

all but disappeared from the airwaves, lives remain shattered, loved ones are still missing, and communities are still coping with inexplorable loss and devastation.

Individuals and communities around the world have poured out their hearts and opened up their pocketbooks to help victims of the tsunami. And while so much good has come out of something so terrible, there remains a dark and vicious threats that has infiltrated this region for years.

South Asia has been a source and destination for human trafficking for a long time. While efforts are being made to put a stop to this horrific form of modern day slavery, the problem remains prevalent in this region. Natural disasters, like the tsunami, significantly increase the risk for trafficking and exploitation of women and children.

That is why the legislation we're considering on the floor today is important. It takes us another step forward in our global effort to combat human trafficking and the sexual exploitation of women and children. This measure will help insure that the children in the tsunami-affected region who lost family members or the roof over their heads will be protected from those who may try to prey on them.

I urge my colleagues to lend their strong support for this critical legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 912.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1405

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 27, JOB TRAINING IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 126 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 126

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 27) to enhance the workforce investment system of the Nation by strengthening one-stop career centers, providing for more effective governance arrangements, promoting access to a more comprehensive array of employment, training, and related services, establishing a targeted approach to serving youth, and improving performance accountability, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 126 is a structured rule providing for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Committee on Rules re-

port, and for the time specified in the report. And finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand before the House today in strong support of this rule and support of the underlying resolution legislation, H.R. 27, the Job Training Improvement Act of 2005. The gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Subcommittee Chairman MCKEON) and the committee members from both sides of the aisle are to be commended for their diligence and hard work in putting together a comprehensive measure reauthorizing vital job training programs while, at the same time, providing for improvements of those programs aimed at providing greater flexibility, accountability, targeting Federal dollars where they will be most effective and where there is the highest demonstrated need.

Mr. Speaker, my favorite movie of all time has always been "Inherit the Wind." I still think it is Spencer Tracy's greatest role. But in that he, playing the character of Henry Drummond, talks about the other main character, Matthew Harrison Brady, who was a well intentioned, yet flawed, character. And in talking about his death, Drummond says of Brady, a giant once lived in that body. But Matt Brady got lost because he was looking for God too high and up too far away.

Federal Government is a lot like Matt Brady. We are well intentioned, the greatest of desire to serve; but we oftentimes get lost and allow too many people to fall through cracks and harm people because we try to solve problems from too high up and administer programs from too far away.

From this isolated Hall, we often concoct specific standards that fail people who have the needs but do not fit our preconceived standards. Last Wednesday in my district at a town meeting, I met a young lady by the name of Micaela, who offered me also this five-page letter of her efforts and her concerns. She is in need of vocational rehabilitation services, but does not quite fit our standards we have designed.

In her letter she said in her years of trying to receive services that she was told she had too many disabilities, too few disabilities. You could not visually see her disability. She was too young, too old, and too rare of a circumstance. You name it, she had heard it. And she has also been basically told that I am not worth helping, hiring, or even listening to.

Oftentimes the Federal Government, in fact, not oftentimes. The Federal Government's only advantage is that of uniformity. By definition we can deal with people only as objects on a factory conveyor belt designed to meet the Federal factory specifications.

But if we truly believe that people are each individuals, that they have a spark of divinity, that individual needs are there that require individualized

help, then we do not need uniformity. What we need is creativity, efficiency, and caring; and that can only be done effectively on the State levels, which is why this particular bill has gone from several years ago, 63 programs, has now taken three funding streams and tried to bring it into one so they could help individual people by trying to apply 70 percent of the funding that has been given to students to those who have been unserved and out of school, to create a demonstration project for personal reemployment accounts to meet individual needs to be addressed by that individual, and to present the President's community college program and tie them all together to give local governments the ability to work with individuals so that Micaela here does not slip through the crack by definition.

Prior to coming to Congress, I had the opportunity, like many of you, of serving in the State legislature, and I was a teacher for a long time. In that position, or those positions, I witnessed firsthand the years of oftentimes Federal programs and mandates shoved on States, on local school districts, on local units of governments with this one-size-fits-all uniform approach. What was often, too often, left out were, quite frankly, the bona fide local needs. A uniform Federal approach stifles innovation with the heavy hand of Federal regulations and professionalism.

The philosophy behind H.R. 27, therefore, is to give Governors as the chief political officer of the States the flexibility over job training programs to promote economic development and jobs based upon local needs, and that way, the States become responsive to employment and to job markets.

Recently, I attended a community college, a community technical college in my district. And I was amazed at the benefits I saw of partnerships with local private industry, government contractors, and local employers coming together. In their diesel program, to find the kinds of materials that were provided by the industry, they have to get hands-on experience for first-rate technicians. And in program after program in that particular college, I saw, through innovation and hard work, the community college has been able to leverage the State and Federal dollars and to attract private contributions for equipment and training that met the need of training qualified workers in the high-tech future.

Vocational rehabilitation services in State after State does the same thing. But these type partnerships are not just allowed in this bill. They are encouraged under this legislation, which is vital in helping provide workers for the competition of the 21st century.

H.R. 27 is strongly supported by a coalition of community colleges which authorizes \$250 million for community-based job training grants to strengthen the role of those communities' colleges and to promote the United States' full workforce potential.

We face a 21st-century challenge in an ever-changing technology and the aging American workforce. We must provide States, local workforce boards, Governors flexibility to fit real people with real skills for real jobs. And they vary in need from State to State. We must allow them the opportunity to work together as they see fit to help people like Micaela.

I further support H.R. 27 because it targets Federal funds to groups of youths who are presently underserved, because it provides for individual self-help efforts.

