our economic security and keep America strong while providing necessary funds for America's homeland security.

My top two priorities are economic security and national security. Strengthening our homeland security is something that we are all working hard to do. There is no reason that the Department of Homeland Security should not do everything they can within reason to buy American goods.

A few years back we had an unfortunate episode where the U.S. Army purchased over 1 million black berets for U.S. soldiers. The problem was that a majority of those berets were made in China, and I think we all can agree that is ridiculous.

We need to take steps to ensure that government agencies not only improve our homeland security, but we have also got to take advantage of every opportunity we can to strengthen and promote jobs here at home.

I urge adoption of this crucial provision and would like to thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and his staff for working with me to provide American companies every opportunity to contract with the Department of Homeland Security and keep America strong.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the ranking member of the full committee and the chairman of the full committee, as well as the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), respectively the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security, are making every effort to work as diligently as they can on addressing the question of homeland security.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to address the question of neighborhood security, and I believe that in the

course of the debate on the floor of the House many Members have come to debate questions and offer amendments not to be frivolous, but to ensure that our duty and responsibility to the American people are carried out.

I rise in support of an amendment, recognizing that the offerers have withdrawn it, but I rise to explain to my colleagues the importance of the concept offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER). I came back from field hearings not in my district but in Long Beach, California, and Los Angeles, California; and I think it is important to note that there is no attempt here to diminish anyone's need for security in any part of the country. In fact, I am a very strong advocate for focusing on urban and rural areas because no one ever knows where a terrorist will attack, but I think this concept of delivering moneys only on the basis of population and not having a formula that responds to the high-targeted areas, let me share with my colleagues from the Houston Chronicle a comment noted that, with Texas as the target, officials are especially concerned about oil or gas facilities and pipelines because al Qaeda terrorists in the past have talked about attacking the energy sector as a way of damaging America's economy, officials said.

Mr. Chairman, even on 9-11 as we were trying to find out what was happening, rumors abounded that Houston was one of the cities because of its oil interests and its oil facilities that might be on the list of the terrorists that were now in the United States and tragically and horribly had struck the World Towers. It is important to recognize reality, and this idea of the formula is to make sense out of a simple process that gives moneys on the basis of population.

I believe, for example, we would take one State that might get \$33 a person because of its population that is less than the State of Texas with its high density and its problems with oil refineries and other oil interests, and they would only get \$3 or \$4 a person. I know as we visited Long Beach and Los Angeles, and I use them only as an example, that the issue that was being made by those first responders was the need for resources in their hands.

Another point that was made was the need for resources to utilize the personnel, Mr. Chairman, not just for equipment, and this is one of the things that I believe we should openly discuss, that the formula that is presently utilized gives money only for equipment to our first responders. They need money for personnel. One can have the highest degree of equipment; but if they do not have personnel in the law enforcement, police departments, if they do not have personnel in the fire department, specifically the hazardous materials unit, that usually four people or five people or six people, it is key, Mr. Chairman, that we look

at this not from the position of indictment, that we are accusatory or that we are not in sync with the mission that we are going forward on, but at the same time we should look for it in improvement.

Let me share with my colleagues the words of Secretary Ridge and paraphrase him, that generally speaking, the way that we have been distributing funds of old does not help the present situation. The very fact that each State should get the same amount of money does not help us fight terrorism. Some States should get more money than others because they have been elevated to a higher risk of terrorism.

So the reason why I believe it was worthy to have the debate that provided us the opportunity to discuss a different formula change is because, Mr. Chairman, it is crucial that this body does the right thing in securing the American people, and changing the formula would help us do the right thing. Getting the moneys in the hands of those first responders and others helps us do the right thing; and I would hope as our colleagues see this bill move forward, giving us more money, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has suggested that we do, in the right and fair way would help do the right thing.

I ask my colleagues to consider these elements as we move forward.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 522. (a) None of the funds provided in this or previous appropriation Acts may be obligated for testing (other than simulations), deployment, or implementation of CAPPS2, the Computer Assisted Passenger Pre-screening System that the Transportation Security Administration ("TSA") plans to utilize to screen aviation passengers, until the General Accounting Office has reported to the Committees on Appropriations that—

(1) a system of due process exists whereby aviation passengers determined to pose a threat and either delayed or prohibited from boarding their scheduled flights by the TSA may appeal such decision and correct incorrect information contained in CAPPS2;

(2) the underlying error rate of the government and private data bases that will be used both to establish identity and assign a risk level to a passenger will not produce a large number of false positives that will result in a significant number of passengers being treated mistakenly or security resources being diverted;

(3) the TSA has stress-tested and demonstrated the efficacy and accuracy of all search tools in CAPPS2 and has demonstrated that CAPPS2 can make an accurate predictive assessment of those passengers who would constitute a threat to aviation;

(4) the Secretary of Homeland Security has established an internal oversight board to oversee and monitor the manner in which CAPPS2 is being developed and prepared;

(5) the TSA has built in sufficient operational safeguards to reduce the opportunities for abuse;

(6) substantial security measures are in place to protect CAPPS2 from unauthorized access by hackers or other intruders;

(7) the TSA has adopted policies establishing effective oversight of the use and operation of the system; and

(8) there are no specific privacy concerns with the technological architecture of the system.

(b) Not later than December 31, 2003, the National Academy of Sciences shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations that assesses the likely impact of the CAPPS2 system on privacy and civil liberties and includes recommendations for practices, procedures, regulations, or legislation to eliminate or minimize adverse effect of such system on privacy, discrimination, and other civil liberties.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order against section 522.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against section 522 on page 42, line 1, through page 43, line 24. This section violates clause 2 of rule XXI. It, in fact, changes existing law and, therefore, constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill in violation of the House rules.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I have assured the sponsor of this original provision, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), that the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will be adding a similar provision to our aviation security bill, H.R. 2144, during full committee markup tomorrow, Wednesday, and we will have similar language, and we do have the authority to authorize this language.

Unfortunately, his language is authorizing on an appropriations measure; and therefore I raise that point of order.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. SABO. It is sort of strange. Would the gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to yield.

Mr. SABO. In discussion of his point of order, we are trying to figure out how—

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair notes to the gentleman from Minnesota that under the rules of the House, debate on a point of order must be directed to the Chair, who hears each Member separately.

Mr. SABO. Okay. Let me see if I figure out how we do this, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. I would note, just to help the gentleman with his dilemma, that others may be heard on it on their own time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I think I understand what the gentleman from Florida is saying is that he is raising a point of order against this provision because it is legislation on an appropriation bill. However, he is also telling me that the authorizing committee is meeting tomorrow and it is their intent to adopt provisions that are similar in substance to what is contained in

the language of the appropriations bill, which will then be amended in another bill.

The gentleman from Minnesota would observe that, as he has read what is intended to be offered tomorrow, that in many ways it is similar and if that bill were before us we would not be subject to a point of order. However, the gentleman from Minnesota has also observed that some of the enforcement techniques within the proposed language are significantly weaker.

I would observe that the proposal that the committee will be considering tomorrow leaves the responsibility for reviewing CAPPS2 proposal internally in the Department while the language in question, which is subject to a point of order now, gives that responsibility to the GAO; and I would hope the gentleman from Florida would consider such language because frankly one of my concerns is the Department may not be equipped to make a good judgment.

We, frankly, have watched an agency that has had a problem trying to figure out which of their own employees do or do not have criminal backgrounds, and we think it might be a significant advantage to have the GAO look at their proposed plans before they are implemented rather than waiting until a year after deployment and development of these plans to have a GAO study.

□ 1745

So I would urge the gentleman from Florida, as he ponders whether he should continue to press this point of order, that they might well consider expanding at an earlier stage the review of GAO of the pending plans of the agency.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH). Does any other Member wish to be heard?

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, again, I think that the point of order that I raised clearly does demonstrate, in fact if we look at the language before us, that there is authorization language contained by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), which is excellent language and directive language but it does authorize on an appropriations measure, which is not allowed under the rules of the House.

The gentleman has raised issues about the substance of what is proposed in the full committee markup, and we will address some of those, but we do have a provision and we clearly have under our charter the responsibility for legislating the procedure which is followed. We will have the Under Secretary directed to not implement, other than on a test basis, the CAPPS2 program until the Under Secretary provides to Congress a certification that certain steps are taken. And later on we will have, of course, a GAO review required under our measure.

So we have the authority to the point of order clearly under the charter with-

in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. This is going to be considered under the FAA AIR-21 reauthorization. The security measure which is being considered, H.R. 2144, will be marked up tomorrow and blended into legislation which has already passed the House and, again, clearly under our authority as authorizers.

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

The Chair finds that section 522 proposes explicitly to supersede existing law, most immediately by proposing to restrict funds that were appropriated in other acts. As such, it constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(b) of rule XXI, and the point of order is sustained. Section 522 is stricken from the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAYES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYES:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the applicable provisions of the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken as to my support for this amendment, and if he so desires I would yield to my friend and cosponsor, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

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

Mr. HAYES. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I certainly appreciate the privilege of having my name associated with anything that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) does here.

The Buy American provisions that we have talked about a lot in the past on this floor are very germane to this debate. I appreciate the fact that we can offer this amendment, hopefully without anyone raising a point of order against it, because it is essential that in this appropriations bill, as we prioritize the homeland security needs of the future, that we put all the language we can in the bill to encourage United States business and enterprise to produce and provide the goods and services that we need to secure our homeland.

Let me give an example, one very large example. In this bill we actually fund into the future a program called BioShield, where the administration leads and we scrub and fund and hold the hearings on an effort to provide the stockpiles for vaccines and immunizations in the event that we are attacked. Companies all around the world make these products. But when we are talking about chelating agents that would actually provide relief and support to those people affected that we may stockpile in a dozen locations

around the country in very large quantities, I want a United States manufacturer, if at all possible, to make those products, and I want those products stockpiled here in the United States, if at all possible.

That is all that this language says, is that wherever we can we buy American for these products and services. And on this BioShield initiative in this bill, it is \$5.6 billion over the next 10 years, including a 2004 appropriation, the coming year appropriation of \$890 million. That is a lot of money. It is a lot of procurement. It is very important that wherever we can we look to United States companies.

Mr. Chairman, there are countries around the world that have not been particularly supportive of us in recent years that have the advanced capabilities of providing these products and services and goods from time to time. And we do not want to respond in a punitive way whatsoever. If they have the products, and we need them, and we have good relations, that is great. But what we want to say is there are businesses and workers and interests in this country that support our country with their taxes. We want to support them wherever we possibly can.

That is the intent. That is the reality of this legislation. Many have come before us and attached Buy American amendments to a host of legislative matters, some big, some small, but I have to say, as we begin this new Department of Homeland Security, as we properly resource it, I cannot think of a more important issue that we attach Buy American provisions to than securing our homeland, to make sure that we actually control as much as possible what these products actually are, to make sure that they are what they say they are, and that we know what we are getting if an event happens once again.

So, Mr. Chairman, I applaud the author, he and I are going in the same direction, and we have teamed up on this amendment.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), and I urge the support of others to keep America strong and to support our industrial defense base.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARKEY:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to approve, renew, or implement any aviation cargo security plan that permits the transporting of unscreened or uninspected cargo on passenger planes.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I bring a very important subject to the attention of the Members of the House. Each

one of us, justifiably so, and every American, more than 100 million, who get onto planes in our country every year are now required to take their shoes off as they go through a process in an airport to ensure that no danger will befall the other passengers on that plane. Now, that is completely justifiable, and I think all Americans, well, almost all Americans, accept that now as part of the process of getting on any airplane in America since September 11.

We in Boston, at Logan Airport, know the consequences, because two of the planes that were hijacked came from Boston, came from Logan Airport, and came from within five miles of my home. So my amendment today deals with the reality that after everyone's shoes have been inspected, bags have gone through security, and this is what the Transportation Security Administration now requires, after the booties of babies are taken off and inspected, underneath, on the same plane, on the same day, with the same passengers on board, with their shoes now back on after having been screened underneath the cargo, the cargo has not been screened.

My amendment would require that the cargo that goes on the passenger planes that more than 100 million Americans each year fly is screened as well as the passengers themselves, as well as grandma, as well as the babies with their booties, because it is unfair to every American who gets on a plane to be put in danger that the cargo on that plane has not been screened.

Now, what do we mean by screening? We mean the same level of physical inspection of passenger plane cargo as is applied to passenger plane luggage and to the passengers themselves. What do we not mean? We do not mean the Known Shipper Program, which is the current excuse for allowing commercial cargo to be carried on passenger planes without physical screening. And which technology will we use? We will use the same technology that American air carriers use to screen cargo in international airports every single day of the week all day long. Who will do the screening? The same screeners who are now being laid off, 3,000 of them, 6,000 of them who are trained to do this job. We cannot allow this to go on any longer.

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

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time the gentleman has left?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, which will require the Transportation Security Administration, TSA, to develop a plan to screen or inspect all cargo that is carried on passenger planes.

To me, it blows me away that we would allow any freight to go in the

belly of an aircraft that has not been inspected. And at the very least the public has the right to know that basically 20 percent of the cargo in the belly of an aircraft is totally unscreened. Its cargo is unscreened. We could have not one, not two, not three, but we could have a number of planes knocked out of the sky at any one time simply because we are not inspecting the freight cargo that is in the belly of an aircraft.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I will yield back to my colleague and thank him for his amendment. I cannot think of a stronger and more important amendment.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman and I urge support of the full House on as important an amendment as we are going to be called on to vote on this year in Congress.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition. TSA currently screens cargo based on the Known Shipper Program and identifies potentially troublesome cargo by additional screening. By law, they are required to ensure adequate cargo security measures, but not 100 percent screening of air cargo. In essence, this amendment would stop airlines from loading cargo onto passenger aircraft until TSA can screen or inspect each individual piece.

Now, in the bill, we already provide \$50 million for the security of air cargo. This funding will do the following: It will develop an air cargo security program for domestic and foreign air cargo carriers. It will promote the development and implementation of a risk-based freight screening system that will identify pieces of cargo that require closer scrutiny and participation in the Known Shipper Program, including linkages with other databases to verify shipper information that is provided. We provide for development of state-of-the-art detection technologies that will screen cargo and also research and test devices that exist now and procedures to be applied to air cargo.

□ 1800

Right now, Mr. Chairman, it is not humanly possible to inspect every piece of cargo that goes onto the aircraft. TSA does not have the staff or technologies in place to do that. For example, airport screeners screen passengers and baggage using explosive detection and trace machines. These machines are not certified to screen cargo, nor can they handle the large pallets that cargo is typically shipped in. In these cases, the pallets would need to be broken apart and screened by hand. That is very time-consuming and labor intensive.

In addition, in many cases cargo is sorted and prepared onto pallets at airport warehouses nowhere near the airports; and to implement this amendment, the cargo would need to be screened at these off-site locations. Ac-

ording to an analysis prepared by Battelle just prior to 9-11, 100 percent screening of all cargo on passenger carriers would require at least \$500 million in the first year alone. That includes procurement of equipment, installation, training, and staffing. It would require 7,800 employees, which would include 6,600 screeners and 1,100 supervisors. If we adopt this amendment, TSA would need to hire a substantial number of new staff to inspect cargo and install new technologies at all of these warehouses.

Even if there was sufficient funding in the bill, which there is not, it is not logistically possible to have all of these screeners and technologies in place by the beginning of the fiscal year. TSA is currently in compliance with the Transportation Security Act, which requires TSA to provide adequate security measures for air cargo. The law does not require every piece to be screened or inspected, as this amendment would. We do not require every piece of cargo that goes onto a ship be screened when it is loaded onto a ship or before it is off-loaded. Instead, DHS targets what cargo pieces need to be more closely inspected based on intelligence and innovations such as the advanced manifests that we now require.

By adopting this amendment, TSA would have to refuse to allow airlines to transport any cargo until all of it can be screened, and I would point out that the money-strapped airlines would be sorely tried trying to do this, and it would greatly impact their bottom line.

Currently, the only cargo airlines can ship on passenger planes is from a known shipper. They cannot, for example, ship any mail above 16 ounces because the shippers may not be known.

So, Mr. Chairman, I understand the obvious meaning of the amendment. I appreciate the concern the gentleman has. We have tried to address that in the bill with \$50 million to begin to address the problem. To adopt this kind of a drop-dead provision would mean chaos in the airlines. It would not substantially increase the security that is now ongoing in loading cargo onto planes. The Known Shipper Program is reliable. It is working, and while we spend the \$50 million this coming year to begin to try to get the machines and technology in place to be able to screen, as we do, container freight in most cases, this money should be sufficient for that purpose. So I would urge defeat of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the Markey amendment, and that issue is the glaring hole that remains in our airline security. It is a shocking realization for most Americans to learn that almost fully half of the cargo that is in the hold of an air passenger plane when they get on a plane to go on vacation or work travel, that almost half of that cargo is commercial cargo that is

never screened by anyone for explosives.

That is a massive failure in our airline security. Some months ago I introduced the Airline Cargo Security Act modeled after legislation by Senators FEINSTEIN and HUTCHISON which would require the TSA to adopt comprehensive measures to inspect airline cargo. It gives the TSA flexibility to use a variety of different methods to accomplish this, from new technologies to blast-proof containers, to a database of known shippers; but it requires that the job get done. The airline industry is hanging by a slender thread. Terrorists do not have to hijack our airplanes any more to wreak chaos on this industry and wreak devastation on this country and our economy. They just have to blow a plane out of the sky. Given the fact that so much of the cargo is not screened for anything, this is tragically too easy to accomplish. This has to change. This has to change.

It is hard to overstate the significance and the disparity of this security problem. All of us have had the experience of going through the airport now and having to take our belt and shoes off and remove the toenail clippers from our carry-on luggage, but imagine the fact that in the hold of that plane are huge containers which have not been inspected by anyone. And when we consider the security lapses in shipping that cargo, the opportunities when that freight is forwarded to include explosive or other dangerous materials in that cargo, it is extraordinary.

Indeed, I think most Americans would find it baffling that we go through these personally intrusive measures when we go to the airport, but our cargo goes through nothing. We cannot fight the last battle; we cannot simply predict that terrorists are going to use the same technique they used before. We have to be forward-thinking and recognize that there are wholesale gaps in what we are doing to protect the American people. I applaud my colleague for raising this issue in this legislation. I want to urge my colleagues both here today and in the future to address the issue of cargo security. Let us not wait for a tragedy to awaken us to this problem.

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

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to note in the Obey amendment, which the House was not allowed to vote on today, we would have added \$150 million for airline security, including an additional \$50 million for this very project, doubling what the committee has in its bill.

The problem that we have is that the known-shipper system is simply a trust-the-luck system based on what we know about shippers and the people who work for them. Our concern is about what we do not know. We have just seen that TSA had a very difficult time in doing the background screening for criminal activity before they

hired a number of people, and those people had to be let go. We really do not have any way of knowing what is happening within the businesses of the people who are shipping. It just seems to me that this amendment is eminently prudent and should be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, first let me say, and I do not say this out of formality but because I believe it deeply, that the chairman of the subcommittee has crafted a good bill, and this is the first bill on homeland security, and I applaud the gentleman for his tremendous efforts and work; but he has given us an opportunity to discuss something which has troubled me deeply.

I chair the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Government Reform. We learned clearly before September 11 of the terrorist threat. We knew it was a new threat, and we knew that we needed to develop a strategy to confront it and to reorganize our government; and we are in that process. But what blew me away when we debated the Aviation Security Act was the fact that I had always thought that we screened all of the luggage put in the belly of the airplane by passengers.

We put an amendment on the bill in 2001 that said by the end of 2003 we would have to search all baggage. We finally got it included in the bill, even though the Inslee amendment was not made in order. It was put in as a manager's amendment, but people said we could not do it by the end of 2003. Then when the bill came back from the Senate and we had our conference bill, it said by the end of 2002.

I thought, "If we could not do it then by 2003, how can we do it by the end of 2002?" And what I was told was that we really do not want people to know that we cannot secure the aircraft from explosives, so that is what they did. We had to amend the bill eventually and say we would have adequate security measures.

Mr. Chairman, the definition of adequate security measures includes machinery we do not have yet, dogs that we are using, swabs on the outside of luggage, and then hand searches. The bottom line is even the passenger baggage on aircraft is not fully checked for explosives. And then we learn to compound that, we have the cargo holds. Cargo that is put in the belly of a passenger aircraft is not checked, and it is just wrong.

We cannot say that we have adequate security measures to inspect cargo. We do not. It is a fraud. Maybe the chairman is right that this is an amendment that is going to be a problem, and maybe when we get to conference we will have to find a better way to deal with it, but we have to send a message.

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

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman from Kentucky

(Mr. ROGERS), and I know it is a difficult job that he has; but there are two programs in America. One is the known-tripper program. We are all part of the known-tripper program. Every American that gets on a plane is part of a known-tripper program. They want to know who you are. You have to show your ID. They are going to check you if you are suspicious. They are going to go through your bags. They do now care who you are, baby or grandmother.

The known-shipper program for cargo, on the other hand, going onto the very same plane, only requires a piece of paper. They do not know what warehouse it really came from.

That al Qaeda operative that just got arrested last week ran a cargo firm. When he was interviewed, he said he was working with other people. He said the name of the firm was Kashmir, Kashmir Service. It was his own trucking company, a cargo firm. That is something we cannot run the risk of happening in this country. They have to go through the same screening for biological, chemical, and nuclear material that would go on a plane as every one of us on a known-tripper program has to go through. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is right, we cannot afford not to pay the price. It might cost us some money, but America cannot afford not to pay it. It cannot be allowed to occur.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is a plane could be blown out of the sky from explosives in the belly of an aircraft because someone shipping cargo is simply able to get it on the airplane. We have learned from the terrorists there is no line they will not cross. I hope this amendment is passed; and then if we have to change the amendment, we can do that in conference.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, which will require the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to develop a plan to screen or inspect all cargo that is carried on passenger planes.

Since September 11, our nation's homeland defenses have undergone tremendous improvements. I truly believe we are safer today than we were prior to these heinous attacks, but we don't feel safer because we had a false sense of security that was cruelly lifted.

In 2001, when Congress was considering the Aviation Security Act, I was shocked to learn that less than 10 percent of checked baggage on domestic flights was being screened. I worked with Congressman Jay Inslee to add a provision to the bill requiring all checked baggage to be screened for explosives.

During a recent hearing of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, I was equally surprised to learn that air, which accounts for approximately 22 percent of all baggage on passenger flights, is not being screened for explosives. If we are not screening all the baggage and cargo on passenger planes, then we are once again giving the American people a false sense of security.

The bottom line is as long as cargo and baggage screening is incomplete, there are

gaps in aviation security that are unacceptable. TSA must come to grips with this challenge, which continues to leave too many air travelers at risk.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this common-sense amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think all of us have made it very clear that our efforts are way from that tragedy. Our bags are in fact screened and unaccompanied bags are screened. But when we began this journey and we began to tell our airports and our airlines that they were going to have to haul in this enormous equipment and make sure that every bag was screened, what an uproar. Nobody thought it could happen. Nobody thought we would be successful. It would take too long. There would be backlogs.

□ 1815

Yes, it is an inconvenience; but we have done it, and every airport to a certain extent is working toward that goal. At our large airports we have these huge machines that our bags must go through. Why, then, Mr. Chairman, can we do any less or should we do any less for cargo, because as we have determined in our field visits, the same kind of activity is occurring in our ports, where in many instances we are checking paperwork and we are looking at paperwork given to us by foreign entities. Oh, yes, we do have criteria. Our intelligence gathering has improved. We are looking at different marks that staff and personnel can check off. When one mark does not come up, they say, this is suspicious and they put them in a different category. We are doing a better job. But I think this amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is a sensible, reasonable approach that may be inconvenient, may seem like a high mountain to climb; but in the long run we will be able to not only pay tribute and mourn the loss of those who over the years have died in terrorist attacks and in particular the Pan Am 103, which in my community we lost an endeared family member, we will be able to assure that we have done as much as we could do in that area.

That is why I think this is an important amendment, recognizing the hard work of this committee and the efforts that have already been made, but I clearly believe that our work is not

complete. We mourn the loss of the Pan Am 103 and other tragic acts. Pan Am 103 was a suitcase that was unaccompanied, before our knowledge reached the sophistication of terrorists. Now we cannot speculate what cargo might contribute to some unfortunate and tragic act. Let us be proactive and get in front of this question and help the committee in the way that we could and can help it, and, that is, to look favorably on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment. But what I want to say more than anything else is that I think that those of us who serve in this Chamber deserve to tell the American people the truth. I believe that most moms and dads who get on an airplane and this summer when they take their families on vacations and they get on an airplane, they believe that those of us who serve in this Chamber have taken the necessary steps to see that they are not blown out of the sky as a result of a bomb being placed in cargo that is on that plane. I think most Americans think we are already doing this.

We want the airlines to succeed. We have given billions of dollars in aid to the airline industry. Can you imagine what will happen to passenger travel in this country if an airplane is blown out of our sky this summer with vacationers, travelers, businesspeople on it? This is something that we have got to face up to.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and I and others stood on this floor months ago when we argued night after night after night that there needed to be complete screening and inspection of everything that went onto an airplane. The American people heard that, and I think most of them agreed with us. But for us to say we cannot do it because we do not have the money is a hollow argument. We find money around here for everything we think is important. Everything that we truly believe is important, that is of value to us, we fund. It ought to be a value to make sure that those who travel on our aircraft can do so with the confidence that we have done everything humanly possible to protect them.

It is beyond me why we would not embrace this amendment. It is just beyond me. I hope we do not have to stand here in this Chamber at some time in the future and talk in somber tones about those who have lost their lives to a terrorist act when we could have taken an action that prevented that terrible tragedy from happening.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits any funds from the Homeland Security appropriation from being used to approve a security plan that permits the transporting of unscreened or uninspected cargo on passenger planes.

Air cargo is a potential area of vulnerability in our aviation security system.

In the Aviation and Transportation Security Act, Congress moved to ensure that all checked baggage was screened for explosives. But carry-on baggage and air cargo is still not screened for bombs, at least not the plastic explosives that terrorists tend to use. However, carry-on baggage is screened by x-ray, and air cargo is screened by the "known shipper program." In both areas, we could do better and I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from Massachusetts to do so.

I am concerned that this amendment could be misinterpreted as requiring that all air cargo be put through an explosive detection system or be opened and physically inspected. If the plain language of the amendment required that, I would oppose it. That is clearly impractical, if not impossible. Currently, there are no machines large enough and quick enough to screen all air cargo in this way. And physical inspection is so cumbersome that it would grind our economy to a halt. This would be a particular problem in my State of Alaska, where the people are especially dependent on air cargo for obtaining necessary goods and service.

However, the amendment simply prohibits any funds from being spent to approve an airline security plan unless that plan provides that air cargo will be screened. Such screening is currently being done through the known shipper program and I would expect that to continue. Over time, new technology may enable us to improve air cargo screening and I would support the use of such technology as long as it would not impede the flow of air commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

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

Mr. MARKEY. 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 Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MANZULLO

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. MANZULLO:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary of Homeland Security to enter into a contract for the procurement of manufactured articles, materials, or supplies unless section 2 of the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a) is applied to such procurement by substituting "at least 65 percent" for "substantially all".

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the gentleman's amendment because it proposes to impose new duties and constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2(c) of House rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia raises a point of order. Is

there further discussion on the point of order?

Mr. MANZULLO. My understanding is that the gentleman was going to reserve a point of order so I could get my point across.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I reserve the point of order.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin also reserves a point of order.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, the American economy is in the midst of a manufacturing crisis. Over the past 3 years, we have lost 2.6 million manufacturing jobs. In the past 12 months, 53,000 manufacturing jobs each month have been lost in this country. These are good-paying jobs. Small business manufacturers pay on average 20 percent more to their employees than other small businesses and provide a vast majority of the basic products such as tools, dies and molds that are essential to our national security and essential to our defense industrial base.

In 1981, Rockford, Illinois, my district's largest city, had an unemployment rate of 24.9 percent, the highest in the Nation. Today it is around 11 percent. I do not want to see a recurrence of what happened in 1981. But we are losing our industrial base in this country. Unlike the past when factories were closed during an economic downturn but reopened when times improved, today a too-frequent outcome is the permanent closure of the factory. The jobs leave forever. Young people entering the workforce do not have a manufacturing career choice left open to them as they did in the past.

Since 1933, the Buy American Act has safeguarded the interests of American manufacturers by requiring the Federal Government to purchase domestically produced products. But that only means 50.001 percent has to be American goods. The Department of Labor's May employment report showed again the 34th consecutive month of loss of manufacturing jobs.

Let me tell my colleagues what happened in Rockford, Illinois. After 112 years in business, Ingersoll Milling ceased operations. The Rockford machine tool maker was one of only two companies to make machines to shape radar absorbent composites into the skin of stealthy warplanes. In bankruptcy, a Chinese state-owned enterprise is trying to buy Ingersoll. The only plant that is left in the United States is in Kentucky and that is Cincinnati Machine. They have just downsized from 750 people to 350 people. We are losing the ability to have manufacturing facilities to defend the United States. The purpose of this amendment is to build that manufacturing core to say, wake up, Wash-

ington, wake up, America, the manufacturing jobs are gone, the security of our Nation is being imperiled.

This amendment simply increases the Buy American content from 50 percent to 65 percent. It is so simple. The money that is being used to protect America, we are only asking 65 cents of that be used to buy American products. This is a very simple amendment. We would ask that this body take its part in restoring American manufacturing in this country. I would urge my colleagues, urge them, beg them, beseech them, to adopt this amendment to help the restoration of our manufacturing base.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Actually, this amendment would radically change the current application of the Buy American Act from 50 percent to include products made in America even if most of the cost of the components, up to 65 percent, are produced domestically. This substantially increases the 50 percent test as provided in the current regulations.