I would like to point out also that H.R. 27 builds upon legislation passed in the 108th Congress, namely H.R. 1261, the Workforce Reinvestment and Adult Education Act of 2003, which was passed by this House.

There may be some who would oppose this bill because it respects both the letter and the spirit of existing law. If there is a problem with existing law, this is not the proper venue for that discussion.

□ 1415

Let us not, in the debate over the rule or the bill, lose focus and lose sight of our goal, which is to help the Micaelas of this Nation who need services, which are and will continue to be distributed fairly without precondition.

It is significant that we not confuse services rendered with the desire of some to sanitize and regulate legally diverse practices, reaffirmed in a rare moment of sanity by the courts, which do not impact the rendering of those employment services. Others beside sanctioned-government programs care and help and are effective, and we ought to forget the old pattern of confrontation and pointless attacks on groups that we see as different; we should join for the common goal of helping people.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good rule, supporting a bill that has been discussed and amended in committee through regular order. The rule allows for three specific amendments to focus discussion on key elements of the proposal. I am looking forward to riveting debate on this bill, with the realization our goal is to help the Micaelas of this world who have been hurt because there have been programs which are too high, too far away, and forgot our purpose of helping real people. I urge adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. The 109th Congress convened 2 months ago. The Committee on Rules has reported

eight rules, including the one we are considering today. None of these rules, not a single one, has been open. The Republican majority is zero for eight on open rules. It is an abysmal record and just continues to prove how out of touch with America, and with the democratic process, this leadership really is.

I oppose this rule and I oppose this bill. The Republican leadership seems to think that the job picture in this country is rosy, but they could not be more wrong. They seem to think jobs are popping out of the woodwork, but it is clear our workers need job training assistance in order to compete in the 21st century workplace.

When we think that the Republican leadership cannot be any more out of touch with the challenges facing working Americans, they bring the Job Training Improvement Act of 2005 to the floor today.

Let us look at the facts. Every day over 85,000 people in this country lose their jobs. Under this administration's watch, the Nation has lost 2.8 million jobs, and 4.3 million formerly middle class Americans have been pushed into poverty. President Bush's failed economic policies have produced a 5.2 percent unemployment rate.

Let us be clear. This slightly lower unemployment rate does not signal a rebounding labor market. In addition to the 8 million Americans who are currently unemployed, there are 5 million unemployed workers who want to work but have given up looking for jobs simply because there are no jobs out there for them. Beyond that, there are 4.5 million people who have accepted low-wage, part-time work simply because they cannot find full-time employment in this weak economy. The real unemployment rate would skyrocket to 9.3 percent by merely including these workers.

And not only are millions of American workers looking for jobs, but the long-term unemployment rate, workers who have been jobless for 6 months or more, is the highest in more than 20 years. Despite these startling statistics, this administration has continued to resist efforts to extend unemployment benefits for the 3.5 million workers who have exhausted their coverage.

The Republicans have mismanaged this economy, and American workers are paying the price through lower pay, reduced benefits, and in too many cases job loss. As if this were not enough, the Republican leadership is trying to enact broad, sweeping changes to the Workforce Investment Act. This bill will do nothing to create new jobs, reduce the number of unemployed people in this country, or sufficiently train workers for jobs. Frankly, this bill is a slap in the face to American workers. Contrary to what we will hear from the Republican leadership, the Job Training Improvement Act will actually make it harder for the unemployed to obtain employment and reemployment training.

Specifically, H.R. 27 would eliminate the employment services system, a program which provides critical job assistance to those unemployed workers hardest hit with the job loss of recent years. In my home State of Massachusetts, this program provides services to nearly 165,000 jobseekers each year, and it has successfully helped 75 percent of them retain employment in less than 6 months.

In addition, this bill block grants adult and dislocated worker funding streams. It allows States to use funds from the Disability and Veteran Employment and Adult Learning Programs to fund expenses at the Workforce Investment Act's centers. The result of this provision will be more bureaucracy and less training for the disabled and veterans.

Given all of the rhetoric that we hear about supporting our troops and providing for our veterans, we should find this provision particularly disturbing. We should be doing everything we can to help veterans find employment instead of slashing the disability and veteran employment and adult learning programs.

Additionally, the bill eliminates existing protections and safeguards against low quality and potentially fraudulent job training providers and permits States to allow these providers to receive Federal funding. It caps at 30 percent the use of funds for services targeting low-income youth, those considered most likely to drop out of school.

If that were not bad enough, this bill also abandons a core principle of our Constitution by repealing civil rights protections written into current law.

Twenty-one years ago, then-Senator Dan Quayle sponsored legislation that provided civil rights protections against religious-based employment discrimination in programs that receive Federal funding. These protections were extended to secular as well as religious organizations. President Reagan signed that bill into law. It is not every day that I praise Dan Quayle, but the nondiscrimination provision he offered is good policy which has served us well. This provision received strong bipartisan support when the Workforce Reinvestment Act was reauthorized in 1998.

However, the Job Training Investment Act shreds these protections by allowing religious organizations to receive Federal funding for job-training activities and social services while also employing religious-based discriminatory practices. In other words, this bill would allow a religious organization that discriminates based on religion, like a Bob Jones University, to get taxpayer money and use that Federal funding to legally discriminate on religious grounds when hiring staff to carry out the job training programs and services in this bill.

But let me be clear, the right of churches, synagogues, mosques and other religious organizations to remain

free from government intervention has long been protected under the law, and I am sure my colleagues join me in support of this protection. Congress has always exempted faith-based organizations from antidiscrimination provisions in programs funded by their own money, and we are not proposing that a church or synagogue or mosque be forbidden from using religious criteria in deciding who to hire as a minister or rabbi or imam.