Some companies have responded to the current Buy American Act restrictions by establishing costly, labor-intensive product-tracking systems that are not needed in the commercial business to ensure that the products are being sold to government. In a few cases, companies have simply stopped selling certain products in the Federal marketplace. This denies our government access to some of the latest, most cost-effective products in our fight against terrorism and preserving homeland security. This radical Buy American Act if it were allowed to be part of this legislation would impose financial and legal burdens on taxpayers and the commercial companies that sell to the Department.

I would, therefore, insist on my point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Do the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Wisconsin insist upon their points of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply agree with the point of order lodged by the gentleman. I do not happen to have much of a problem with the substance; but it seems to me that if the rules are to be applied around here, they ought to be applied to everybody on both sides of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other Members desiring recognition?

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed for five minutes. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, the Raleigh News & Observer headline this past Sunday said, "North Carolina's Trade Deficit Soars: Manufacturing Slide Continues Despite Decline in Dollar." One in four North Carolinians employed in manufacturing have lost

their jobs during the past 5 years. Plants across the State are closing their doors entirely, and other firms are moving jobs offshore, truthfully mostly to China.

North Carolina's 10th Congressional District has a disproportionately large percentage of local economies built on manufacturing. So the communities I represent are struggling even more due to this manufacturing recession. The National Association of Manufacturers reports that job losses will continue as long as U.S. imports from China are six times as large as exports to China. These statistics highlight why I have become a strong proponent of the newly formed Defense Industrial Base Caucus.

The U.S. cannot be reliant on foreign manufacturers of military or homeland security systems and equipment. We have got to invest in critical industries where we do not have the capacity for self-sufficiency and purchase goods from those United States sectors that are the best in the world. A recent admission from the Pentagon underscores the need for the U.S. to regain its manufacturing self-sufficiency. The Swiss Government's refusal to provide crucial bomb components during Operation Iraqi Freedom could have hampered our efforts in the fight effectively if the war had lasted a little longer. We cannot afford to be hamstrung by countries that disagree with our intentions and our goals as we defend the homeland.

The U.S. makes the best products in the world. We have got to provide jobs for the American people. There is no better place to demonstrate that commitment than providing our first responders with American-made products, procured with taxpayers' dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other Members seeking recognition?

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order is reserved. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address the point of order and in support of the amendment. My concern is that the American Government be as concerned about homeland security as we should be about household security. When tax dollars are taken from the American people, from the entrepreneurs and the people who create wealth in this country, those tax dollars should not be used by their government to put them out of work or to decimate our manufacturing base. I believe that this is a reasonable amendment, and I wholeheartedly support it.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Virginia advise if he insists upon his point of order and state the grounds for his point of order?

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Again, I make the point of order because it proposes to impose new duties and constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill and violates clause 2(c) of House rule XXI.

□ 1830

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair finds that this amendment explicitly supersedes existing law and the amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. Therefore, the point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I would challenge the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to table.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion to table is not available in the Committee of the Whole.

The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, is this motion debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is debatable under the five-minute rule.

Mr. OBEY. Then could I move to strike the last word?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply urge the gentleman to withdraw his motion. I know of no one who disagrees with the ruling of the Chair, and I do not see why we should impose on the House when we already have seen another amendment dealt with on the subject in a proper manner. This amendment clearly was not. Everyone knew it was not in order, and there is no doubt in my mind the Chair's ruling is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee?

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 385, noes 28, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 306]

AYES—385

Abercrombie	Bilirakis	Burton (IN)
Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Buyer
Aderholt	Bishop (NY)	Calvert
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Camp
Allen	Blackburn	Cannon
Andrews	Blumenauer	Cantor
Bachus	Blunt	Capito
Baker	Boehlert	Capps
Baldwin	Boehner	Capuano
Ballenger	Bonner	Cardin
Barrett (SC)	Bono	Cardoza
Bartlett (MD)	Boozman	Carson (IN)
Barton (TX)	Boucher	Carson (OK)
Bass	Boyd	Carter
Beauprez	Bradley (NH)	Case
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Castle
Bell	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Bereuter	Brown (OH)	Chocola
Berkley	Brown (SC)	Clay
Berman	Brown, Corrine	Clyburn
Berry	Burgess	Coble
Biggert	Burns	Cole

Collins	Issa	Osborne
Cooper	Istook	Ose
Cramer	Jackson (IL)	Otter
Crane	Janklow	Oxley
Crenshaw	Jefferson	Pallone
Crowley	Jenkins	Pascrell
Culberson	John	Payne
Cummings	Johnson (CT)	Pearce
Cunningham	Johnson (IL)	Pelosi
Davis (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	Pence
Davis (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (MN)
Davis (FL)	Jones (NC)	Peterson (PA)
Davis (IL)	Jones (OH)	Petri
Davis (TN)	Kanjorski	Pickering
Davis, Jo Ann	Kaptur	Pitts
Davis, Tom	Kelly	Platts
Deal (GA)	Kennedy (MN)	Pombo
DeFazio	Kennedy (RI)	Pomeroy
DeGette	Kildee	Porter
DeLahunt	Kilpatrick	Portman
DeLauro	Kind	Price (NC)
DeLay	King (IA)	Pryce (OH)
DeMint	King (NY)	Putnam
Deutsch	Kingston	Quinn
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirk	Radanovich
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kline	Rahall
Dicks	Knollenberg	Ramstad
Doggett	Kolbe	Rangel
Doolittle	LaHood	Regula
Dreier	Lampson	Rehberg
Duncan	Langevin	Renzi
Dunn	Lantos	Reynolds
Edwards	Larsen (WA)	Rodriguez
Ehlers	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)
Emanuel	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Emerson	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)
Engel	Leach	Rohrabacher
Eshoo	Lee	Ros-Lehtinen
Evans	Levin	Ross
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Rothman
Farr	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Fattah	Lewis (KY)	Royce
Feeney	Linder	Ruppersberger
Ferguson	Lipinski	Rush
Flake	LoBiondo	Ryan (OH)
Fletcher	Lofgren	Ryan (WI)
Foley	Lowe	Ryun (KS)
Forbes	Lucas (KY)	Sabo
Ford	Lucas (OK)	Sanchez, Linda
Fossella	Lynch	T.
Frank (MA)	Majette	Sanchez, Loretta
Franks (AZ)	Maloney	Sandlin
Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	Saxton
Frost	Markey	Schakowsky
Galleghy	Marshall	Schiff
Garrett (NJ)	Matheson	Schrock
Gerlach	Matsui	Scott (GA)
Gibbons	McCarthy (MO)	Sensenbrenner
Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano
Gillmor	McCollum	Sessions
Gingrey	McCotter	Shadegg
Gonzalez	McCrery	Shaw
Goode	McGovern	Shays
Goodlatte	McHugh	Sherman
Gordon	McInnis	Sherwood
Goss	McIntyre	Shimkus
Granger	McKeon	Shuster
Graves	McNulty	Simmons
Green (WI)	Meehan	Simpson
Greenwood	Meek (FL)	Slaughter
Grijalva	Meeks (NY)	Smith (MI)
Gutierrez	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Gutknecht	Michaud	Smith (TX)
Hall	Millender-	Snyder
Harman	McDonald	Solis
Harris	Miller (FL)	Souder
Hart	Miller (MI)	Spratt
Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)	Stark
Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary	Stearns
Hayes	Miller, George	Stenholm
Hayworth	Mollohan	Strickland
Hefley	Moore	Stupak
Hensarling	Moran (VA)	Sullivan
Herger	Murphy	Sweeney
Hill	Murtha	Tancredo
Hobson	Musgrave	Tauscher
Hoeffel	Myrick	Tauzin
Hoekstra	Napolitano	Taylor (NC)
Holden	Neal (MA)	Terry
Holt	Nethercutt	Thomas
Honda	Neugebauer	Thompson (CA)
Hoolley (OR)	Ney	Thompson (MS)
Hostettler	Northup	Thornberry
Houghton	Norwood	Tiahrt
Hoyer	Nunes	Tiberi
Hulshof	Nussle	Tierney
Hoyer	Obey	Toomey
Inslee	Olver	Turner (OH)
Isakson	Ortiz	Udall (CO)

Udall (NM)	Watson	Whitfield
Upton	Watt	Wicker
Van Hollen	Waxman	Wilson (NM)
Visclosky	Weiner	Wilson (SC)
Vitter	Weldon (FL)	Wolf
Walden (OR)	Weldon (PA)	Wu
Walsh	Weller	Young (AK)
Wamp	Wexler	Young (FL)

NOES—28

Alexander	Hinojosa	Sanders
Baca	Jackson-Lee	Scott (VA)
Baird	(TX)	Tanner
Ballance	Kucinich	Taylor (MS)
Boswell	McDermott	Towns
Costello	Menendez	Turner (TX)
Etheridge	Nadler	Velazquez
Filner	Oberstar	Waters
Green (TX)	Owens	Woolsey
Hinchey	Pastor	

NOT VOTING—21

Bonilla	Dooley (CA)	Moran (KS)
Brown-Waite,	Doyle	Paul
Ginny	English	Reyes
Burr	Gephardt	Skelton
Conyers	Hunter	Smith (WA)
Cox	Hyde	Wynn
Cubin	Keller	
Dingell	Klecza	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1858

Messrs. SANDERS, BACA, TOWNS, and GREEN of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. HART, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, and Messrs. INSLEE, ACKERMAN and HAYES changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Committee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1900

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:

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

SEC. . The Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop measures to simplify and expedite the grant allocation process of the Department of Homeland Security so that a percentage of funds is provided directly to fire departments in urban and rural areas, police departments, law enforcement agencies, hazardous materials teams, emergency medical staff, and other first responders, hospital districts, school districts, city and county governments, non-profit organizations, port and airport security, and citizen corps groups in the 10 cities most vulnerable to terrorist attacks, without the funds being first allocated to State government agencies.

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

There was no objection.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as we have been proceeding with this debate, I think we have been on common ground that the security of America's homeland has to be our first priority. Many of us have agreed with the leadership of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), that a billion dollars needed to be added to the Homeland Security appropriations to be able to give and free the hands of the appropriators on the many, many needs that are facing our Nation. But there is another issue, Mr. Chairman, that I think is crucial for us to be able to address directly: The needs of our neighborhoods, and let me share them with you.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment specifically and particularly isolates the crux of the problems that I have heard from many, many local communities. In fact, Mr. Chairman, in a hearing with Secretary Brown, an Assistant Secretary under the Homeland Security Department, in his energetic testimony he acknowledged the importance of involving the local community in their own security.

I do not know if many of my colleagues are aware that in the Homeland Security authorizing legislation there are the concepts called citizen corps. These are organizations that are resident in our respective communities, engaging neighborhoods, towns, cities and rural areas in their own security. But yet there is no funding for those particular entities. This amendment simplifies or asks that the process of getting funds to our local entities be expedited so that a percentage of funds be provided directly to fire departments in urban and rural areas, police departments, law enforcement agencies, hazardous material teams, emergency medical staff, and other first responders, hospital districts, school districts, city and county governments, nonprofit organizations, port and airport security and citizen corps groups in the 10 cities most vulnerable to terrorist acts.

Let me share with you, Mr. Chairman, testimony from Noel Cunningham in our field hearing just this past weekend, the Chief of the Port Police of the Port of Los Angeles. His words can apply to ports all over the Nation, but also to communities all over the Nation.

Since 9/11 we have spent approximately \$6 million of our own funds to enhance port security. We have added staffing and equipment resources for our port police. What they actually need, Mr. Chairman, is they need resources to help us, if you will, for their personnel. That is one of the things that we heard, that buying equipment, which is some of the limiting requirements of grants, is not their only need. They need it for personnel and we have not been able to provide monies for personnel.

As a central component to the Nation's economic engine, we need to re-

ceive a reasonable and appropriate share of the Federal port security funding. That is another comment from Chief Cunningham. So my amendment would simply provide an expedited way to get monies into homeland security.

I had another amendment, Mr. Chairman, that I had discussed in the rules, and that is to make sure that no monies are spent as an abuse of power at the Homeland Security Department. That is, of course, whether you think it is humorous that 55 Democrats in Texas ran away to avoid a quorum, they used their constitutional rights. I am sorry that that amendment could not be brought up today, and that is an amendment that says we limit the use of the Homeland Security funds for any surveillance or tracking of individuals not related to homeland security. I am going to continue to work on that issue because it is a crucial issue.

But on this matter I would like to pose a question to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), as it relates to the question of working with local communities to get resources directly in their hands, first responders, port and airport security, the citizen corps group, though we know that they are not necessarily funded but working with civic clubs on getting resources, when I say civic clubs, civic communities, county and city governments to get funds directly in their hands so that neighborhoods and communities can be safe.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

We have provisions in this bill that requires that the State to whom we give the money must send the money on to the localities within 30 days, and then 80 percent of the monies that we give to those States must be passed on to local units of government within 60 days. Those are provisions in our bill that we added in an attempt to force the money quickly to the community.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's response.

What I would like to be able to say to this body is that even as we give those instructions to the State, what I am finding out by our local responders, and I use that term broadly, but our community, local community interests who have the responsibility for securing the neighborhoods, the neighborhoods that are around ports, the neighborhoods that are around refineries, the neighborhoods that are in dangerous high terrorist vulnerable areas is that the processes are so difficult.

I hope that this body can work through the process that we will be able to provide a less complicated process and expedite the application process so that our local communities, civic clubs and all will be able to have the resources they need.

Mr. Chairman, I propose this amendment to H.R. 2555, the Department of Homeland Se-

curity appropriations bill and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

The purpose of this amendment is to expedite and simplify the grant application process so that needed homeland security funds go directly to first responders, local districts, and local government agencies, without first going to the States.

The efforts to secure our homeland will occur at the local level. City and county fire departments, police departments, hazardous materials teams, and other first responders will need to be well-equipped to protect American citizens from terrorist attacks. In our efforts to fund our local first responders Congress has authorized and appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars. However, few of those dollars have made it to the hands of local first responders.

I participated in two hearings last week with representatives of government agencies who confirmed that funds are not getting to America's local first responders. First, at a hearing of the full Select Committee on Homeland Security, Undersecretary Mike Brown of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Department of Homeland Security said that delays getting funds to local first responders and civic groups persist. During on-site reviews last weekend, Chief Cunningham of the Los Angeles Port Authority confirmed that few, if any, federal homeland security dollars are reaching first responders.

One reason for the delay is that often funds appropriated to city and county agencies for homeland security initiatives, through a lengthy application process, must first be disbursed to the States. State governments then have their own grant application process for funds disbursed by the Department of Homeland Security. This unnecessary application process preventing local communities from finalizing the preparations for dealing with terrorist attacks and is endangering our citizens.

I propose this amendment to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill to disburse a percentage of the funds directly to local homeland security organizations in those cities, including Houston, that were deemed more vulnerable to a terrorist attack by Secretary Tom Ridge. This amendment will allow local organizations engaged in homeland security to get funds now.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will enable many communities to prepare for terrorist attack without further unnecessary delay. This amendment protects America's citizens and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

AMENDMENT TO HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2004 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for political purposes or any other purpose not related to protecting homeland security, including for—

(1) use of the surveillance powers of the Department of Homeland Security, for a purpose not related to protecting homeland security, to—

(A) tap personal or business telephones; or
(B) otherwise monitor or record conversations or activity in any home, office, or other location; or

(2) use of the investigative powers of the Department of Homeland Security, for a purpose not related to protecting homeland security, to track automobiles, airplanes, or other modes of transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I propose this amendment to H.R. 2555, The Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

This amendment prohibits the use of funds made available to the Department of Homeland Security through this act from being used for political purposes, or other purposes not related to protecting homeland security.