However, that same church, synagogue or mosque should not be permitted to apply for and receive Federal funding for job training and then, as written in this bill, be exempted from Federal civil rights protections. Faith-based institutions should be required, like all other recipients of Federal funds, to adhere to basic civil rights laws, and I cannot even begin to count the number of institutions that have contacted my office in the last few days asking to be held to those same standards.

Last night in the Committee on Rules, I heard my colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) talk about a return to discrimination practices that forced these men and millions of other African Americans to drink from separate drinking fountains and eat at separate lunch counters from white Americans.

How can anyone justify abandoning one of our Nation's most fundamental principles? How can Members believe this is the right position for Congress to advocate? How can Members believe this provision is moral? I certainly cannot find it in myself to do so. This provision is offensive, it is ugly, it is wrong, it is unacceptable. But beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is unconstitutional and unAmerican.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) will offer an amendment to strike this offensive provision from the bill. I hope that my colleagues will join me in voting for the Scott amendment. It is important that we oppose discrimination at every turn, and this is an important vote.

Mr. Speaker, many Democrats offered several high-quality amendments in the Committee on Rules yesterday. Unfortunately, the majority has continued to stifle the democratic process by denying common sense amendments to this bill.

Just because the Republican leadership allowed the Scott amendment to be considered on the floor today does not make this a good rule. Once again, let me remind my colleagues and the American people watching at home that the Republicans have not reported one single open rule this year.

Mr. Speaker, this is an unfair rule, poor policy-making and a bad bill. It is truly a tragedy when a Nation that prides itself on democracy and equality considers and will most likely pass a bill that would permit employment discrimination in federally-funded programs. It is a slippery slope from here

on out, and I fear this may just be the beginning. I urge this House to defeat the rule and vote against the bill.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) as a new member of the Committee on Rules for his work today on his first rule that he is bringing to the floor of the House.

Today we are considering a rule that would allow for consideration of the reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act. The Workforce Investment Act, enacted in 1998, brought together some 60 Federal job-training and retraining programs, and put them together and we created these one-stop shops all across America. They are intended to be able to provide training and retraining for American workers who are out of work or workers who simply want to improve their skills so they can move up the economic ladder.

By and large, these one-stop shops have worked very well, but as we reauthorize this law, it is our obligation to take a look at what is working, what could work better, and as we bring this reauthorization forward, there are some important changes that we are bringing to the floor with it.

Mr. Speaker, we want to provide more flexibility for the local workforce boards to do their work by consolidating the funding stream. We want to ensure that more of the funding that is available for this Act goes down to the local county boards, or, in some cases, multiple county jurisdictions. In this bill, we also renew the vocational programs for those who have disabilities, an important part of our workforce.

I think all of us know if we are going to be successful in the 21st century, that America has to do a better job of training and retraining our workforce. The days of going to work for one employer and being there for most of your career are, by and large, over. People are going to change jobs multiple times during their career, and we have to have available to them the kinds of services where they can improve their skills to take that new job of tomorrow.

The reauthorization program that we have today, I think is a good one. There is one amendment that we will debate that we have had considerable debate on over the last several years in this Congress and considered in the committee twice during the markup of this bill. It is on the faith-based language. Members are going to hear an awful lot about it today, but let me give the parameters.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act, the landmark legislation which prevented discrimination in America, allowed for one exception in hiring and that exception was granted to religious organizations where we grant them an exemption if they wished to only hire people

of their own faith. That is the law. It has been the law since 1964.

We believe that faith-based providers who may want to offer services, job training services or retraining services, ought not to be denied their rights under the 1964 Civil Rights Act just because they want to help the neediest of the needy and help the poor improve their skills and get a job.

This is a great debate which has gone on for several years. We allow faith-based providers in this bill to provide services without giving up their protections in the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Some believe, and it is certainly their right to have a different opinion, believe that faith-based organizations, even though they have this right, ought to be forced to give it up in order to take Federal funds to help the poorest of the poor.

Now I would argue those who really do believe that is the case ought to go back and amend the 1964 Civil Rights Act, title 7, and not try to do it in this bill. But this provision, and again, we will have ample time to debate it later, I think this provision helps organizations who want to go out and help the needy in their community. It gives them the tools to do it without having to set up a new organization, or denies them the ability and the rights that they have under the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

□ 1430

I think that we have a fair rule before us. I think it will provide for a very meaningful debate today on this reauthorization. I would urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just reiterate that what we believe is that taxpayer money should not be used by faith-based organizations to discriminate against people based on religion. What we feel is that this provision in this bill is offensive and it turns the clock backwards on civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, I include for printing in the RECORD a letter opposing this bill signed by 67 religious organizations and civil rights organizations that have great concerns not only with the provision on religious-based employment discrimination but on a whole series of other provisions.

FEBRUARY 28, 2005.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations are writing to urge you to vote against H.R. 27, the Job Training Improvement Act, unless it is modified to address the concerns outlined in this letter; and to oppose any effort to expand the block grant authority in the bill along the lines of the Administration's "WIA Plus" proposal.

H.R. 27 fails to make meaningful improvements to the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) that would enhance the training and career opportunities of unemployed workers. Instead, the legislation would eliminate the dislocated worker training program, undermine state rapid response systems, end the federal-state labor exchange system, roll back protections against religious discrimination in hiring by job training providers,

and potentially undermine the stability of other important programs.

In particular, we are concerned about the following provisions in H.R. 27:

NEW BLOCK GRANT

H.R. 27 consolidates into a single block grant the WIA adult and dislocated worker programs with the Wagner-Peyser employment service program and reemployment services for unemployment insurance recipients. In doing so, it will eliminate job training assistance specifically targeted to workers dislocated by off shoring and other economic changes, pit different types of workers against each other, and lead to future funding reductions. The block grant also eliminates the statewide job service, which provides a uniform statewide system for matching employers and jobseekers, replacing it with a multiplicity of localized programs that would have no incentive or ability to cooperate and function as a comprehensive labor exchange system. Eliminating the employment service, which is financed with revenue from the unemployment insurance (UI) trust fund, breaks the connection between the unemployment insurance program and undermines the UI "work test," which ensures that UI recipients return to work as quickly as possible.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND CORE SERVICES FUNDING

A principal criticism of WIA has been the substantial decline in actual training compared to its predecessor, the Job Training Partnership Act. While there are various reasons for the reduction in training, including the sequence of services requirement in current law, the use of WIA resources by local boards and operators to build new one-stop facilities and bureaucracies, without any limitation, has contributed substantially to the decline in training. This is despite the fact that many WIA partner programs also contribute operating funds to one-stop operations.

H.R. 27 gives governors even broader discretion to transfer additional resources from the WIA partner programs to pay for WIA infrastructure and core services costs—without any assurance that more training would result. These programs include the vocational rehabilitation program, veterans employment programs, adult education, the Perkins post secondary career and technical education programs, unemployment insurance, trade adjustment assistance, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and, if they are partners, employment and training programs under the food stamp and housing programs, programs for individuals with disabilities carried out by state agencies, including state Medicaid agencies, and even child support enforcement. By relying on funding transfers from these programs to guarantee resources for WIA infrastructure and core services, H.R. 27 will disrupt and weaken services provided by these non-WIA programs, which also will face substantial pressures for funding reductions in the next few years.

The infrastructure and related provisions start the commingling of funds from these non-WIA programs. In doing so, they transform the original one-stop idea of a better-coordinated workforce system into a mechanism for reducing resources for and block granting these programs in the future. A more effective and simple solution to ensuring adequate training services would be to require that a certain percentage of WIA funds be used for training as provided in previous job training programs and to create a separate WIA funding stream for one-stop operations, if necessary.

PERSONAL REEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNTS

H.R. 27 includes permanent and unlimited authority for the Secretary to conduct "per-

sonal reemployment account" (PRA) demonstrations even though the Department of Labor recently initiated a PRA demonstration without strong interest among the states. Although nine states could have participated, only seven are doing so.

Since this demonstration already is in process, we see no justification for this provision and can only surmise that it is an attempt to implement PRAs more broadly, despite a lack of Congressional support for a full-scale program in the past.

Unlike current WIA training programs, the PRAs would limit the cost of training that an unemployment insurance recipient can receive and would bar that individual from WIA training services for a year after the PRA account is established. This is the wrong way to go. With long-term unemployment at historically high levels, there is a much greater need for continued unemployment benefits for the long-term unemployed who have found it so difficult to become re-employed.

RELIGIOUS-BASED EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION

H.R. 27 repeals longstanding civil rights protections that prohibit religious-based employment discrimination by job training providers. These protections have been included in job training programs, which received bipartisan support, since 1982. At no time have the civil rights provisions prohibited religious organizations from effective participation in federal job training programs. This rollback of civil rights protections is especially incongruous in a program designed to provide employment and career opportunities in an evenhanded manner and should be rejected.

WIA PLUS PROPOSAL

The Administration has proposed giving Governors authority to merge five additional programs into the WIA block grant. The proposal would eliminate specialized assistance to unemployed, disabled and homeless veterans, critical job training services for workers under the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act whose jobs have been outsourced or lost to foreign competition, and specialized counseling and customized help for people with disabilities through state vocational rehabilitation agencies. These individuals would have to compete with each other for a declining share of resources without the protections and requirements under current law. Furthermore, the proposal abrogates accountability for the expenditure of federal taxpayer dollars by eliminating program reporting requirements. We strongly urge you to oppose any effort to adopt this misguided plan.

In summary, H.R. 27 strays far from the appropriate mission for federal job training programs of enhancing training opportunities for workers and providing skilled workers for employers. We strongly urge you to oppose this legislation unless amendments are adopted to delete the block grant, PRA demonstration and religious-based discrimination provisions and to modify the infrastructure provisions as recommended.

American Association of People with Disabilities.

American Civil Liberties Union.

American Counseling Association.

American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE).

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO).

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME).

American Federation of Teachers (AFT).

American Humanist Association.

American Jewish Congress.

American Psychological Association.

American RehabACTion Network.

Americans for Democratic Action (ADA).
 Americans for Religious Liberty.
 Americans United for Separation of Church and State (AU).
 Association for Career and Technical Education.
 Baptist Joint Committee.
 Brain Injury Association of America.
 Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Training.
 Campaign for America's Future.
 Center for Community Change.
 Communications Workers of America (CWA).
 Council of State Administrators for Vocational Rehabilitation (CSAVR).
 Easter Seals.
 Equal Partners in Faith.
 Goodwill Industries.
 Institute for America's Future.
 Interfaith Alliance.
 International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers.
 International Brotherhood of Teamsters.
 International Union of Painters and Allied Trades.
 National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd.
 National Alliance For Partnerships in Equity.
 National Association of State Directors of Career Technical Education Consortium.
 National Association of State Head Injury Administrators.
 National Council of Jewish Women.
 National Education Association.
 National Employment Law Project.
 National Head Start Association.
 National Immigration Law Center.
 National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty.
 National League of Cities.
 National Organization for Women.
 National Rehabilitation Association (NRA).
 National WIC Association.
 National Women's Law Center.
 NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby.
 OMB Watch.
 Paralyzed Veterans of America.
 Patient Alliance for Neuroendocrine-immune Disorders; Organization for Research and Advocacy.
 Plumbers and Pipe Fitters Union.
 Professional Employees Department, AFL-CIO.
 Protestants for the Common Good.
 Service Employees International Union (SEIU).
 The Arc of the U.S..
 United Cerebral Palsy.
 Unitarian Universalist Service Committee.
 United Auto Workers (UAW).
 United Church of Christ Justice and Witness Ministries.
 United Mineworkers of America.
 United Steelworkers of America.
 USAction.
 Welfare Law Center.
 Wider Opportunities for Women.
 Women Employed.
 Women Work! The National Network for Women's Employment.
 YWCA USA.
 9 to 5, National Association of Working Women.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time, and I rise to oppose this rule to H.R. 27, the Workforce Investment Act. The gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the committee