In the course of the recent redistricting controversy in Texas, several allegations of misuse of resources of the Department of Homeland Security surfaced. Specifically, there were reports that the Air and Marine Interdiction Coordination Center, which is staffed by employees of the Department of Homeland Security, received a telephone call asking the Coordination Center to locate a particular aircraft that belonged to former Texas House Speaker Pete Laney. There were also allegations that surveillance was conducted on private and business phones, and that the Department of Homeland Security was involved with the Texas Department of Public Safety in the destruction of documents related to the redistricting controversy.

The use of Department of Homeland Security resources for political purposes endangers the lives of American citizens. While hundreds of millions of dollars are authorized and appropriated to protect our homeland, every one of those dollars is needed if America is to be protected from terrorist attacks. The police departments, fire departments, emergency medical staffs, hazardous materials teams, and other first responders across the country are in dire need of equipment and operational funds. Every available dollar appropriated for Homeland Security should be used for homeland security initiatives.

My amendment to the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill will insure that funds are not misused for political purposes or other purposes not related to homeland security. My amendment will also ensure that the wasteful, political use of funds that occurred in Texas last month does not occur in other cities.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a non-partisan proposal that will protect the constituents of every member of this committee, and every Member of the House of Representatives. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Does the gentleman have a statement she would care to make in regard to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any Members wishing to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw this amendment, but let me just simply say very briefly that our responsibility is to ensure the homeland, and I, in my advocacy, believe that is the neighborhood.

I would like to work with the chairman in respect of this point of order on getting rid of the red tape that is also bogging down the State system so that monies can get, as I said, to the hazardous material teams, the emergency medical staff, the first responders, hospital districts, school districts in a fast and efficient way.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, that we can manage to unstrap these local communities from using these funds for equipment only but can use it for personnel. I hope that we can work together to ensure that.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to withdraw this particular amendment as it is subject to a point of order at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman asks to withdraw her amendment.

Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. BALDWIN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Ms. BALDWIN: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used to enter into any contract to develop, lease, or procure Coast Guard vessels in the National Security Cutter class or Offshore Patrol Cutter class unless the main propulsion diesel engines are manufactured in the United States by a domestically operated entity. The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the restriction in the preceding sentence on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that—

(1) adequate amounts of such components are not available from a domestically operated entity to meet requirements on a timely basis;

(2) such a contract is necessary to acquire capability for national security purposes; or

(3) there exists a significant cost or quality difference between components manufactured in the United States and components manufactured outside the United States.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) is recognized for 5 minutes on her amendment.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It would prohibit funds from being used to enter into any contract to develop, lease or procure Coast Guard vessels in the National Security Cutter Class or Offshore Patrol Cutter Class of ships unless the main diesel engines are manufactured in the United States.

The Coast Guard's Deepwater program is a large acquisition effort to replace and modernize the aging fleet of the Coast Guard ships. I fully support this program. However, when procuring

the most critical components of these ships, the main propulsion engines, I believe the Coast Guard should contract with American firms that make the engines here in the United States.

The Department of Defense in many instances already must contract with firms that produce their components here in America. Because the Coast Guard was previously under the Department of Transportation and is now under the Department of Homeland Security, it has not been subject to these domestic manufactured provisions for components. I believe our government should contract with American firms whenever possible. The Federal Government is one of the largest customers in the world. Using American labor can help get our economy back on track. But in particular, in matters of national security, we should ensure that American workers build what we need to keep America safe.

After September 11, we tragically learned that Americans were not as safe, even on our own soil, as we had once thought. The Coast Guard's mission has increased exponentially since that awful day. In this uncertain time and as we have experienced shifting global alliance, it makes no sense to allow foreign nations to build critical component for large Coast Guard vessels. After all, the Coast Guard is now in the Department of Homeland Security, and is not keeping capable, hard working Americans working the essence of homeland security?

I have a firm in my district that produces these engines. They were ready to start filling orders tomorrow. They competed in the first round of Deepwater engine contracts awarded earlier this year. Even though they can prove that their engines would cost less in total operating costs, the Coast Guard gave the contract to a German firm that will now build engines in their homeland. And so that Members understand that this is not strictly a local issue for me, there are several other firms in the United States that stand ready to compete for these contracts and are perfectly capable of producing quality American-made engines for the Coast Guard.

I have often visited the employees of the plant in my district. They are confused and frustrated. They do not understand why a branch of the Armed Services would choose to give a major contract to a foreign competitor. Although their plant is operational, there are many workers who are currently laid off. The workers that I talk to are not only worried for themselves and their families, they are desperately worried about their buddies who are waiting, waiting for the call that tells them to come back to work so they will be able to support their families once again.

Mr. Chairman, we are bleeding good-paying, family-supporting manufacturing jobs in this country. When manufacturing jobs go away, our history shows us that it is very hard to get

them back. My amendment is a small but needed change to the current Coast Guard procurement process.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the subcommittee, has reserved a point of order against this amendment. The gentleman has a choice. He can insist and press on with his point of order and continue funneling good paying jobs overseas or he can allow this amendment to go forward as we just did a short while ago with the amendment presented by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES). I hope that he has the best interest of America's working families at heart.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has yielded back.

Does the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) insist upon his point of order?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, I speak in opposition to the amendment which I believe is nothing more than a blatant attempt to use the legislative process to give one American company an unfair competitive advantage over another American company. It is wrong and should be defeated.

The amendment seems innocent enough. No funds should be used to procure Coast Guard vessels in the National Security Cutter Class or Offshore Patrol Cutter Class unless the main propulsion diesel engines are manufactured in the U.S. by a domestically operated entity.

Now, that sounds just like a restatement of the Buy American Act, but it is not. The Buy American Act does not consider the nationality of the contractor when determining if a product is of domestic origin. Manufactured articles are considered domestic if they have been manufactured in the U.S. from components "substantially all," quote, of which have been mined, produced or manufactured in the U.S.

□ 1915

"Substantially all" means that the cost of foreign components does not exceed 50 percent of the cost of components.

Now, when the Coast Guard wants to purchase diesel engines for its ships, it has two options, Detroit Diesel in Michigan, Utah, Kansas and I believe Ohio, and Fairbanks Morse Engine in Wisconsin. Both are fine companies that manufacture their engines in the U.S. with components, substantially all of which come from the U.S. as well. They both comply with the Buy American Act, creating a healthy competition for the Coast Guard's contracts, which I think we would all agree is a good thing; but it seems that some people do not want competition.

Detroit Diesel is a subsidiary of that German company Daimler Chrysler, which is based in Germany, while Fairbanks Morse Engine is based in the

U.S. and notably I believe only in Wisconsin.

The current procurement program for the Coast Guard Deepwater program, for which these engines will be built, is already under way. If this amendment were to be signed into law, Detroit Diesel will no longer be eligible for Coast Guard contracts because it is not a domestically operated entity.

Fairbanks Morse Engine will corner the market, not because it builds better diesel engines than Detroit Diesel, but because it found a way to shut out the competition; and it will have done so by changing the rules in the middle of the game.

There are 5,000 Americans working in those four States for Detroit Diesel. They build diesel engines that the current law says are American products. These Americans should not be penalized because their parent company is based in another country. Congress should not even be involved in this issue.

This amendment is frankly outrageous. It is not our job to give one American company a competitive advantage over another, and I obviously implore my colleagues to not be fooled by what seems to be an innocuous amendment, but there are 5,000 Americans who work for Detroit Diesel who are waiting and depending on us and the Members of this body.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise in support of the gentleman's point of order. This amendment would apply a radical domestic source restriction to the acquisition of main propulsion diesel engines for use in Coast Guard vessels, and my friend from Michigan just said, in the middle of the game. It could delay this procurement.

This could have a devastating effect on the Coast Guard's ability to buy the best propulsion engines at reasonable cost to support its critical antiterror missions because it takes competition out of the picture. Restrictive provisions such as these run counter to efforts to create an open, flexible, responsive, and impartial competitive acquisition system that will enable all government agencies, including the Coast Guard, to acquire from the world market the best products available at fair and reasonable prices. Indeed, we owe our taxpayers nothing less than to get the best value for the taxpayer dollar as we buy these, and this amendment abrogates that Buy America Act provisions apply here.

It has been reiterated here by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) that this amendment would impose substantially new duties on the Department, and because of that I believe it also violates House rule XXI; and I want to applaud the gentleman for raising the point of order and support it.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against

the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI which states in pertinent part, an amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

The Chair finds that this amendment does include language conferring authority; and, therefore, the amendment constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI, and the point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. WATERS:

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

SEC. ____ (a) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall conduct a review of the proposed project for construction of a remote passenger check-in facility at Los Angeles International Airport to determine whether the project as designed will protect the safety of air passengers and the general public.

(b) Upon completion of the review and not later than the end of fiscal year 2004, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration a report containing the results of the review.

Ms. WATERS (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 gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) amendment had been accepted, there would be no need for my amendment. His amendment did what I think needed to be done in order to make our Homeland Security Department real.

The gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) amendment would have shored up what we say we want to do by appropriating \$1 billion to improve aviation security, maritime security, infrastructure security, and border security and port security.

Now, it seems to me if this administration was serious about homeland security, we would not hear these weak arguments that we are hearing on the floor tonight. It is absolutely amazing that the people on the other side of the aisle, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can get up and defend against needing more money to make

our homeland secure. It is really not to be understood how they can defend contracts going to foreign companies when we have Members on this floor begging for the opportunity to have these contracts in their districts to do something about this unemployment that was created by this administration.

Mr. Chairman, the day is over for flashlights and duct tape and plastic material. This is about some serious business. Some of us really do take this seriously. We want to fight terrorism. We want to spend the money on it. We want to have real homeland security, and I am absolutely amazed that my friends on the other side of the aisle do not understand that.

I come because I have got a problem in Los Angeles. The Los Angeles International Airport, which is located in my congressional district, is the third largest airport in the United States with a capacity to serve 78 million air passengers per year. On July 2, 2002, Los Angeles Mayor Jim Hahn proposed a plan to expand LAX by constructing a remote passenger check-in facility. The mayor estimated that this project would cost 9 to \$10 billion. The environmental impact report on this project is due to be released in the near future.

Supporters of this proposed project to construct a remote passenger check-in facility claim that the facility is necessary to improve the safety and security of LAX and prevent terrorist attacks at LAX. However, it is even more likely that the concentration of passengers in a remote passenger check-in facility could actually reduce the safety and security of LAX.

The Rand Corporation conducted a security study of the proposed remote passenger check-in facility, which was released on May 14, 2003. The study concluded that the proposed project would not improve the security of LAX. The study also concluded that concentrating passengers in the proposed remote passenger check-in facility would make the check-in facility the likely target of a terrorist attack. The study even suggested that concentrating passengers in the remote passenger check-in facility could exacerbate the effects of an attack on airport operations.

The Rand study did conclude that limiting the capacity of the airport could reduce the overall vulnerability of LAX to terrorist attacks. However, this could be accomplished by maintaining LAX at its existing capacity, with no additional airport construction projects.

My amendment would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to review the proposed project to construct a remote passenger check-in facility at LAX to determine whether the project will protect the safety of air passengers and the general public. The Secretary will be required to transmit to Congress and the Federal Aviation Administration a report containing the results of the review.

Mr. Chairman, I am simply saying homeland security, look at this, review it, give us an assessment. If we are about the business of securing the homeland, this is a very simple request. If, in fact, my airport, which is already identified as one of the highest security risks in the United States, is attacked because we are concentrating passengers, I have been to the Committee on Rules twice. I am on this floor, and if I cannot get support for a simple review to talk about whether or not this would be safe, then something's wrong with those who purport to want homeland security.

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to say that again the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) amendment should have been accepted because this amendment will ensure that we have a real emphasis on homeland security in fighting this terrorism. Without it, we are just joking; we are playing games. We do not really mean that we want to support terrorism.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI which states in part, an amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. The amendment imposes additional duties and, therefore, violates the rule.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further Members desiring to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment does include language imparting direction. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI, and the point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TANCREDO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TANCREDO:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to any State or local government entity or official that restricts any government entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, the Department of Homeland Security information regarding an individual's citizenship or immigration status, as prohibited under section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, as was indicated in 1996, this body did, in fact, pass the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act. One provision of that act states

notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State or local law, a Federal, State or local government entity or official may not prohibit or in any other way restrict any government entity or official from sending to or receiving from the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual.

It is a good provision of law. I am glad that we passed it. One problem with it is that there are no provisions for any sort of sanction should a State, local, or any other agency choose to violate the law.

It was indicated earlier there was some degree of indignation that was identified as appropriate by some of my colleagues on the other side when we have corporations, they say, who have fled from the United States, sought some sort of tax haven off the coasts of America, yet would make application for funds under this act. They were indignant and outraged; and I, by the way, share that feeling of indignation.

It is also, I think, somewhat outrageous to have cities apply for funds under this act when they pass legislation, which has been done in several cities around the country, that actually prevents the law enforcement agencies in those cities from sharing information or obtaining information from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, or the Bureau of Immigration and Customs as it is now known.

So this is a very simple amendment. It just says a person cannot obtain funds under this act if they are, in fact, one of those cities that have done as I have just described.

□ 1930

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

Mr. Chairman, I was trying to listen to the gentleman from Colorado as he explained his amendment. I have read the amendment several times and I, frankly, have to admit I do not understand it.

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

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to explain it again. The purpose of the amendment is to restrict the ability of cities, counties, and local entities that have violated provisions of the 1996 act which are word for word what we have described in this amendment.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we now have a new department. It could not have existed in 1996.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I would note that the law, and as I understand the law subsequent to that time, has indicated the term INS can be used interchangeably with Homeland Security, or the Bureau of Immigration and Customs.

Mr. SABO. So it applied to the INS, the existing law?

Mr. TANCREDO. If the gentleman will continue yielding, the original law in 1996, yes, it did.

Mr. SABO. Would it now apply to all parts of the Department of Homeland Security, so it would also apply to TSA?

Mr. TANCREDO. The law applies as it applied before. It does not change the application of the law, it simply provides some enforcement mechanism.

Mr. SABO. But does it expand who the law applies to?

Mr. TANCREDO. If the gentleman is continuing to yield, it does not. It is exactly the same wording of the 1996 act. The only thing we are doing is adding some sort of sanction for its violation.

Mr. SABO. Are there new and different grants that could be restricted?

Mr. TANCREDO. Grants under the provisions of this act.

Mr. SABO. I am trying to understand, again, Mr. Chairman. Can the gentleman tell me who the original law applied to, in what form?

Mr. TANCREDO. Shall I read the law again? Does the gentleman wish me to read the law?