on which I serve, is correct. The Workforce Investment Act has been successful. The renewal that is proposed to us today, however, is a step backwards; and we will hear a great deal about that.

There were amendments that were proposed that have not been made in order. These amendments would have created a separate authorization for infrastructure funding for one-stop centers, would have struck the provisions regarding personal reemployment accounts. There was an amendment that would have struck the provisions to consolidate the funding of adult, dislocated worker and employment service; and an amendment that I would like to address at this moment that I offered that would have increased the authorization by \$750 million for job training programs under the Workforce Investment Act.

Between fiscal year 2002 and fiscal year 2006, Mr. Speaker, funding for the Workforce Investment Act has been reduced by three-quarters of a billion dollars. This is for a program that works. But the funding has been reduced. My amendment would have restored this funding. However, the Committee on Rules did not see fit to accept the amendment. At a time when there are 7.7 million people unemployed, not counting those who have fallen off the rolls, 4.5 million working part-time because they cannot find a full-time job that they need, we should be doing more. Through the one-stop delivery system, job seekers have access to labor market information, job counseling, and job training to help them get back on their feet.

Back in 1998 when this bill, this program, was first passed, David Broder wrote an article. He said: When Senator Paul Wellstone walked off the floor arm in arm with Senator MIKE DEWINE of Ohio, bipartisan I should point out, Paul Wellstone said, "MIKE, this may not be the lead story on the network news, but it's a good piece of work." Well, indeed it was not the lead story on the network news.

David Broder reports, It was hard to find a trace of their bill. The news at that time was overwhelmed, overtaken by scandals. But as says Broder, In communities less consumed by scandal than Washington, the impact of the measure that DEWINE and Wellstone and others had fashioned may be felt in real lives long after the memories of the scandals have faded. In a dynamic economy where technological changes and market shifts are forcing layoffs of some people even as other jobs are being created, the key is to equip workers with needed skills and then link them efficiently to the vacancies.

That is what this legislation is intended to do. It should be authorized at a greater amount. Said Broder back then, The workers will never know the names of the legislators, but they are in their debt.

Unfortunately, the workers who do not get to take advantage of this pro-

gram because it is underfunded will never know what they have missed, and we have let them down. We should oppose this rule, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I urge the body to adopt this rule and to pass the bill.

I will be addressing just one particular topic which has been controversial in committee discussions and will be the subject of an amendment later on, and that is turning the clock back on the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and changing what it says. Those who are opposed to this bill on that ground believe that somehow it is wrong to allow religious institutions to receive Federal funds for programs that benefit the public at large, are not restricted to people of particular faith but are operated by organizations that are religiously based.

I have listened carefully to the debate in the committee. We have had this same debate several times in committee. I have yet to understand precisely what the objections are, but it seems that opponents are afraid of two things: one, that this provision in the bill somehow will allow these organizations to discriminate on other grounds in their hiring, which is, first, contrary to the Civil Rights Act, and second, I would say religious organizations are the least likely to discriminate on the basis of race or any of the other forbidden categories.

The other objection appears to be that somehow these churches are going to use this Federal money to try to proselytize, to get people in these programs and then they will say, okay, now isn't this wonderful, you should join this church.

I would like to say, that is also not true. It just does not happen. I can speak from my personal experience. When my wife and I moved to Grand Rapids, Michigan, in 1966 to take on a new position, we looked for a church. In fact, we spent 3 months trying out different churches, looking, trying to find a certain something: we wanted a church in the inner city because we wanted to be able to contribute to solving the problems of the city of Grand Rapids, particularly in the inner city.

And so we joined Eastern Avenue Christian Reformed Church because of its location and because of the attitude of its people. They worked very hard in the community. As an example, they established a community center. There was none at that time either federally funded, State funded, or city funded. The church stepped in and started it. It was on the top story of a ramshackle building which housed a small convenience store in the lower floor. It grew slowly at first, but then took off. Today it is a large community center, one of the best, if not the best, in the city. They purchased a school which was being abandoned, filled up that

school, and they now have just successfully completed a \$2.5 million capital drive to add on to their facilities and improve them.

Our church started that. We did have and still largely do have religious restrictions on the hiring of individuals, but the facility serves all people in that community. It has brought in medical care workers of all faiths to work and provide medical care and dental care for the recipients in that community.

We started a housing program which turned into the Inner City Christian Federation, and we spun off this organization as well as Baxter Community Center, but they are still largely faith-based organizations. ICCF, the Inner City Christian Federation, developed housing programs, and they had built many houses before Habitat for Humanity started in our community; but ICCF has built and remodeled more houses than almost any organization within the city that I am aware of. Again, it is faith-based. The employees are hired partially on the basis of their faith and their commitment to serving in the inner city and often work for less pay than they could get elsewhere.

Our church, not our individual congregation, but our denomination started a mental health institution, Pine Rest, years ago because the people of our church and of our community were not getting adequate mental care. Today it is one of the largest mental health hospitals in our Nation. It serves many people of different faiths and of no faith, but it is a faith-based institution because their treatment modalities are based, to a large extent, on our beliefs about the nature of people and their interaction with each other. It has been very successful. It has received millions upon millions of dollars of aid from the Federal Government, from the State through community mental health funds and from the local community.

No one has ever said a word about this, that using Federal money for this is improper. The reason is simply that Pine Rest provides services that really are unequaled anywhere else. And so they have received Federal dollars through Medicaid and through Medicare, and State dollars through community mental health. It is an outstanding operation.

Then, finally, something we have ongoing in our church right now. Every Saturday, I wish you could visit our church; you would see people of all races, all colors, all faiths walking in the church basement which we have stocked with food that we have collected from different stores, warehouses and so forth: produce, baked goods, and many different types of perishable food.

We have purchased a truck to go around and collect this on Fridays. And Saturday morning anyone from that city can walk in with no test of their faith, no means test, they can just walk in and say, I need some gro-

ceries, and they go through the line. We charge them roughly 10 cents on the dollar because we think it is a good thing for them to feel they have bought something; but a family of four can buy a week's worth of groceries for about \$10. That is a good deal. It is staffed by people from our church and from other churches, and it is a very successful operation. If we adopt the Scott amendment, which we will be discussing later, we simply could not do that.

There is one other factor here as well, and that is every church that I am aware of does not have a surplus of money. The people that they hire have to do many different jobs. That is true in our church as well. We have hired individuals who work in the church. Those individuals not only operate programs such as the food program, or getting community centers started, but they also have duties within the church and by necessity, and clearly within the intent of the Civil Rights Act, they are performing religious duties. A church cannot go out and afford to hire a different person to run each different program. You have to be multifaceted to be on the staff of a church, and that is precisely what we have in our church.

For these reasons, and many others I could enumerate, I urge the Congress to pass this rule and this bill, and to defeat the Scott amendment, so that churches and faith-based organizations of other sorts can continue to do their good work for the people of this country without fear of their programs being damaged because they would have to hire additional personnel who do not have a faith compatible with the organization.

I believe the system as we have it now, and have had it since the 1964 Civil Rights Act, has worked, it has worked well, and I urge that we keep it that way and not adopt the Scott amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just say to the gentleman who just spoke that we believe that there are many religious organizations, many faith-based organizations that do incredible work, and they will still be able to do incredible work. What we object to, quite frankly, is the use of taxpayers' money to basically subsidize discrimination. It is not just a concern that those of us who are speaking here have; I submitted a list of close to 70 civil rights and religious organizations that have objections to this provision, including the African American Ministers in Action; American Jewish Committee; the American Jewish Congress; Americans for Religious Liberty; the Anti-Defamation League; the Baptist Joint Committee; Central Conference of American Rabbis; Episcopal Church, USA; the General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church; the National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; National Council of Jewish

Women; NETWORK, a national Catholic social justice lobby; Presbyterian Church USA; Protestants For the Common Good; Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism; Texas Faith Network; the Interfaith Alliance; Union for Reform Judaism; United Universalist Association of Congregations; United Church of Christ Justice & Witness Ministries. They go on and on and on. This is a concern that many of the faith-based organizations all across this country share with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about the amendment I will be offering. I will be offering it in conjunction with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) in order to preserve and maintain civil rights protections as they currently appear in the job training laws. Current law prohibits sponsors of job training programs from discriminating based on race or religion, and that policy goes back decades. For decades, our country has prohibited discrimination in hiring with Federal funds.

In 1941, President Roosevelt ordered a prohibition against discrimination in all defense contracts. In other words, since 1941, our national policy has been that even if you can build better and cheaper rifles, the Army will not buy them from you if you discriminate in employment. The Civil Rights Act passed in 1964, and it prohibited discrimination; but it included an exception for religious organizations, but that exception was limited to the context of the religious organizations using their own money. In 1965, President Johnson banned discrimination in all government contracts without exception.

□ 1445

In job training programs specifically, this Congress passed in 1982 the Job Training Partnership Act with bipartisan support. In that Act, Congress included a nondiscrimination clause without exception, and that remains the statutory requirement in job training requirement programs today. That policy will change and discrimination will be allowed if my amendment is not adopted.

So let us be clear. This is not a debate about religious organizations having the right to participate in job training programs. They already do. As the current law stands, and my amendment would keep that law intact, Catholic, Jewish, Lutheran, Baptist, and other religious organizations already get hundreds of millions dollars today to run job training and other federally funded programs. Religious organizations do not need Section 129 in the

bill to sponsor federally funded job training programs. They need that section in order to discriminate in hiring with Federal dollars. My amendment would delete Section 129 and maintain the law against discrimination.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, when the government refuses to prohibit discrimination based on religion, it cannot effectively enforce laws against discrimination based on race or national origin. Many churches are all virtually white; others virtually all black. So if they restrict hiring based on their religious organization, they can effectively discriminate based on race. And if we do not enforce discrimination laws in Federal contracts with secular programs, where is our moral authority to tell private employers who may be devoutly religious that they cannot discriminate with their private money?