Mr. SABO. Yes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State or local law, a Federal, State, or local government entity or official may not prohibit or in any other way restrict any government entity or official from sending to or receiving from the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual.

As I say, this amendment does not change anything except it adds a sanction for any one of those entities that in fact violate the law.

Mr. SABO. But, Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to get at, I guess, is my understanding that you are saying that the old law applied to the INS; this law now applies to the Department of Homeland Security, which is 22 agencies rather than one agency.

Mr. TANCREDO. The gentleman is correct that this act, the act that we are amending, does in fact include TSA, Coast Guard, Secret Service, and First Responders, and the amendment would apply to all of those agencies also.

Mr. SABO. So it would be a significant expansion in the scope of what the current law is?

Mr. TANCREDO. I suppose under that interpretation that is true.

Mr. SABO. I thank the gentleman.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin insist on his point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I do. I think the gentleman's last words indicate the validity of the point of order.

As I understand it, under the gentleman's amendment, if States prohibit information from going to the Homeland Security agency, then the State

can get no dollars under this act. My understanding of current law is that it only prohibits States from providing information to the INS. But Homeland Security, as the gentleman from Minnesota has indicated, includes TSA, it includes the Coast Guard, it includes Secret Service, FEMA, and a number of other agencies.

To me, this amendment substantially expands the scope of the coverage and, therefore, I think is legislation on an appropriations bill and not in order under the House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any other Members desire to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair notes that the limitation addresses a broader segment of the Executive than is addressed by the cited statute. As such, the amendment is susceptible to the construction that it attempts to apply the cited statute in cases where it is not otherwise applicable.

Because the proponent of the amendment has not carried the burden of persuading the Chair that the amendment is solely a negative restriction on funds in the bill without changing the application of existing law, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order. The amendment is not in order.

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:

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

SEC. . In addition to the amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, the amount of \$3,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Secretary of Homeland Security for a grant to the University of Texas Center for Biosecurity to establish a homeland security training capacity in Houston, Texas, with strong academic and community partners.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky reserves a point of order on the amendment; and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes on her amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that this amendment that I intend to discuss would be considered an earmark. I would like to think that the reason I am bringing this amendment to the floor goes to the earlier debate that we had on the question of expediting funds to those who are in the fight against terrorism.

Mr. Chairman, there is a desperation out there, Mr. Chairman, and, frankly, this particular program is a program that has a very important mission. In a few days the Select Committee on Homeland Security will be marking up the BioShield legislation that is to provide, in essence, a shield around the United States against bioterrorism. The mission of this center is to educate

the front line public health work force, medical and emergency responders, key leaders, and other professionals to respond to threats such as bioterrorism and other emergencies that affect our communities. The center responds to the unique challenges in Texas to which regional campuses, including three sites along the critical U.S.-Mexican border, and through its urban campuses located in San Antonio, Dallas, and Houston.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a request because it happens to be in my area, but it is a request because Texas is listed as one of the most vulnerable areas for terrorism. This center will work nationally. The center works with academic institutions, governmental agencies, and relief organizations to promote our health security programs.

This amendment I am offering is representative of a number of amendments that I have offered on the basis that there is desperation out there. Another amendment that is not part of this but I want to make mention of, Mr. Chairman, is an amendment for \$1 million to the University of Texas Health Science Center and Charity Productions to develop community-based homeland security preparedness. This, I hope, will educate my colleagues, along with other Members interested, to the fact that we must ensure the protection of the neighborhoods.

This particular proposal coming from the University of Texas Health Science Center and Charity Productions is to provide for an emergency preparedness education program for community residents. Charity Productions is also developing an emergency preparedness education program in conjunction with the University of Texas. The civic organization collaborates with human service organizations, such as the Red Cross and the NAACP. To date, this civic coalition has held several emergency and disaster citizen workshops.

The goals of the partnership between the University of Texas Health Science Center and Charity Productions is to train neighborhood stakeholders, provide a comprehensive range of opportunities to ensure neighborhood safety, and to facilitate full participation for all community residents, whether or not their active language is English, to increase community partnerships and to work with governmental programs to provide the support and training necessary at the grass roots level. The value of these collaborative efforts in the event of a terrorist attack is immeasurable.

The question always has to be that when we try to secure the homeland we have to secure the neighborhoods. These earmarks that I am suggesting are clearly to bring to the attention of this floor that we must expedite the funds to these local communities.

My other amendment, that again I will simply discuss, has to do with resources to the Houston Bureau of Immigration Customs Enforcement, and the grounds are basically the same;

that in fighting terrorism there are some places that have a higher ranking. Houston was ranked number seven on the list of cities most vulnerable to a terrorist attack by Secretary Tom Ridge of the Department of Homeland Security. Certainly we need effective immigration controls necessary to add to the safety of the region.

Mr. Chairman, it is crucial as we move through this process that we realize that all of this cannot be done in Washington. It has to be done on the homefront. Again, I remind my colleagues of the overview that many of us took this past weekend when we could clearly see neighborhoods within yards, within blocks of very dangerous or potentially dangerous areas, meaning they were vulnerable to terrorist attacks. While I was in California, there was a train derailment that wound up going into a local crowded residential area.

Mr. Chairman, desperation causes us to want to move the Department faster, to want to move the funds faster, to want to simplify the process to ensure that monies are gotten directly to those who are doing research.

I also want to add, Mr. Chairman, the importance of including Hispanic serving institutions in research, which is what this BioShield effort will do and these monies will do, historically black colleges, Native American institutions, Asian Pacific so we can expand the reach to culturally diverse communities. So though we may not be able to move forward today, we clearly should be moving forward to be of greater assistance to those who are securing the homeland.

Mr. Chairman, I propose this amendment to H.R. 2555, the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

The purpose of this amendment is to appropriate funds to the University of Texas—Center for Biosecurity, in conjunction with academic and community partners, to establish training programs for dealing with biological terrorist attacks in the Houston area.

Protecting America's homeland will be accomplished at the local level. To adequately prepare local police departments, fire departments, hazardous materials teams and other first responders will require expert training and education. Additionally, preparing community-based nonprofit organizations and civic corps will require guidance on how members of the community can help government agencies in the event of a terrorist attack. The University of Texas—Center for Biosecurity's training initiative will not only prepare the Houston area to deal with a terrorist attack, it will provide a training model for other cities across the country.

The University of Texas—Center for Biosecurity is located within the School of Public Health of The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston. The mission of this center is to educate the frontline public health workforce, medical and emergency responders, key leaders, and other professionals to respond to threats such as bioterrorism, and other emergencies that affect our communities. The center responds to the unique chal-

lenges in Texas through its regional campuses, including three sites along the critical United States-Mexico border and through its urban campuses located in San Antonio, Dallas, and Houston. Nationally, the center works with academic institutions, governmental agencies, and relief organizations to promote our health security program objectives. The Center for Biosecurity is organized into four main homeland security cores to conduct its programs: training and education, research, integrated response, and community service.

The Training and Education component provides an integrated forum to bring critical community responders together under the philosophy of "training together to respond together." This endeavor includes both short-term targeted programs of instruction, as well as longer term opportunities for more specialized education culminating in master's and doctoral degrees.

The research component focuses on emerging public health and safety issues to provide analysis, evaluation, and technology solutions for homeland security health threats that endanger the community and those who must respond to preserve their health. The center also strives to translate new ideas into effective solutions that address State-based health security needs.

The Integrated Response component works with public health, medical, and affiliated first responders to identify training needs to improve our Nation's health security. In addition, we strive to provide the tools for preparedness and response where active collaboration between vital emergency response sectors will be critical to achieve the best health outcomes for the population. Lessons from the military are integrated into civilian practice.

The Community Service component provides expertise for planning, training exercises, executive leadership, public health, and hospital preparedness in both domestic and international settings. Partners in vulnerable communities are critical to this preparedness effort. Local partners integral to this center include Texas Southern University on issues related to providing mass medical prophylaxis to underserved populations, and Prairie View A&M on issues related to public health outreach and nursing.

Mr. Chairman, the University of Texas—Center for Biosecurity is a critical program for preparing the Houston area for a terrorist attack. My amendment will provide needed funding for this pilot program. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2555, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

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

SEC. . . In addition to the amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, the amount of \$3,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Secretary of Homeland Security for a grant to the University of Texas Center for Biosecurity to establish a homeland security training capacity in Houston, Texas, with strong academic and community partners.

Mr. Chairman, I propose this amendment to H.R. 2555, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

This amendment requests that \$1,000,000 in Department of Homeland Security funds be appropriated for the University of Texas Health Science Center and Charity Productions to develop community-based homeland security preparedness measures.

Securing America's homeland must be accomplished at the local level. It is imperative that community-based organizations work in conjunction with state and local government officials, first responders, and medical personnel to ensure that needed services are provided to the community in the event of a terrorist attack, and needed information only available to members of the community gets to public officials. The partnership between University of Texas Health Science Center and Charity Productions seeks to develop and implement programs to assist local community officials in their homeland security preparedness efforts.

The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston embraces a mission to advance the health of the people of the State of Texas, the Nation, and our global community through educating compassionate health care professionals and innovative scientists. The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston supports its mission by working with the community organizations to meet the needs of local residents. Charity Productions is a nonprofit organization dedicated to providing innovative programs and workshops for community groups, school districts, parents, youths, law enforcement agencies, and various other service providers.

Charity Productions has developed a prototype community activism initiative designed to reach underserved communities and get them active in homeland security efforts through civic clubs. The local focus of the charity allows members of the community to work directly with health care, fire, and police officials to prepare for terrorist attacks. The University of Texas Health Science Center brings technical, medical and emergency expertise to the partnership. One of the goals of MNP is to develop and implement an Emergency Preparedness Education Program (EPEP) for community residents. Charity Productions is also developing EPEP in conjunction with the University of Texas. The Civic Organization Collaborates with human service organizations such as the Red Cross, and NAACP. To date the Civic Coalition has held several Emergency and Disaster Citizens Workshops.

The goals of the partnership between University of Texas Health Science Center and Charity Productions are: to train neighborhood stakeholders; provide a comprehensive range of opportunities to insure neighborhood safety; to facilitate full participation for all community residents whether or not their active language is English; to increase community partnerships; and to work with governmental programs to provide the support and training necessary at the grassroots level. The value of these collaborative efforts in the event of a terrorist attack is immeasurable.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment requests funds to implement a program that will provide safety to the citizens of the Houston area, and will provide a model for local communities across the country in their homeland security preparedness efforts. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2555, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

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

SEC. . . In addition to the amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, the amount of

\$1,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Secretary of Homeland Security for a grant to the University of Texas Health Science Center and Charity Productions to develop community-based homeland security preparedness initiatives in the Houston area.

Mr. Chairman, I propose this amendment to H.R. 2555, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

My amendment seeks a \$1,000,000 appropriation for the Houston Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement for homeland security related immigration and customs enforcement measures.

The events of September 11 have illustrated the importance of strict enforcement of immigration laws and regulations. Likewise, the events in the aftermath of September 11, from terrorism profiling to illegal detentions, have illustrated that our immigration efforts related to fighting terrorism must be refined. My amendment allocates funds to the Houston Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement to make the necessary changes to immigration enforcement procedures in regards to fighting terrorism.

Houston was ranked number seven on the list of cities most vulnerable to a terrorist attack by Tom Ridge, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. As such, effective immigration controls are necessary to protect Houston from terrorist attacks. The homeland security/immigration enforcement component of Houston's Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement will promote public safety and local security by deterring illegal migration, preventing immigration-related crimes regarding terrorism, and removing individuals, especially criminals, who are unlawfully present in the Houston area. This mandate is carried out by the Immigration Investigations, Detention and Removal, and Intelligence Departments.

The Immigration Investigation Department, and their staff of field agents, investigates violations of the criminal and administrative provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The Detention and Removal Department is responsible for the supervision, detention, and removal of aliens who are in the Houston area and United States unlawfully or who are found to be deportable or inadmissible. Finally, the Intelligence Department analyzes and implements intelligence received from the National Office, and collects and analyzes immigration intelligence for the Houston area.

The funds will be used to finance existing immigration enforcement programs, and to develop new programs to improve immigration enforcement and reduce the likelihood of terrorist attacks in the Houston area.

Mr. Chairman, if terrorists are unable to breach the borders of the United States their ability to perform terrorist acts will be all but eliminated. I propose my amendment to fund the immigration control efforts in the city of Houston. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2555, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

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

SEC. . . In addition to the amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, the amount of \$1,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Secretary of Homeland Security for use by the Houston, Texas, Office of the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement for

homeland security related immigration and customs enforcement in the Houston area.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky insist upon his point of order?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I do, Mr. Chairman. I make a point of order against the amendment because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program, therefore it violates clause 2 of rule XXI which states, in pertinent part, an appropriation may not be in order as an amendment for an expenditure not previously authorized by law.

Mr. Chairman, the authorization for this program has not been signed into law. The amendment, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI, and I respectfully ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. Do other Members desire to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I said this earlier today. We are working as best we can, but I would argue that while Rome is burning we are standing on this issue of waiving points of order and, therefore, those who are in great need of resources to protect America and to protect neighborhoods are without those resources.

This amendment was offered in desperation, the need to move forward on funding the opportunities for neighborhoods to secure themselves, that school districts can provide safe places in the community for our neighbors, to educate our neighbors about homeland security, to provide personnel, to provide resources and to provide equipment.

What I would say, Mr. Chairman, is that in light of the point of order, the point has been made, and I hope to work with the authorizing committee as we move through the appropriations process to douse this fire that Rome now is engulfed in and to be able to say to our communities that we are expediting those funds and providing the necessary resources.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss the funding of the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The bill before us includes \$1.8 billion in disaster assistance for FEMA to use in fiscal year 2004 to assist the many communities across the country that will encounter natural disasters such as ice storms, tornadoes, and forest fires.

Mr. Chairman, I planned to offer an amendment today that would have given FEMA an additional \$1.6 billion that it needs just to cover a shortfall in disaster assistance for the 2003 year.

□ 1945

But the communities that are waiting for this money cannot wait any

longer. They cannot wait for the new fiscal year to begin in October when FEMA's coffers will be replenished. The administration has an obligation to ask Congress immediately to provide FEMA with the money it needs to help the communities that were promised assistance by the President when he declared those cities and towns disaster areas. FEMA is running so low on money right now that I understand the agency is only fulfilling a part of its mission under the Stafford Act, parts A and B for debris removal and emergency protection measures.

While I believe it is very important for FEMA to provide funds for these important categories of assistance, relief under categories C through G of the Public Assistance Program are also vitally important. Unfortunately, I have been informed that FEMA has frozen funding for the Public Assistance Programs that help communities rebuild roads and bridges as well as public buildings and utilities. This is unacceptable.

I know that the communities in the 29 counties in Ohio that the President declared disaster areas this winter have already expended money to rebuild the local infrastructure required to get these towns back on their feet. In one of my counties, Monroe County, Ohio, the county engineer has already spent so much money and has failed to be reimbursed for it that he has had to lay off five county employees. Five workers in Monroe County, Ohio, are unemployed tonight because FEMA has not met its obligations.

In southern Ohio, FEMA approved 1,363 projects across 29 counties to be funded following this winter's ice storms that occurred in my district and districts of many other Members throughout the region, both Republican and Democratic Members. Because of FEMA's funding shortfall, however, 293 reconstruction projects remain to be funded. Only 80 percent of approved projects in Ohio have been completed since last winter's ice storm. The State is still waiting for \$11 million from FEMA to finish up the remaining 293 projects, but across this country the situation is the same.

The National Emergency Management Association has indicated in a letter to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) that thousands of applications will go unanswered if supplemental appropriations in the range of \$1.6 billion are not passed immediately. More than 35 States and Territories have experienced disasters just this year and thousands of projects in those States will go unfunded unless the administration asks Congress for supplemental appropriations.

I am circulating a letter to Secretary Ridge today, and I ask all of my colleagues to join me. We should ask Secretary Ridge to work with the administration to ensure that a request for supplemental appropriations is made

immediately so that the appropriations committees in the House and Senate can begin work on a bill to provide FEMA with the money the agency needs to continue disaster payments to the States. The States cannot wait for the fiscal year 2004 appropriations process to run its course. They need assistance now, as do the thousands of communities across the country that are waiting to be reimbursed for the important rebuilding projects that they have already begun or for the funds that they need to begin these projects.

Mr. Chairman, I just call this issue to the attention of my colleagues and to this House. This is a critical matter. It needs to be addressed. As I said, I am calling upon Secretary Ridge and I hope all of my colleagues in the House will be willing to sign a letter to the Secretary asking that this request for supplemental funds be coming forthwith.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that his comments are very well taken and when the administration makes the request, which we do anticipate, for FEMA and other issues, that the Committee on Appropriations will move on it quickly and very likely apply it to the very next appropriations bill that is in the process and ready to be considered by the House.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made me very happy. I appreciate the gentleman's concern and personal commitment, and we look forward to getting this done so these communities can get the help they so desperately need.

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

Mr. Chairman, I also want to talk about FEMA. FEMA is now under the jurisdiction of the Department of Homeland Security. FEMA and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission have a memorandum of understanding that FEMA is in charge of certifying offsite emergency evacuation plans of nuclear power plants. The process is still underway for the Indian Point plant in New York in Westchester County.

I originally was going to put forth an amendment which would prevent Federal funds from being spent by FEMA to certify any offsite emergency evacuation plans for nuclear power plants, but I will not offer this amendment. However, I feel it is critical that I speak about a matter of homeland security to my constituents and the 20 million people living near the Indian Point Nuclear Power Plant in New York.

While I am not against nuclear power, I believe it is in our Nation's vital interest to shut down the Indian Point Nuclear Power Plant in Buchanan, New York, right near my dis-

trict of Bronx, Westchester, and Rockland Counties. Indian Point is located 35 miles north of midtown Manhattan. The planes that flew into the World Trade Center passed directly over the nuclear power plant and blueprints for American nuclear power plants were found in al Qaeda caves in Afghanistan.

The problems with Indian Point are not new. Indian Point is located in a densely populated area, in fact the most densely populated area in all of the United States. In fact, it is the nuclear power plant that is the closest to any densely populated metropolitan area of the United States, and it happens to be the major metropolitan area of the United States.

Approximately 20 million people are located within the 50-mile emergency planning zone. The road system in the area is woefully inadequate to meet the needs of those people living in the area making an evacuation in the event of an emergency at Indian Point impossible.

No matter what the cause of radioactive release at Indian Point, terrorists or accidental, the result would be the same. The 20 million people living in the emergency planning zone would be in grave danger. Now the emergency evacuation plan that FEMA is now considering is fatally flawed and will not protect the public. An independent investigation of emergency preparedness at the plant conducted by former FEMA Director James Lee Witt and commissioned by Governor Pataki found that "the current radiological response system and capabilities were not adequate to overcome their combined weight and protect the people from an unacceptable dose of radiation in the event of a release from Indian Point."

Following the release of the report in early January of this year, Governor Pataki and the four county executives from both parties within the 10-mile emergency planning zone refused to certify the evacuation plans. The report concluded there was no way to improve the existing emergency plan to sufficiently meet the current security threat.

If we are to truly protect the citizens of the tri-State area of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut, we must shut Indian Point down. Again, I want to say I am not anti-nuclear power, but I am against risking the lives of 20 million American people.

FEMA, despite refusing to certify the emergency evacuation plans on February 21, saying it could not provide reasonable assurance that the public would be protected in the event of a radioactive release from the plant, has still not issued a final determination. As a result, Indian Point is still operating despite the fact that no Federal agency is protecting the safety and security of my constituents.

We all know that if built today, Indian Point would never be sited anywhere near the New York Metropolitan Area. Furthermore, September 11

changed the equation. While I may not have been worried about the fact that a nuclear power plant was located in my backyard before September 11, now we all know it is a potential terrorist target. We should not allow a nuclear plant to continue to operate just simply because it exists. FEMA must be forced to take the post-9/11 world into account when it evaluates the offsite emergency evacuation plan.

In that case, I cannot imagine how FEMA could then provide reasonable assurance that the public would be protected should something go wrong at the plant. I know the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) shares these sentiments. I think it is very important that we understand that the Indian Point Nuclear Power Plant should be shut down.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2004".

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: The amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) 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 149, noes 274, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 307]

AYES—149

Ackerman	Cardin	Dingell
Alexander	Cardoza	Doggett
Baca	Carson (IN)	Dooley (CA)
Baird	Case	Doolittle
Ballance	Clay	Engel
Becerra	Clyburn	Eshoo
Berkley	Costello	Etheridge
Berman	Crowley	Evans
Bishop (NY)	Cummings	Farr
Blumenauer	Cunningham	Filner
Boehlert	Davis (CA)	Ford
Boswell	Davis (FL)	Fossella
Boyd	Davis (IL)	Frank (MA)
Brown (OH)	DeFazio	Gonzalez
Brown, Corrine	DeGette	Green (TX)
Capps	Delahunt	Grijalva

Gutierrez	Lipinski	Rush	Pallone	Rothman	Tanner	Baca	Hart	Oberstar
Harman	Lofgren	Ryan (OH)	Pascarell	Royce	Tauzin	Baird	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Hastings (FL)	Lowe	Sanchez, Linda T.	Pearce	Ruppersberger	Taylor (MS)	Baldwin	Hayworth	Olver
Hefley	Majette	Sanchez, Loretta	Pence	Ryan (WI)	Taylor (NC)	Ballance	Hefley	Ortiz
Hinchey	Maloney	Sanders	Peterson (MN)	Ryun (KS)	Terry	Becerra	Hensarling	Ose
Hinojosa	Matsui	Schakowsky	Peterson (PA)	Sabo	Thomas	Bell	Hill	Owens
Hoekstra	McDermott	Schiff	Petri	Sandlin	Thornberry	Berkley	Hinchey	Pallone
Holt	McGovern	Schiff	Pickering	Saxton	Tiahrt	Berman	Hinojosa	Pascarell
Honda	McHugh	Scott (VA)	Pitts	Schrock	Tiberi	Berry	Hoefel	Pastor
Hostettler	Meehan	Sherman	Platts	Scott (GA)	Toomey	Hoekstra	Payne	Payne
Houghton	Meek (FL)	Shimkus	Pombo	Sensenbrenner	Turner (OH)	Bishop (GA)	Holden	Pelosi
Hunter	Meeks (NY)	Slaughter	Pomeroy	Serrano	Turner (TX)	Bishop (NY)	Holt	Peterson (MN)
Inslee	Menendez	Solis	Porter	Sessions	Upton	Blumenauer	Honda	Pickering
Issa	Michaud	Spratt	Portman	Shadegg	Upton	Boehlert	Hooley (OR)	Platts
Jackson (IL)	Millender-	Stark	Price (NC)	Shaw	Visclosky	Bono	Houghton	Pomeroy
Jackson-Lee (TX)	McDonald	Stenholm	Pryce (OH)	Shays	Vitter	Boswell	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Jefferson	Miller (NC)	Tancredo	Putnam	Sherwood	Walden (OR)	Boucher	Hoyer	Quinn
Johnson (CT)	Miller, George	Tauscher	Radanovich	Shuster	Wamp	Boyd	Israel	Rahall
Johnson, E. B.	Moran (VA)	Thompson (CA)	Rahall	Simmons	Waters	Brady (PA)	Brady (IL)	Jackson (IL)
Jones (NC)	Nadler	Thompson (MS)	Ramstad	Simpson	Weldon (FL)	Brady (TX)	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Rangel
Jones (OH)	Napolitano	Tierney	Rangel	Smith (MI)	Weldon (PA)	Brown (OH)	Janklow	Reyes
Kaptur	Neal (MA)	Towns	Regula	Smith (NJ)	Weller	Brown, Corrine	Jefferson	Rodriguez
Kennedy (RI)	Oberstar	Udall (CO)	Rehberg	Smith (TX)	Whitfield	Burr	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Kildee	Olver	Udall (NM)	Reynolds	Snyder	Wicker	Burton (IN)	John	Ros-Lehtinen
Kind	Ortiz	Van Hollen	Rogers (AL)	Souder	Wilson (NM)	Capito	Johnson (IL)	Ross
Kleczka	Owens	Velazquez	Rogers (KY)	Stearns	Wilson (SC)	Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman
Kolbe	Pastor	Walsh	Rogers (MI)	Strickland	Wolf	Capuano	Jones (NC)	Roybal-Allard
Kucinich	Paul	Watson	Rohrabacher	Stupak	Wu	Cardin	Jones (OH)	Royce
Langevin	Payne	Watt	Ros-Lehtinen	Sullivan	Young (FL)	Cardoza	Kanjorski	Ruppersberger
Lantos	Pelosi	Waxman	Ross	Sweeney		Carson (IN)	Kanjorski	Rush
Larsen (WA)	Quinn	Weiner				Carson (OK)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Lee	Renzi	Wexler				Case	Kelly	Ryan (WI)
Levin	Reyes	Woolsey	Brown-Waite,	Gephardt	Myrick	Castle	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Lewis (GA)	Rodriguez	Wynn	Ginny	Hobson	Skelton	Chabot	Kildee	Sanchez, Linda T.
	Roybal-Allard		Conyers	Johnson, Sam	Smith (WA)	Clay	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
			Cubin	Kilpatrick	Young (AK)	Clyburn	King (NY)	T.

NOT VOTING—11

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 2019

Messrs. BROWN of South Carolina, BEAUPREZ, MILLER of Florida, TAYLOR of Mississippi, BRADY of Texas, and ISRAEL, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. TANCREDO, QUINN, JONES of North Carolina, BOEHLERT, HEFLEY, WALSH, EVANS, HOLT, MATSUI, SCHIFF, FOSSELLA, SHIMKUS, RENZI, SHERMAN, and Ms. ESHOO 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. MARKEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) 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 278, noes 146, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

AYES—278

Abercrombie	Deal (GA)	Janklow
Aderholt	DeLauro	Jenkins
Akin	DeLay	John
Allen	DeMint	Johnson (IL)
Andrews	Deutsch	Kanjorski
Bachus	Diaz-Balart, L.	Keller
Baker	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kelly
Baldwin	Dicks	Kennedy (MN)
Ballenger	Doyle	King (IA)
Barrett (SC)	Dreier	King (NY)
Bartlett (MD)	Duncan	Kingston
Barton (TX)	Dunn	Kirk
Bass	Edwards	Kline
Beauprez	Ehlers	Knollenberg
Bell	Emanuel	LaHood
Bereuter	Emerson	Lampson
Berry	English	Larson (CT)
Biggett	Everett	Latham
Bilirakis	Fattah	LaTourette
Bishop (GA)	Feeney	Leach
Bishop (UT)	Ferguson	Lewis (CA)
Blackburn	Flake	Lewis (KY)
Blunt	Fletcher	Linder
Boehner	Foley	LoBiondo
Bonilla	Forbes	Lucas (KY)
Bonner	Franks (AZ)	Lucas (OK)
Bono	Frelinghuysen	Lynch
Boozman	Frost	Manzullo
Boucher	Gallely	Markey
Bradley (NH)	Garrett (NJ)	Marshall
Brady (PA)	Gerlach	Matheson
Brady (TX)	Gibbons	McCarthy (MO)
Brown (SC)	Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)
Burgess	Gillmor	McCollum
Burns	Gingrey	McCotter
Burr	Goode	McCreery
Burton (IN)	Goodlatte	McInnis
Buyer	Gordon	McIntyre
Calvert	Goss	McKeon
Camp	Granger	McNulty
Cannon	Graves	Mica
Cantor	Green (WI)	Miller (FL)
Capito	Greenwood	Miller (MI)
Capuano	Gutknecht	Miller, Gary
Carson (OK)	Hall	Mollohan
Carter	Harris	Moore
Castle	Hart	Moran (KS)
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	Murphy
Chocoma	Hayes	Murtha
Coble	Hayworth	Musgrave
Cole	Hensarling	Nethercutt
Collins	Herger	Neugebauer
Cooper	Hill	Ney
Cox	Hoefel	Northup
Cramer	Holden	Norwood
Crane	Hooley (OR)	Nunes
Crenshaw	Hoyer	Nussle
Culberson	Hulshof	Obey
Davis (AL)	Hyde	Osborne
Davis (TN)	Isakson	Ose
Davis, Jo Ann	Israel	Otter
Davis, Tom	Istook	Oxley

Abercrombie	Aderholt	Allen
Ackerman	Alexander	Andrews

Akin	Bartlett (MD)	Biggert
Bachus	Barton (TX)	Bishop (UT)
Baker	Bass	Blackburn
Ballenger	Beauprez	Blunt
Barrett (SC)	Bereuter	Boehner

NOES—146

Bartlett (MD)	Biggert
Barton (TX)	Bishop (UT)
Bass	Blackburn
Beauprez	Blunt
Bereuter	Boehner

Bonilla	Hastings (WA)	Peterson (PA)
Bonner	Hayes	Petri
Boozman	Heger	Pitts
Bradley (NH)	Hobson	Pombo
Brown (SC)	Hostettler	Porter
Burgess	Hulshof	Portman
Burns	Hunter	Pryce (OH)
Buyer	Hyde	Putnam
Calvert	Isakson	Radanovich
Camp	Issa	Regula
Cannon	Istook	Rehberg
Cantor	Johnson (CT)	Renzi
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Reynolds
Chocola	Keller	Rogers (AL)
Coble	Kennedy (MN)	Rogers (KY)
Cole	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)
Collins	Kingston	Ryun (KS)
Crane	Kline	Schrock
Crenshaw	Knollenberg	Sessions
Culberson	Kolbe	Shaw
Cunningham	Latham	Sherwood
Deal (GA)	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Smith (MI)
DeMint	Linder	Smith (TX)
Doolittle	Lucas (OK)	Souder
Dreier	McCrery	Stearns
Duncan	McHugh	Sullivan
Dunn	McInnis	Sweeney
Ehlers	McKeon	Tancredo
Emerson	Mica	Tauzin
English	Miller, Gary	Taylor (NC)
Everett	Musgrave	Terry
Flake	Myrick	Thomas
Franks (AZ)	Nethercutt	Thornberry
Gallely	Neugebauer	Tiahrt
Garrett (NJ)	Northup	Walsh
Gibbons	Norwood	Wamp
Gillmor	Nunes	Weller
Gingrey	Osborne	Wicker
Goode	Otter	Wilson (NM)
Goss	Oxley	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Paul	Wolf
Graves	Pearce	Young (FL)
Harris	Pence	

NOT VOTING—10

Brown-Waite,	Cubin	Skelton
Ginny	Gephardt	Smith (WA)
Conyers	Kilpatrick	Young (AK)
Cox	McDermott	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2028

Messrs. ROHRBACHER, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, KIRK, and ROYCE, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, and Ms. HART changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TANCREDO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TANCREDO:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to any State or local government entity or official that restricts any government entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, the Bureau of Immigration and Customs (assuming the responsibility of the Immigration and Naturalization Service) information regarding an individual's citizenship or immigration status, as prohibited under section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

□ 2030

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, in 1996, the House passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act, a provision of

which I have restated in this amendment. It simply says that notwithstanding other provisions of Federal, State, or local law, that a Federal, State, or local government entity or official may not prohibit or in any way restrict any government entity or official from sending to or receiving from the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual.