Mr. Speaker, for 40 years, if an employer had a problem hiring the best qualified applicant because of discrimination based on race or religion, that employer had a problem because the weight of the Federal Government was behind the victim of discrimination. The underlying, without my amendment, proposes to shift the weight of the Federal Government from supporting the victim of discrimination to supporting some so-called right to discriminate with Federal funds. That is a profound change in civil rights protection.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the majority try to defend the discrimination with misleading and poll-tested rhetoric. For example, I read in a Dear Colleague that the bill is one that would "restore hiring protections for faith-based organizations participating in federal job training programs." Mr. Speaker, Section 129 does not restore anything. People have not been able to discriminate in Federal contracts since 1965 and specifically not in any job training program since 1982. If anything is being restored, it is the ugly practice of discrimination that existed before the 1960s.

The Dear Colleague went on to say that Congress needs to "continue to uphold the basic civil right of America's religious organizations to hire the staff they judge to be best qualified to carry out their programs and missions when they provide job training assistance." Mr. Speaker, the language fails to say that they can hire whoever they want to promote their religious missions with the church money. But with the Federal money, they have got to hire the best qualified for the Federal mission the tax dollars were appropriated to promote without discrimination. Funds appropriated under this bill are not gifts or grants to churches. They are contracts for government services, and we should honor the tradition begun in 1941, which prohibits discrimination.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, Dear Colleague talks about barriers that exist to prevent faith-based organizations

from fully participating in government-sponsored programs, but it does not say what the barrier is. In fact, the only barrier is one cannot discriminate. Any program that can get funded under the underlying bill could be funded without Section 129 if the sponsoring organization would agree not to discriminate in employment. As a representative said during the debate on the Civil Rights Act of 1964, he said, "Stop the discrimination, get the money; continue the discrimination, do not get the money."

Employment discrimination is ugly. We can put lipstick on a pick, but we cannot pass it off as a beauty queen, and we cannot dress up "we do not hire Catholics and Jews" with poll-tested semantics and euphemisms and pass it off as anything other than ugly discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, religious organizations actively supported the Civil Rights Act 40 years ago. Today they support the nondiscrimination provision in the Workforce Investment Act the way it is and they oppose Section 129.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill unless traditional civil rights protections are included.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) will control the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS).

MR. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 27, the administration's job training reauthorization bill, would, among other misguided actions, harm veterans' employment programs and critical vocational rehabilitation services.

Specifically, this bill would permit States to siphon off Federal resources from already underfunded veterans' employment programs that operate under State "one-stop" centers. Veterans and disabled job seekers do not deserve this.

Mr. Speaker, in the 107th Congress, we passed in a bipartisan manner the Jobs for Veterans Act, legislation to reorganize, update, and improve these very same veterans' employment and training programs. Now is not the time for this bipartisan effort to be unraveled. While our troops are actively engaged in Iraq and Afghanistan and many others suffering from severe injuries and permanent disabilities, now is not the time to reduce the resources for these critical job training programs. Indeed, we need to give these programs the chance to be effective.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that States are facing tremendous fiscal challenges due to the harsh economic times, but clearly taking resources from one chronologically underfunded program is not the answer. The responsible thing for the administration to do, the right thing, would be to ade-

quately support job seekers, especially disabled veterans, as well as to assist the States with infrastructure costs.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not responsible and permits already modest resources intended for the Nation's disabled veterans, all who have served our country, to be further diminished.

I oppose this legislation and urge a "no" vote on the underlying legislation. And as a former Marine, I have benefitted from many programs that help veterans with education and training. As a continuation of those efforts, we must not let these people fall through the cracks that we have in our employment laws.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

May I respond simply to the arguments about our veterans because they are so important to us. Let me reiterate that H.R. 27 does not harm worker-retaining programs for veterans. Not one dollar from this account comes that is meant to help veterans with their training. The programs that we already have in place, specifically the Disabled Veterans' Outreach Program, the Local Veterans Employment Representative Program, the Vocational Rehabilitation Program, already are required to contribute to the infrastructure of these one-stop career center programs. Any money that would come to the one-stop center would be coming out of their administrative funds, not from the money going directly to the training of veterans. That is an area that was specifically covered in this bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, my friends on the other side have had numerous objections to provisions in H.R. 27. They have a right to do so and I expect it will be warmly discussed in the ensuing discussion of the bill itself. I believe strongly in the ability of our States, Governors, local boards, workforce boards, to be creative and innovative. There is no omniscient power that we have here. People can think for themselves in other parts of this country. And the essence of our government demands that we give them the opportunity to succeed without the benevolent help of the Federal Government.

Our job, might I remind my colleagues, is to make sure the Micaelas of the world never slip through the cracks. I believe, and I have confidence in the ability of local governments to be creative and effective, and I think so does H.R. 27. What we have today is a confusing patchwork of employment, training services. The duplication of those reduces the amount of money we get to use to help Micaelas. Many amendments that we will be discussing

on the floor have also been discussed in committee. A lot of other amendments were heard in the committee. This was fully discussed in committee and voted upon.

May I just, in closing, ask us not to lose sight that the goal is service and how to provide training for people which is given without any precondition. Hiring practices that are protected by existing law are that, protected by existing law. If we feel there is a problem with that, then we should attack the existing law, and there are venues to do that. This is not the venue in this particular bill. Faith-based institutions out there, which are not rich, are still nevertheless effective. They care. They have the same goal as we do. Our goal should be to try to join hands to help all the Micaelas in the world solve the problem of employment, retraining, and servicing, not to try to change our friends in other particular ways but to join together on a common front, in a common effort, to help people, not to harm people.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge adoption of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the structured rule that has been reported out of the Committee on Rules for this debate. The party-line vote of 220–204 that we saw in the 108th Congress on the debate of the then H.R. 1261 should evidence the need for the most open debate over the issues. The need for debate arises from disagreement. As representatives of the United States Congress, we all have a duty to fully debate the issues on behalf of our constituents. A restricted rule precludes that opportunity.