That is current law. We passed that in 1996.

There was just one tiny problem with it. There are no sanctions, there are no provisions for a penalty if localities, in fact, violate the law. Unfortunately, there are cities in the United States that have disregarded the law. Recently, as a matter of fact, the City of New York rescinded an ordinance that for 20 years had prohibited police officers from not communicating—

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am having trouble following what this amendment does or does not do. It may be of significant relevance to some people.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, there are several cities in the United States that have chosen to pass legislation, pass laws that, in fact, restrict the ability of their own police forces, in many cases, from sharing information with the now Bureau of Immigration and Customs. That is a violation of the law. It is a violation of the present law. Unfortunately, there are no sanctions for that violation.

All this amendment does is to impose such sanctions by saying that no funds made available in this act and under the provisions of specifically the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which has now become the Bureau of Immigration and Customs, can be forwarded to such a city that has, in fact, violated the law. It is as simple as that. There is nothing else to it. It was the original amendment that I made during the discussion earlier. I have changed the language to reflect the concerns of the Parliamentarian and the reason it was ruled out of order.

That is the entire scope of the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If a Member wants to reserve a point of order, it must be done before the amendment is presented.

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

I want to ask the gentleman a question. What cities would this apply to?

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

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TANCREDO. Well, there are several cities that have passed laws in the nature I have just described, including Los Angeles; Portland, Maine; Houston; Seattle; San Francisco; San Jose; Portland, Oregon; San Diego; and Chicago, to name a few. I think there are others.

Mr. SABO. Houston. And do I understand correctly, because I have tried to read this language. I am sorry, there was so much noise I could not clearly hear what the gentleman was saying.

Under old law, under the INS, there were certain restrictions that we passed that in some fashion applied to the transfer of funds from the INS if a city did certain things; is that what it states?

Mr. TANCREDO. No, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the original law did not apply to the transfer of any funds. It was simply a law making it illegal for any city to restrict the flow of information to or from the Department of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, actually.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, as I read this amendment, this says, none of the funds can be used to provide assistance to any State or local government, entity, or official that does certain things. I do not quite understand the end of this, what they are or are not doing.

My assumption is that now this would apply to FEMA funds, emergency funds; it would apply to airports that are receiving funds under the Transportation Security Act.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, no, that is not correct. That was the original concern the gentleman raised. The Parliamentarian at that time ruled that because the original amendment had the words “Homeland Security,” that the gentleman was correct in his point of order. I have changed it so that it does not refer to the Department of Homeland Security. It refers specifically to the Bureau of Immigration and Customs, which meets the Parliamentarian's concern; and I have reintroduced the amendment.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am sorry, I am having trouble again. But as I read this, none of the funds made available in this act may be used to provide assistance to any State or local government or official that restricts any government entity or official from sending or receiving funds, and I am not sure what agency the gentleman is referring to. But “none of the funds that are used to provide assistance” would now include all of the funds flowing to airports from the TSA; and it would apply to FEMA funds, I would assume. It would apply to all of the first responder funds that are in this bill. I would assume it would apply to all the port funds that are in this bill.

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

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, once again, the law that I am amending, the provision of the law that I am addressing here is current law. The provision of the law that we are dealing with is the part of the 1996 act.

All this amendment does is say that no funds can be provided through the Bureau of Immigration and Customs to cities that have violated this law. That is it. We are simply putting teeth into the original law. That is all there is to it. Nothing more. It is as simple as that. And it is through the Bureau of Immigration and Customs. It is not TSA in particular, by the way, the one that the gentleman keeps referring to.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I will let someone else maybe try and figure it out. I remain confused. It just seems to go farther to me than what the gentleman has indicated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word in an effort to understand the first few words.

The gentleman from Colorado said to the gentleman from Minnesota that the only funds involved were funds under the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act, but that is not what it says. The amendment says "none of the funds made available in this act." The reference to the Immigration Responsibility jawbreaker does not come until the bottom. What it says is that if you violate the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act, then you get no funds under this act.

I know we debated what "is" is, but I thought we were pretty clear on what "this" is. This is this. This is the act. It says "none of the funds made available in this act."

So the question is, in line 2 of the gentleman's amendment, when it says "none of the funds made available in this act," what act is he talking about? And it would appear to be the act that we are now about to enact.

I wanted to ask the question precisely. I would ask the gentleman when it says in line 1, none of the funds made available, and in line 2, this act, in line 2, what do the words "this act" refer to?

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment goes on to further define it, and it is defined: through the money that is provided to the Bureau of Immigration and Customs.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, no, it does not. The gentleman has not read his own amendment, much less written it.

What this says is, you do not get any funds under this act if you violate the Illegal Immigration Act. It does not say that the funds come under the act; it is a 2-part amendment. It says, first, you do not get any funds under this act. It does not define this act later on; it defines what forfeits money under this act. What causes you to forfeit money under this act is a violation of the Immigration Act. It does not say in here that you lose money under the Immigration Act; it says you lose

money under this appropriation if you violate that act.

I will yield again.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I must admit I do not believe that the gentleman is really confused about the purpose of the amendment or the words that are printed here. It is, in fact, quite clear.

We have run it around the horn here several times, including with the Parliamentarians. The issue that the gentleman brought up earlier dealing with an expansion of the original law has been dealt with by this new amendment. We are speaking specifically of the Bureau of Immigration and Customs.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman, I understand his concern with making clear, and I have heard him say this in other contexts, that English is the official language, and I would urge him to work on that, because English is what it states here, and it says, in English, this is in English now, the only language I speak being a typical American; it says in English, "none of the funds made available in this act may be used to provide assistance to any State that violates the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Act."

So it is very clear. It is this act to which the funds refer. The act that was passed in 1996 triggers the loss of funds under this act. And it seems to me it is a far harsher penalty for the violation and the very fact that the gentleman offers the amendment in one form and then explains it in another is, I think, an indication of its weakness.

□ 2045

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who is offering this amendment has just said that what he is doing is to apply to existing law with respect to the Immigration Act as a new set of sanctions. And what that means is that none of the funds provided in this bill can go to any locality that is violating that law which means they get no fire grants, they get no port security money, they get no money for their Office of Domestic Preparedness.

It applies to FEMA. How many of you want to have a disaster and find out because of some technicality your State is not eligible for any money? How would you like that if it happened to fire funds, for instance?

So I would say that it is very clear, you are making a very big change in what localities can receive under this bill. Now, State and localities are already being short-changed and should have received far more than they did in the tax bill because of their budget crunch. This will simply add to their woes and will do so inadvertently if they were simply in violation because of a technicality.

It is obvious to me that we are going to have a vote on this bill. As far as I

am concerned, we might as well get on with the vote and get out of here.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak for 5 minutes. I just want to say what this amendment does, to be blunt, is it says that if any city in the country, and according to the gentleman who read a list of most of the large cities in the country, if they are in violation of a particular provision of the Immigration Act which now has no sanction, this will put a sanction on the city, on all the large cities, and the sanction will be that we will leave them open and naked to the terrorists. That is what it says.

No funds can go to those cities to protect their ports, no funds made available in this act. This act makes available funds for fire, for police, for emergency responses, for protection against terrorists. Now, I know we want to get to a vote but this is about as important an amendment as we have taken up here in a long time. Because whether the people understand it or not, what this amendment will do, and maybe we should do something about non-enforcement about the immigration provision, maybe the Committee on the Judiciary should hold hearings on that, but in fact what this amendment does is say most of the large cities in the country because they are not in compliance with a specific provision of the immigration law will get no funds to use to protect themselves against the terrorists. No funds for port security, no funds for airport security, no funds for fire and emergency response. That, I submit, makes no sense.

It says to all the citizens in all those large cities, we will hold you hostage so that the terrorists have a free hand at you if your city violates the immigration law. That is not the way to enforce the immigration law. I urge a no vote.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hope the public is paying attention to this debate. If we had major cities throughout this country, they are refusing to cooperate with the INS and other people who are trying to protect us from illegal aliens that may be coming in to do terrorist acts, they should not be getting funds from this government. We are trying to ask them to comply to protect our citizens when we are given that type of a description.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) to give him a chance to answer some of these absurd charges.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, at least the gentleman from the other side who spoke a minute ago did reflect accurately, I think, the purpose of the amendment. It is to do exactly that. It is to restrict funds to those cities

which have decided to restrict their police or other agencies from sharing information with the Bureau of Immigration and Customs. That is accurate and that is the first time it was described accurately by anybody on the other side. That is exactly what I want to do. Because, Mr. Chairman, there are in fact cities that are violating that law. We passed it in 1996. There has got to be some way for us to impose some sort of sanction or repeal the law with or if it is on the books, let us have in some teeth in that.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Reclaiming my time, the purpose of this amendment is clear. We are trying to have cooperation throughout the country in a matter that is vital to our national security and the safety of our people. If there are people in those governments, in those cities that are refusing to cooperate with us, refusing to permit those who are responsible for protecting our borders to get assistance, they should not be getting funds. This is how we will encourage them to get involved and to help protect America.

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

Mr. Chairman, three quick points.

Number one is this says none of the funds, no funds will go to any municipality, any State entity, any governmental entity for any homeland security purpose if they have chosen in a totally legitimate way not to give information about someone's citizenship like mine or anyone else's because that is what the gentleman's amendment reads.

This is a coercive action against any State, municipal or other entity to say to that State, municipality or other entity, you must do a series of things, including giving information on a person's citizenship status, like my citizenship status, to the INS. So much for State rights, so much for the local municipalities know best. So much for all I have listened to for the last decade.

This is an unfunded mandate on all of those governmental entities making it an extension of what was the INS. That is what you really want to do.

Lastly, you can keep taking lessons in Spanish, but if this is your Hispanic outreach we want none of it. I urge a no vote.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not a lawyer but in spite of that I think I understand the intent of this amendment. As I understand it, we have a law that has been in effect now for 7 years which is really being violated by a number of cities. The Mayor of San Francisco, for example, told her police not to give information to INS. This is a clear violation of the law.

No evil thing is going to happen to any city or any jurisdiction if they just follow the law. When you do not follow the law, you end up in jail if you are an ordinary citizen. These cities and juris-

dictions that are violating this law need to understand that the law needs to be kept.

All this amendment says is if they do not follow the law which has now been in effect for 7 years, they are not going to get any money, and I think that is a very reasonable thing. I do not think there will be any violations of the law because they clearly want the money. And I just do not think there is anything sinister in this. We have a law that is grossly violated. There are no penalties in the law. All this does is put in reasonable penalties. The only penalties you can put in this bill is simply denying them funding under this bill. Nobody will get hurt. All they have to do is follow the law and they will get all the money they should get.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is very simple. It should not be necessary to discuss this any longer. It could not be simpler. They are breaking the law. This puts some teeth in the law. If they continue to break the law, they will not get money. If they do not get money, they will not continue to break the law.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the discussion that we are having tonight is really a discussion about immigration and the immigration policy of our country. And we might want to cloak it in national security but it is what it is.

Our Supreme Court has stated that when you matriculate a child in school, you do not ask the immigration status of that child or that child's parents. That is the Supreme Court decision. That is the law of this land. Children born here in the United States of America, they are citizens by constitutional right. When their parents go to enroll them in school, they must feel free to enroll them in school. Indeed, there are hundreds of thousands of children in our public school systems in this country whose parents do not have a legal status in this country. They do. They are the citizens of this great Nation of ours. We should allow those educational systems to continue to work.

There are police departments, over 400 of them in the Nation, that have made a decision that they want crime reported. That is a very local decision. And we should not be substituting it with a national policy by passing this amendment. I think the police chief of LA, the police chief of New York, the police chief of Chicago and the employees that work under them should be given the respect that this institution should give to them because they are on the front line fighting crime each and every day. And they should make the decisions about how best they can protect the welfare of the citizens of those cities.

We have talked a lot about the localities and making sure that everything works better back home. Well, this is an instance where things are working

better back home and we should leave it alone. And we can have a debate all night, but I think clearly what is going to be read in the papers tomorrow and the evaluation that is going to be made of this vote is going to be that those that care to say that immigrants are bad to this country, and those that care to extol the virtues of immigrants are going to take different sides on this debate. But this is really a debate about immigration.

Let me end with this: I think that the President of the United States of America acknowledged that we have to do something about undocumented workers in this country. That is just a fact. There are 8 to 10 million undocumented workers and that is what this is really all about, and this is an attempt to deny them education and to deny their children education and to deny the police to protect them. That is what this is really all about.

The President of the United States sat down with the President of Mexico for one to try to work out some reasonable immigration policy. We should allow them and the Secretaries of State of those countries to bring back, to come to a reasonable solution. Listen, this is not going to get rid of one undocumented worker, as long as in the State of Washington 70 percent of the agricultural workers are undocumented. We know that we eat their apples. We eat the grapes from California. We eat the oranges from Florida. We know who picked those fruits in this Nation. We know who does some of the hardest work in this country each and every day.

So let us have a debate on immigration. Let us have a debate on immigration. Let us have a broad debate on immigration, and let us try to figure out how we streamline new immigrants to this country as we integrate those that are working hard, paying taxes and following the law of this land. Let us not have a debate here tonight where one person can go and put a claim, I got the immigrants today. I feel so proud.

America has a proud tradition in this country of respecting the work and the wealth of the contributions of immigrants, whether they be Italian or Irish or Polish. That is what has made this Nation so great.

Let us not belittle those contributions here with this debate tonight. Let us vote no on this amendment.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will just say the following: The topic of immigration is a very much sensitive topic and it is emotional. It is perceived with a lot of emotion in the immigrant communities in this country. And so what I would ask is that we have the opportunity to review this amendment. I asked my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) for a copy, and he said that the only copy is on the desk, so I have not had an opportunity to even read this amendment.