Nevertheless, I am pleased that the amendments of my colleagues from Massachusetts, New York, and Virginia respectively have been ruled in order.

Passage of these three important amendments will bring H.R. 27 one step closer to providing more jobs and better opportunities for American workers to receive training for these jobs. Without them and many other suggestions that have been made by our colleagues, this bill fails as to both initiatives. In the short term, extending unemployment benefits, coupled with the assistance that unemployed workers can receive through one-stop service centers, will provide workers with the means to achieve high paying jobs.

We must address the needs of our unemployed now and in a manner that respects the rights of individuals regardless of their faith, while they are struggling to pay their mortgages and to put food on the table for their families. The base bill will fail to address these concerns and squander resources better used to provide immediate help to our unemployed workers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject a restrictive rule or to support the amendments offered by Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 3:15 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 3:15 p.m.

□ 1515

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule xx, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 126, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 912, by the yeas and nays.

Without objection, the minimum time for electronic voting on the second question will be reduced to 5 minutes, notwithstanding the intervention of remarks concerning the passing of a former Member.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 27, JOB TRAINING IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 126, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 191, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—227

Aderholt	Bilirakis	Bradley (NH)
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)
Alexander	Blackburn	Brown (SC)
Bachus	Blunt	Brown-Waite,
Baker	Boehler	Ginny
Barrett (SC)	Boehner	Burgess
Bartlett (MD)	Bonilla	Burton (IN)
Barton (TX)	Bonner	Buyer
Bass	Bono	Calvert
Beauprez	Boozman	Camp
Biggert	Boustany	Cannon

Cantor	Hyde	Platts
Capito	Inglis (SC)	Poe
Carter	Issa	Pombo
Castle	Istook	Porter
Chabot	Jenkins	Portman
Choccola	Jindal	Price (GA)
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Pryce (OH)
Cole (OK)	Johnson (IL)	Putnam
Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Radanovich
Cox	Jones (NC)	Regula
Crenshaw	Keller	Rehberg
Cubin	Kelly	Reichert
Culberson	Kennedy (MN)	Renzi
Cunningham	King (IA)	Reynolds
Davis (KY)	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Davis, Jo Ann	Kingston	Rogers (KY)
Davis, Tom	Kirk	Rogers (MI)
Deal (GA)	Kline	Rohrabacher
DeLay	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
Dent	Kolbe	Royce
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kuhl (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart, M.	LaHood	Ryun (KS)
Doolittle	Latham	Saxton
Drake	LaTourette	Schwarz (MI)
Dreier	Leach	Sensenbrenner
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Sessions
Ehlers	Lewis (KY)	Shadegg
Emerson	Linder	Shaw
English (PA)	LoBiondo	Shays
Everett	Lucas	Sherwood
Feeney	Lungren, Daniel	Shimkus
Fitzpatrick (PA)	E.	Shuster
Flake	Mack	Simmons
Forbes	Manzullo	Simpson
Fortenberry	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
Fossella	McCaul (TX)	Smith (TX)
Fox	McCotter	Sodrel
Franks (AZ)	McCrery	Souder
Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Stearns
Gallely	McHugh	Sullivan
Garrett (NJ)	McKeon	Sweeney
Gerlach	McMorris	Tancredo
Gibbons	Mica	Taylor (NC)
Gilchrest	Miller (FL)	Terry
Gingrey	Miller (MI)	Thomas
Gohmert	Miller, Gary	Thornberry
Goode	Moran (KS)	Tiahrt
Goodlatte	Murphy	Tiberi
Granger	Musgrave	Turner
Graves	Myrick	Upton
Green (WI)	Neugebauer	Walden (OR)
Gutknecht	Ney	Walsh
Hall	Northup	Wamp
Hart	Norwood	Weldon (FL)
Hastings (WA)	Nunes	Weldon (PA)
Hayes	Nussle	Weller
Hayworth	Osborne	Westmoreland
Hefley	Otter	Whitfield
Hensarling	Oxley	Wicker
Herger	Paul	Wilson (NM)
Hinojosa	Pearce	Wilson (SC)
Hobson	Pence	Wolf
Hoekstra	Peterson (PA)	Young (AK)
Hostettler	Petri	Young (FL)
Hulshof	Pickering	
Hunter	Pitts	

NAYS—191

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Ford
Ackerman	Conyers	Frank (MA)
Allen	Cooper	Gonzalez
Andrews	Costa	Gordon
Baca	Costello	Green, Al
Baird	Cramer	Green, Gene
Baldwin	Crowley	Grijalva
Barrow	Cuellar	Gutierrez
Bean	Cummings	Harman
Becerra	Davis (AL)	Hastings (FL)
Berkley	Davis (CA)	Herseth
Berman	Davis (FL)	Higgins
Berry	Davis (IL)	Hinchee
Bishop (GA)	Davis (TN)	Holden
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Holt
Blumenauer	DeGette	Honda
Boren	Delahunt	Hooley
Boswell	DeLauro	Hoyer
Boucher	Dicks	Inlee
Boyd	Dingell	Israel
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Brown (OH)	Doyle	Jackson-Lee
Brown, Corrine	Edwards	(TX)
Butterfield	Emanuel	Jefferson
Capps	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Cardin	Eshoo	Jones (OH)
Cardoza	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Carnahan	Evans	Kaptur
Case	Farr	Kennedy (RI)
Chandler	Fattah	Kildee
Clay	Filner	Kilpatrick (MI)