□ 2100

What I do know is the following, that this is a sensitive issue; that it requires that this House deliberate on it, and if it is an amendment that we have not even had an opportunity to read, then my suggestion would be to my friend that he give an opportunity to this House, through the regular process, for this to be studied; and if he will not, then I will vote against this amendment. I say so because this is a sensitive issue. This is an issue of extraordinary sensitivity to the immigrant communities in this country; and so I ask both sides of the aisle, if the amendment is not withdrawn, to vote it down.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I hope that we can listen to my good friend from Florida; and for those who are still trying to struggle with their own conscience, let me just simply say that this is a sensitive issue, but what it does capture is our fear of politics, and I just want my colleagues to think of a local hamlet or rural area that inadvertently, inadvertently does not provide information. They too will lose their fund.

The other aspect of this amendment that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) has not spoken to is that they will make the teachers, doctors, nurses and others hunting down those they believe to be violators of the immigration laws and they will begin to approach not those who may be undocumented, but they will approach citizens who are, in fact, documented. It will be a politics of fear because our local communities will be fearful of losing the dollars that they are going to get.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida has made a very good proposition. This House, the committees have not had an opportunity to review this amendment, nor have they had a full opportunity to review how we wish to go forward on immigration policy.

My question to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) would be, is the administration in support of this amendment? Is President Bush in support of this amendment? Is this an administration proposition? If it is, then we need to have a policy statement, a letter from the administration suggesting that this is an amendment that they support; and frankly, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is an amendment that will take us down that very thorny path of seeking out citizens who happen to have a foreign name, wherever they might be, because our cities and local governments, rural areas will be fearful that the long hand of the government will snatch their money away from them.

This is a bad amendment, and I hope that it goes down the tube; but I hope the gentleman will withdraw the amendment or vote it down.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 102, noes 322, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

AYES—102

Aderholt	Garrett (NJ)	Pence
Akin	Gingrey	Peterson (PA)
Bachus	Goode	Petri
Baker	Goodlatte	Pitts
Barrett (SC)	Graves	Platts
Bartlett (MD)	Gutknecht	Putnam
Barton (TX)	Hayes	Ramstad
Blackburn	Hayworth	Rehberg
Boozman	Hefley	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Herger	Rogers (KY)
Burns	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Hostettler	Royce
Buyer	Hulshof	Ryun (KS)
Cantor	Hunter	Schrock
Carter	Hyde	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Isakson	Sessions
Coble	Istook	Shadegg
Collins	Jenkins	Shays
Cox	Johnson, Sam	Shimkus
Crane	Jones (NC)	Shuster
Culberson	King (IA)	Smith (MI)
Davis, Jo Ann	Kingston	Smith (TX)
Deal (GA)	Lucas (OK)	Stearns
DeLay	Manzullo	Sullivan
DeMint	McInnis	Tancredo
Doolittle	Mica	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	Miller (FL)	Tiahrt
Emerson	Miller, Gary	Toomey
Everett	Musgrave	Vitter
Feeney	Myrick	Wamp
Flake	Neugebauer	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	Norwood	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Otter	Wicker
Gallegly	Paul	Wilson (SC)

NOES—322

Abercrombie	Cardoza	Filner
Ackerman	Carson (IN)	Fletcher
Alexander	Carson (OK)	Foley
Allen	Case	Ford
Andrews	Castle	Fossella
Baca	Chocola	Frank (MA)
Baird	Clay	Frelinghuysen
Baldwin	Clyburn	Frost
Ballance	Cole	Gerlach
Ballenger	Cooper	Gibbons
Bass	Costello	Gilchrest
Beauprez	Cramer	Gillmor
Becerra	Crenshaw	Gonzalez
Bell	Crowley	Gordon
Bereuter	Cummings	Goss
Berkley	Cunningham	Granger
Berman	Davis (AL)	Green (TX)
Berry	Davis (CA)	Green (WI)
Biggett	Davis (FL)	Greenwood
Bilirakis	Davis (IL)	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Davis (TN)	Gutierrez
Bishop (NY)	Davis, Tom	Hall
Bishop (UT)	DeFazio	Harman
Blumenauer	DeGette	Harris
Blunt	Delahunt	Hart
Boehlert	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Boehner	Deutsch	Hastings (WA)
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hensarling
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hill
Bono	Dicks	Hinchey
Boswell	Dingell	Hinojosa
Boucher	Doggett	Hobson
Boyd	Dooley (CA)	Hoeffel
Bradley (NH)	Doyle	Holden
Brady (PA)	Dreier	Holt
Brown (OH)	Dunn	Honda
Brown (SC)	Edwards	Hooley (OR)
Brown, Corrine	Ehlers	Houghton
Burgess	Emanuel	Hoyer
Burr	Engel	Insee
Calvert	English	Israel
Camp	Eshoo	Issa
Cannon	Etheridge	Jackson (IL)
Capito	Evans	Jackson-Lee
Capps	Farr	(TX)
Capuano	Fattah	Janklow
Cardin	Ferguson	Jefferson

Johnson (CT)	Michaud	Sanchez, Linda
Johnson (IL)	Millender-	T.
Johnson, E. B.	McDonald	Sanchez, Loretta
Jones (OH)	Miller (MI)	Sanders
Kanjorski	Miller (NC)	Sandlin
Kaptur	Miller, George	Saxton
Keller	Mollohan	Schakowsky
Kelly	Moore	Schiff
Kennedy (MN)	Moran (KS)	Scott (GA)
Kennedy (RI)	Moran (VA)	Scott (VA)
Kildee	Murphy	Serrano
Kilpatrick	Murtha	Shaw
Kind	Nadler	Sherman
King (NY)	Napolitano	Sherwood
Kirk	Neal (MA)	Simmons
Kleczka	Nethercutt	Simpson
Kline	Ney	Slaughter
Knollenberg	Northup	Smith (NJ)
Kolbe	Nunes	Snyder
Kucinich	Nussle	Solis
LaHood	Oberstar	Souder
Lampson	Obey	Spratt
Langevin	Olver	Stark
Lantos	Ortiz	Stenholm
Larsen (WA)	Osborne	Strickland
Larson (CT)	Ose	Stupak
Latham	Owens	Sweeney
LaTourette	Oxley	Tanner
Leach	Pallone	Tauscher
Lee	Pascarell	Tauzin
Levin	Pastor	Taylor (MS)
Lewis (CA)	Payne	Terry
Lewis (GA)	Pearce	Thomas
Lewis (KY)	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Linder	Peterson (MN)	Thompson (MS)
Lipinski	Pickering	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Pombo	Tiberi
Lofgren	Pomeroy	Tierney
Lowey	Porter	Towns
Lucas (KY)	Portman	Turner (OH)
Lynch	Price (NC)	Turner (TX)
Majette	Pryce (OH)	Udall (NM)
Maloney	Quinn	Upton
Markey	Radanovich	Van Hollen
Marshall	Rahall	Velazquez
Matheson	Rangel	Vislosky
Matsui	Regula	Walden (OR)
McCarthy (MO)	Renzi	Walsh
McCarthy (NY)	Reyes	Waters
McCollum	Reynolds	Watson
McCotter	Rodriguez	Watt
McCrery	Rogers (MI)	Waxman
McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Weiner
McGovern	Ross	Weller
McHugh	Rothman	Wexler
McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (NM)
McKeon	Ruppersberger	Wolf
McNulty	Rush	Woolsey
Meehan	Ryan (OH)	Wu
Meek (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Wynn
Meeks (NY)	Sabo	Young (FL)
Menendez		

NOT VOTING—10

Brown-Waite,	Gephardt	Udall (CO)
Ginny	John	Weldon (PA)
Conyers	Skelton	Young (AK)
Cubin	Smith (WA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2120

Mr. GIBBONS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California changed his vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I was inadvertently detained and did not arrive in the Chamber in time to vote on rollcall number 309, the Tancredo amendment to H.R. 2555, the Homeland Security appropriations bill. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as we wrap up debate on this bill, this historic bill, the very

first appropriations bill that this Congress has taken up to fund the new Department of Homeland Security, truly a historic day, I want to say just briefly how much I appreciate all of the help that the members of the subcommittee gave to us as we crafted this bill in a bipartisan way, and for all of the Members who have conducted the debate today, I think, in a very high-minded way.

I want to especially thank my colleague, my ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), who has been of immense help as we constructed the bill, and all the members of the subcommittee and of the full committee.

I want to especially single out the vice chairman of the subcommittee, the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), who was helpful in the drafting of this bill, but also, most importantly, had the courage back in the wintertime to have the Subcommittee on Homeland Security created in the full committee. It was courageous. The other body followed suit. Otherwise, this Department would be appropriated by seven or eight different subcommittees on the House and Senate side. So I want to thank Chairman YOUNG for doing a great job and having the courage to be a leader.

And lastly, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the very excellent staff that we have had the good fortune to work with for only 3½ months since this subcommittee has existed. Just a short time, but this staff pulled together a bill from whole cloth and nurtured it through the process, and we owe a lot to this excellent staff on both sides of the aisle who put this very first bill together.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for allowing me to thank these people for doing a great job.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) having assumed the chair, Mr. GILLMOR, 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. 2555) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 293, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage will be followed by a 5-minute vote on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1416.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 425, nays 2, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

YEAS—425

Abercrombie	Cummings	Herger
Ackerman	Cunningham	Hill
Aderholt	Davis (AL)	Hinchey
Akin	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Alexander	Davis (FL)	Hobson
Allen	Davis (IL)	Hoefl
Andrews	Davis (TN)	Hoekstra
Baca	Davis, Jo Ann	Holden
Bachus	Davis, Tom	Holt
Baird	Deal (GA)	Honda
Baker	DeFazio	Hooley (OR)
Baldwin	DeGette	Hostettler
Ballance	Delahunt	Houghton
Ballenger	DeLauro	Hoyer
Barrett (SC)	DeLay	Hulshof
Bartlett (MD)	DeMint	Hunter
Barton (TX)	Deutsch	Hyde
Bass	Diaz-Balart, L.	Insole
Beauprez	Diaz-Balart, M.	Isakson
Becerra	Dicks	Israel
Bell	Dingell	Issa
Bereuter	Dogett	Istook
Berkley	Doyle (CA)	Jackson (IL)
Berman	Doolittle	Jackson-Lee
Berry	Doyle	(TX)
Biggert	Dreier	Janklow
Bilirakis	Duncan	Jefferson
Bishop (GA)	Dunn	Jenkins
Bishop (NY)	Edwards	John
Bishop (UT)	Ehlers	Johnson (CT)
Blackburn	Emanuel	Johnson (IL)
Blumenauer	Emerson	Johnson, E. B.
Blunt	Engel	Johnson, Sam
Boehlert	English	Jones (NC)
Boehner	Eshoo	Jones (OH)
Bonilla	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Bonner	Evans	Kaptur
Bono	Everett	Keller
Boozman	Farr	Kelly
Boswell	Fattah	Kennedy (MN)
Boucher	Feeney	Kennedy (RI)
Boyd	Ferguson	Kildee
Bradley (NH)	Filner	Kilpatrick
Brady (PA)	Fletcher	Kind
Brady (TX)	Foley	King (IA)
Brown (OH)	Forbes	King (NY)
Brown (SC)	Ford	Kingston
Brown, Corrine	Fossella	Kirk
Burgess	Frank (MA)	Kleczka
Burns	Franks (AZ)	Kline
Burr	Frelinghuysen	Knollenberg
Burton (IN)	Frost	Kolbe
Buyer	Gallegly	Kucinich
Calvert	Garrett (NJ)	LaHood
Camp	Gerlach	Lampson
Cannon	Gibbons	Langevin
Cantor	Gilchrest	Lantos
Capito	Gillmor	Larsen (WA)
Capps	Gingrey	Larson (CT)
Capuano	Gonzalez	Latham
Cardin	Goode	LaTourette
Cardoza	Goodlatte	Leach
Carson (IN)	Gordon	Lee
Carson (OK)	Goss	Levin
Carter	Granger	Lewis (CA)
Case	Graves	Lewis (GA)
Castle	Green (TX)	Lewis (KY)
Chabot	Green (WI)	Linder
Chocola	Greenwood	Lipinski
Clay	Grijalva	LoBiondo
Clyburn	Gutierrez	Lofgren
Coble	Gutknecht	Lowey
Cole	Hall	Lucas (KY)
Collins	Harman	Lucas (OK)
Cooper	Harris	Lynch
Costello	Hart	Majette
Cox	Hastings (FL)	Maloney
Cramer	Hastings (WA)	Manzullo
Crane	Hayes	Markey
Crenshaw	Hayworth	Marshall
Crowley	Hefley	Matheson
Culberson	Hensarling	Matsui

McCarthy (MO)	Petri	Smith (MI)
McCarthy (NY)	Pickering	Smith (NJ)
McCollum	Pitts	Smith (TX)
McCotter	Platts	Snyder
McCrery	Pombo	Solis
McDermott	Pomeroy	Souder
McGovern	Porter	Spratt
McHugh	Portman	Stark
McInnis	Price (NC)	Stearns
McIntyre	Pryce (OH)	Stenholm
McKeon	Putnam	Strickland
McNulty	Quinn	Stupak
Meehan	Radanovich	Sullivan
Meek (FL)	Rahall	Sweeney
Meeks (NY)	Ramstad	Tancredo
Menendez	Rangel	Tanner
Mica	Regula	Tauscher
Michaud	Rehberg	Tauzin
Millender-McDonald	Renzi	Taylor (MS)
Miller (FL)	Reyes	Taylor (NC)
Miller (MI)	Reynolds	Terry
Miller (NC)	Rodriguez	Thomas
Miller, Gary	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (CA)
Miller, George	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)
Mollohan	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Moore	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiberi
Moran (VA)	Ross	Tierney
Murphy	Rothman	Toomey
Murtha	Roybal-Allard	Towns
Musgrave	Royce	Turner (OH)
Myrick	Ruppersberger	Turner (TX)
Nadler	Rush	Udall (CO)
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Udall (NM)
Neal (MA)	Ryan (WI)	Upton
Nethercutt	Ryun (KS)	Van Hollen
Neugebauer	Sabo	Velazquez
Ney	Sanchez, Linda T.	Visclosky
Northup	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Vitter
Norwood	Sanders	Walden (OR)
Nunes	Sandlin	Walsh
Nussle	Saxton	Wamp
Oberstar	Schakowsky	Waters
Obey	Schiff	Watson
Olver	Schrock	Watt
Ortiz	Scott (GA)	Waxman
Osborne	Scott (VA)	Weiner
Ose	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (FL)
Otter	Serrano	Weldon (PA)
Owens	Sessions	Weller
Oxley	Shadegg	Wexler
Pallone	Shaw	Whitfield
Pascrell	Shays	Wicker
Pastor	Sherman	Wilson (NM)
Payne	Sherwood	Wilson (SC)
Pearce	Shimkus	Wolf
Pelosi	Shuster	Woolsey
Pence	Simmons	Wu
Peterson (MN)	Simpson	Wynn
Peterson (PA)	Slaughter	Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Flake Paul

NOT VOTING—7

Brown-Waite,	Cubin	Smith (WA)
Ginny	Gephardt	Young (AK)
Conyers	Skelton	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2141

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMELAND SECURITY TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1416, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr.