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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Whereas Representative SENSBNRRENNER willfully trampled the right of the minority to meaningfully hold an additional day of hearings in violation of the Rules of the House of Representa- tives, and brought discredit upon the House of Representatives: Now, there- fore, be it

Resolved, That

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

(2) the House instructs Representa- tive SENSBNRRENNER, in consultation with Representative CONYERS, to schedule a further day of hearings with witnesses requested by members of the minority party concerning the reau- thorization of the USA PATRIOT Act.”

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

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

The Chair will not at this point de- termine whether the resolution con- stitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the res- olution.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unani- mous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to re- vise and extend their remarks and in- clude extemporaneous material on H.R. 2862 and that I may include tabular mate- rial on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gen- tleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COM- MERCE, AND RELATED AGEN- CIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2006

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

▶ 1134

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Chairman, who, pursuant to rule XIX, is pre- cedent for beginning consideration of H.R. 2862, making appro- priations for fiscal year 2006 for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and related agen- cies. This bill provides funding for pro- grams whose impact ranges from the safety of people in their homes and communities to the conduct of diplo- macy around the world, to the furthest reaches of space exploration.

As a bill before the House today re- flects a delicate balance of needs and requirements. We have drafted what I consider a responsible bill for fiscal year 2006 spending levels for the de- partments and agencies under the sub- committee’s jurisdiction. We have had to carefully prioritize funding in the bill and make hard choices about how to spend scarce resources.

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

Also I wanted to thank all members of the subcommittee for their help and assistance: the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRKK), the gentleman from New York (Mr. WELDON), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Cramer), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. REDD), and also the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the full committee.

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

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

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

It has been a good bipartisan effort. Sometimes those things are said, but sometimes there is not a lot of reality to them. But this has been a good bi- partisan effort. As in past years, we
I heard the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) talking earlier during debate on the rule, and I agree with what the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) said. Why would the administration have ever zeroed this out? But we have leveled $1 billion above the request for the highest-priority programs, including SCAAP, Justice Assistance Grants and Juvenile Justice programs, all of which the administration proposed to eliminate or drastically reduce.

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

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

I just cannot understand why this administration is not bringing an intellectual property case with regard to China. We gave them all of the resources this year. If they do not move this year, I do not know what we can do. Hopefully, with Rob Portman down there, they will move. This will empower them to negotiate, verify and enforce trade agreements that they have signed. We will ensure an even playing field for American businesses.

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

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

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

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

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

For NASA, the bill ensures that the President’s vision for space exploration is adequately funded at $31 billion, while at the same time restoring the aeronautics research program to the enacted level of $906 million, and providing $40 million over the request to partially restore NASA’s science programs.

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

Boeing is dropped in production and share of the market. Ten years ago they had 65 percent of the market, now they are down to 48 to 49. Frankly, with an aeronautics policy, that will continue to drop. That language, working with the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLENT), is in here.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We also include new language sup-
porting the maintenance of a flat U.N.
budget. We also require the State De-
partment to keep the committee in-
formed of any changes in the U.N.
budget.

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

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

For the SBA, the bill provides full re-
quested funding for Small Business De-
velopment Centers. We restored $11
million for the Microloan program,
which the President proposed to termi-
nate. For business loan programs, the
bill allows for $16.5 billion in general
business loans, an unprecedented pro-
gram level, while requiring no appro-
priation.

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

It represents our best take on match-
ing needs with scarce resources. We
have tried very hard to produce the
best bill we could within the resources
that we had to work with, and I urge
all Members to support the bill.
### TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

#### General Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>122,443</td>
<td>161,407</td>
<td>89,906</td>
<td>-32,537</td>
<td>-71,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Intelligence and Policy Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,050</td>
<td>+37,050</td>
<td>+37,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>122,443</td>
<td>161,407</td>
<td>126,956</td>
<td>+4,513</td>
<td>+34,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint automated booking system</td>
<td>19,915</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-19,915</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Biometric Identification System-Integrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,987</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-4,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification system integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181,490</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>+46,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice information sharing technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39,969</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-39,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal activities office automation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,064</td>
<td>128,701</td>
<td>+38,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowband communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>+11,336</td>
<td>+18,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative review and appeals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201,241</td>
<td>216,286</td>
<td>+15,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention trustee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>874,160</td>
<td>1,222,000</td>
<td>+347,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>184,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-184,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62,960</td>
<td>67,431</td>
<td>+4,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, General administration</td>
<td>1,608,339</td>
<td>1,977,315</td>
<td>1,876,442</td>
<td>+268,103</td>
<td>-100,873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### United States Parole Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>10,496</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>+704</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Legal Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General legal activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>625,722</td>
<td>679,061</td>
<td>+53,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccine injury compensation trust fund (permanent)</td>
<td>6,249</td>
<td>6,333</td>
<td>6,333</td>
<td>+84</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antitrust Division</td>
<td>138,259</td>
<td>144,451</td>
<td>144,451</td>
<td>+6,192</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting fee collections - current year</td>
<td>-101,000</td>
<td>-116,000</td>
<td>-116,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>37,259</td>
<td>28,451</td>
<td>28,451</td>
<td>-8,808</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### United States Attorneys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>1,526,849</td>
<td>1,626,146</td>
<td>1,626,146</td>
<td>+99,297</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Trustee System Fund</td>
<td>173,602</td>
<td>185,402</td>
<td>214,402</td>
<td>+40,800</td>
<td>+29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting fee collections</td>
<td>-168,802</td>
<td>-180,402</td>
<td>-208,402</td>
<td>-40,000</td>
<td>-29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on U.S. securities</td>
<td>-5,000</td>
<td>-5,000</td>
<td>-5,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Claims Settlement Commission</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### United States Marshals Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>741,941</td>
<td>790,255</td>
<td>800,255</td>
<td>+58,314</td>
<td>+10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)</td>
<td>11,935</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-11,935</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5,657</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, United States Marshals Service</td>
<td>759,533</td>
<td>790,255</td>
<td>800,255</td>
<td>+40,722</td>
<td>+10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total, Legal activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fees and expenses of witnesses</td>
<td>177,585</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td>-9,585</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations Service</td>
<td>9,535</td>
<td>9,759</td>
<td>9,659</td>
<td>+124</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets forfeiture fund</td>
<td>21,468</td>
<td>21,468</td>
<td>21,468</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to radiation exposure compensation trust fund</td>
<td>27,429</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-27,429</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Legal activities</td>
<td>3,192,833</td>
<td>3,331,343</td>
<td>3,327,353</td>
<td>+134,520</td>
<td>-3,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Interagency Law Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interagency crime and drug enforcement</td>
<td>553,539</td>
<td>661,940</td>
<td>506,940</td>
<td>-46,599</td>
<td>-155,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2005 Enacted</td>
<td>FY 2006 Request</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Bill vs. Enacted</td>
<td>Bill vs. Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>4,132,000</td>
<td>4,091,132</td>
<td>3,462,235</td>
<td>-679,855</td>
<td>-638,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)</td>
<td>73,991</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-73,991</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterintelligence and national security</td>
<td>1,003,416</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>2,288,897</td>
<td>+1,285,481</td>
<td>+688,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>5,209,497</td>
<td>5,691,132</td>
<td>5,741,132</td>
<td>+531,035</td>
<td>+50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>10,106</td>
<td>10,105</td>
<td>20,105</td>
<td>+9,999</td>
<td>+10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
<td>5,219,883</td>
<td>5,701,237</td>
<td>5,761,237</td>
<td>+541,034</td>
<td>+60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Enforcement Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>1,765,398</td>
<td>1,692,722</td>
<td>1,907,846</td>
<td>+122,448</td>
<td>+15,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)</td>
<td>7,648</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-7,648</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion control fund</td>
<td>-154,216</td>
<td>-198,566</td>
<td>-201,673</td>
<td>-47,457</td>
<td>-3,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Drug Enforcement Administration</td>
<td>1,638,830</td>
<td>1,694,156</td>
<td>1,706,173</td>
<td>+67,345</td>
<td>+12,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>878,465</td>
<td>803,613</td>
<td>923,613</td>
<td>+45,148</td>
<td>+120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative proposal</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms</td>
<td>882,465</td>
<td>923,613</td>
<td>923,613</td>
<td>+41,148</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Prison System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>4,565,884</td>
<td>4,895,649</td>
<td>4,895,649</td>
<td>+329,765</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-5,500</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and facilities</td>
<td>186,475</td>
<td>170,112</td>
<td>70,112</td>
<td>-16,363</td>
<td>-100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-314,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+314,000</td>
<td>+300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-18,600</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (limitation on administrative expenses)</td>
<td>3,366</td>
<td>3,365</td>
<td>3,365</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Federal Prison System</td>
<td>4,779,825</td>
<td>4,755,126</td>
<td>4,969,126</td>
<td>+189,301</td>
<td>+214,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against women office</td>
<td>382,103</td>
<td>362,997</td>
<td>387,497</td>
<td>+5,394</td>
<td>+24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Justice Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice assistance</td>
<td>224,856</td>
<td>1,234,977</td>
<td>227,466</td>
<td>+2,610</td>
<td>-1,007,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-95,500</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+95,500</td>
<td>+95,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety officers benefits, death benefits</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-64,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Justice assistance</td>
<td>224,856</td>
<td>1,234,977</td>
<td>227,466</td>
<td>+2,610</td>
<td>-976,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and local law enforcement assistance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice assistance grants</td>
<td>625,531</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>346,466</td>
<td>-277,005</td>
<td>+348,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys and Girls clubs (earmark)</td>
<td>(83,865)</td>
<td>(85,000)</td>
<td>(1,135)</td>
<td>(+65,000)</td>
<td>(+10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Justice (earmark)</td>
<td>(9,808)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>(+134)</td>
<td>(-2,467)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA FREEDOM corps (earmark)</td>
<td>(2,467)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(-2,467)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian assistance</td>
<td>17,760</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>17,760</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal prison construction</td>
<td>(4,933)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(-4,933)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian tribal courts program</td>
<td>(7,893)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(-7,893)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian grants</td>
<td>(4,933)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(-4,933)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State criminal alien assistance program</td>
<td>300,926</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>+64,074</td>
<td>+355,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest border prosecutors</td>
<td>29,599</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>+401</td>
<td>+30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne grants (discretionary)</td>
<td>167,756</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>-57,756</td>
<td>+110,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug courts</td>
<td>39,466</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>+534</td>
<td>+40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other crime control programs</td>
<td>5,903</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>-5,032</td>
<td>+971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance for victims of trafficking</td>
<td>9,866</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>+134</td>
<td>+10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription drug monitoring</td>
<td>9,866</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>+134</td>
<td>+10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison rape prevention</td>
<td>36,596</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>+3,404</td>
<td>+40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State prison drug treatment</td>
<td>24,666</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>+334</td>
<td>+25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence sharing</td>
<td>10,359</td>
<td>10,359</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+10,359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005 Enacted</td>
<td>FY 2006 Request</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Bill vs. Enacted</td>
<td>Bill vs. Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis eradication</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>+11,600</td>
<td>+11,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital litigation</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>+10,000</td>
<td>+10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, State and Local law enforcement</strong></td>
<td>1,278,204</td>
<td>1,001,286</td>
<td>-276,918</td>
<td>+1,001,286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed and seed fund</td>
<td>61,172</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-11,172</td>
<td>+50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community oriented policing services:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring</td>
<td>9,866</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-9,866</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and technical assistance</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-14,800</td>
<td>-7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullet proof vests</td>
<td>24,668</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>+5,332</td>
<td>+30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal law enforcement</td>
<td>19,733</td>
<td>51,600</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>+18,267</td>
<td>-13,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meth hot spots</td>
<td>51,854</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>+8,146</td>
<td>+40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police corps</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-14,800</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS technology</td>
<td>136,763</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>-16,763</td>
<td>+120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interoperable communications</td>
<td>98,864</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-98,864</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal records upgrade</td>
<td>24,666</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>+334</td>
<td>+25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA backlog/crime lab</td>
<td>108,531</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>177,057</td>
<td>+68,526</td>
<td>+177,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Coverdell forensics science</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-14,800</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime identification technology</td>
<td>28,070</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-28,070</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender reentry</td>
<td>9,866</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>+134</td>
<td>+10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe schools initiative</td>
<td>4,268</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-4,268</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police integrity grants</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-7,400</td>
<td>-10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce gang violence</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>+60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and administration</td>
<td>29,599</td>
<td>29,181</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-29,599</td>
<td>-29,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-115,500</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+115,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Community oriented policing services</strong></td>
<td>598,346</td>
<td>520,057</td>
<td>-78,289</td>
<td>+517,776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juvenile justice programs:</strong></td>
<td>379,045</td>
<td>333,712</td>
<td>-45,333</td>
<td>+333,712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public safety officers benefits:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death benefits</td>
<td>63,054</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>+1,046</td>
<td>+64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability and education benefits</td>
<td>6,324</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>8,948</td>
<td>+2,624</td>
<td>+8,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Public safety officers benefits program</strong></td>
<td>69,378</td>
<td>72,948</td>
<td>+3,570</td>
<td>+72,948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Office of Justice Programs</strong></td>
<td>2,611,001</td>
<td>2,205,479</td>
<td>-405,522</td>
<td>+999,721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Attorneys (Sec. 107)</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-14,800</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets forfeiture fund (sec. 109) (rescission)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-62,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, title I, Department of Justice</strong></td>
<td>20,893,834</td>
<td>20,562,785</td>
<td>21,675,060</td>
<td>+781,286</td>
<td>+1,112,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(20,586,160)</td>
<td>(21,149,765)</td>
<td>(21,675,060)</td>
<td>(+1,086,900)</td>
<td>(+525,275)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions</td>
<td>(305,874)</td>
<td>(587,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(587,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES**

**TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT**

**RELATED AGENCIES**

**Office of the United States Trade Representative**

| Salaries and expenses National Intellectual Property Law Enforcement Coordinating Council | 40,997 | 38,779 | 44,779 | +3,782 | +6,000 |
| Salaries and expenses International Trade Commission | 1,973 | --- | --- | -1,973 | --- |

**Total, Related agencies**

| 103,846 | 104,057 | 107,531 | +3,684 | +3,684 |
### SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2602)

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Trade Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and administration</td>
<td>396,257</td>
<td>408,925</td>
<td>406,925</td>
<td>+10,668</td>
<td>-2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting fee collections</td>
<td>-8,000</td>
<td>-13,000</td>
<td>-13,000</td>
<td>-5,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>388,257</td>
<td>395,925</td>
<td>393,925</td>
<td>+5,666</td>
<td>-2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bureau of Industry and Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and administration</td>
<td>60,376</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>62,233</td>
<td>+1,857</td>
<td>-14,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWC enforcement</td>
<td>7,104</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>14,767</td>
<td>+7,663</td>
<td>+14,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Bureau of Industry and Security</td>
<td>67,480</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>+9,520</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development assistance programs</td>
<td>253,985</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>200,985</td>
<td>-53,000</td>
<td>+200,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>26,584</td>
<td>26,584</td>
<td>227,569</td>
<td>-56,491</td>
<td>+200,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Economic Development Administration</td>
<td>284,060</td>
<td>26,584</td>
<td>227,569</td>
<td>-56,491</td>
<td>+200,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development Challenge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening America's Communities grant program (legislative proposal)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3,710,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-3,710,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minority Business Development Agency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority business development</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>30,727</td>
<td>30,024</td>
<td>+524</td>
<td>-703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Trade and Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>873,143</td>
<td>4,344,293</td>
<td>836,049</td>
<td>-37,094</td>
<td>-3,506,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic and Statistical Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>78,931</td>
<td>85,277</td>
<td>80,304</td>
<td>+1,375</td>
<td>-4,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bureau of the Census</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>196,110</td>
<td>220,029</td>
<td>208,029</td>
<td>+11,919</td>
<td>-12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic censuses and programs</td>
<td>546,688</td>
<td>657,356</td>
<td>624,206</td>
<td>+75,520</td>
<td>-33,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Bureau of the Census</td>
<td>744,798</td>
<td>877,385</td>
<td>832,237</td>
<td>+87,439</td>
<td>-45,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Telecommunications and Information Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>21,450</td>
<td>17,716</td>
<td>+516</td>
<td>-3,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public telecommunications facilities, planning and construction</td>
<td>21,478</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-19,478</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, National Telecommunications and Information Administration</td>
<td>38,678</td>
<td>23,450</td>
<td>19,716</td>
<td>-18,962</td>
<td>-3,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Patent and Trademark Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current year fee funding</td>
<td>1,336,000</td>
<td>1,703,300</td>
<td>1,703,300</td>
<td>+367,300</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending from new fees (proposed legislation)</td>
<td>208,754</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-208,754</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Patent and Trademark Office</td>
<td>1,544,754</td>
<td>1,703,300</td>
<td>1,703,300</td>
<td>+158,546</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting fee collections</td>
<td>-1,336,000</td>
<td>-1,703,300</td>
<td>-1,703,300</td>
<td>-367,300</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Economic and Information Infrastructure</td>
<td>1,071,161</td>
<td>986,112</td>
<td>932,257</td>
<td>-138,904</td>
<td>-53,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Category</td>
<td>FY 2005 Enacted</td>
<td>FY 2006 Request</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Bill vs. FY 2005 Enacted</td>
<td>Bill vs. FY 2006 Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology</strong></td>
<td>699,225</td>
<td>531,965</td>
<td>548,744</td>
<td>-150,481</td>
<td>+16,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Operations, research, and facilities</strong></td>
<td>2,766,612</td>
<td>2,528,168</td>
<td>2,444,000</td>
<td>-322,612</td>
<td>-94,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer from Promote and Develop Fund)</td>
<td>(65,000)</td>
<td>(77,000)</td>
<td>(77,000)</td>
<td>(+12,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Procurement, acquisition and construction</strong></td>
<td>1,039,365</td>
<td>965,051</td>
<td>936,000</td>
<td>-103,365</td>
<td>-29,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</strong></td>
<td>3,925,167</td>
<td>3,581,219</td>
<td>3,429,000</td>
<td>-496,167</td>
<td>-152,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Science and Technology</strong></td>
<td>4,630,852</td>
<td>4,117,384</td>
<td>3,984,204</td>
<td>-646,648</td>
<td>-133,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Department of Commerce</strong></td>
<td>6,550,359</td>
<td>9,450,022</td>
<td>5,715,203</td>
<td>-635,155</td>
<td>-3,734,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, title II, Department of Commerce and related agencies</strong></td>
<td>6,654,204</td>
<td>9,554,079</td>
<td>5,822,734</td>
<td>-831,470</td>
<td>-3,731,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>(65,000)</td>
<td>(86,000)</td>
<td>(78,000)</td>
<td>(+13,000)</td>
<td>(-8,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer out)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Salaries and expenses</strong></td>
<td>6,460</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>6,460</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+2,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>FY 2005 Enacted</td>
<td>FY 2006 Request</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Bill vs. Enacted</td>
<td>Bill vs. Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE III - SCIENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Science and Technology Policy</td>
<td>6,328</td>
<td>5,564</td>
<td>5,564</td>
<td>-764</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, aeronautics and exploration</td>
<td>9,334,700</td>
<td>9,661,000</td>
<td>9,725,750</td>
<td>+391,050</td>
<td>+64,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-126,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration capabilities</td>
<td>6,704,400</td>
<td>6,763,000</td>
<td>6,712,900</td>
<td>+8,500</td>
<td>-50,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>31,300</td>
<td>32,400</td>
<td>32,400</td>
<td>+1,100</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, NASA</strong></td>
<td>16,196,400</td>
<td>16,456,400</td>
<td>16,471,050</td>
<td>+274,650</td>
<td>+14,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and related activities (non-defense)</td>
<td>4,153,100</td>
<td>4,265,970</td>
<td>4,310,000</td>
<td>+156,900</td>
<td>+44,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense function</td>
<td>67,456</td>
<td>67,520</td>
<td>67,520</td>
<td>+64</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major research equipment and facilities construction</td>
<td>173,850</td>
<td>250,010</td>
<td>193,350</td>
<td>+19,700</td>
<td>-56,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and human resources</td>
<td>841,421</td>
<td>737,000</td>
<td>807,000</td>
<td>-34,421</td>
<td>+70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>223,200</td>
<td>269,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>+28,800</td>
<td>-19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Board</td>
<td>3,968</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>+32</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>10,028</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>+1,472</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, National Science Foundation</strong></td>
<td>5,472,824</td>
<td>5,605,000</td>
<td>5,643,370</td>
<td>+170,546</td>
<td>+38,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, title III, Science</strong></td>
<td>21,675,552</td>
<td>22,068,964</td>
<td>22,119,984</td>
<td>+444,432</td>
<td>+53,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE IV - DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF STATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic and consular programs</td>
<td>3,522,316</td>
<td>3,783,118</td>
<td>3,747,118</td>
<td>+224,802</td>
<td>-36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer out)</td>
<td>(-4,000)</td>
<td>(-4,000)</td>
<td>(-4,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide security upgrades</td>
<td>649,904</td>
<td>689,523</td>
<td>689,523</td>
<td>+39,619</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)</td>
<td>734,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-734,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Diplomatic and consular programs</strong></td>
<td>4,906,220</td>
<td>4,472,641</td>
<td>4,436,641</td>
<td>-469,579</td>
<td>-36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital investment fund</td>
<td>51,452</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>128,263</td>
<td>+76,811</td>
<td>-4,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized IT modernization program</td>
<td>76,812</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-76,812</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>30,029</td>
<td>29,983</td>
<td>29,983</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and cultural exchange programs</td>
<td>355,932</td>
<td>430,400</td>
<td>410,400</td>
<td>+54,466</td>
<td>-20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation allowances</td>
<td>8,524</td>
<td>8,281</td>
<td>8,281</td>
<td>+346</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of foreign missions and officials</td>
<td>9,762</td>
<td>8,390</td>
<td>8,390</td>
<td>-372</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy security, construction, and maintenance</td>
<td>603,510</td>
<td>616,900</td>
<td>603,510</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-12,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide security upgrades</td>
<td>900,134</td>
<td>910,200</td>
<td>910,200</td>
<td>+10,066</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)</td>
<td>592,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-592,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>13,643</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>+3,643</td>
<td>-3,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer out)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(-1,000)</td>
<td>(-1,000)</td>
<td>(-1,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repatriation Loans Program Account:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct loans subsidy</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>+108</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(+1,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Repatriation loans program account</strong></td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>+116</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan</td>
<td>19,222</td>
<td>19,751</td>
<td>19,751</td>
<td>+529</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund</td>
<td>132,600</td>
<td>131,700</td>
<td>131,700</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs</strong></td>
<td>7,688,397</td>
<td>6,776,108</td>
<td>6,699,438</td>
<td>-888,949</td>
<td>-76,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)  
(Amounts in thousands)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment</td>
<td>1,166,212</td>
<td>1,296,500</td>
<td>1,166,212</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-130,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year</td>
<td>463,455</td>
<td>1,035,500</td>
<td>1,035,500</td>
<td>+502,045</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>25,123</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>+312</td>
<td>-3,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, International Organizations and Conferences</strong></td>
<td>2,329,667</td>
<td>2,332,000</td>
<td>2,201,712</td>
<td>-127,955</td>
<td>-130,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Commissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>26,866</td>
<td>28,700</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>+120</td>
<td>-1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5,399</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>+61</td>
<td>-1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American sections, international commissions</td>
<td>9,466</td>
<td>9,879</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>+34</td>
<td>-379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International fisheries commissions</td>
<td>21,686</td>
<td>25,123</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>+312</td>
<td>-3,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, International commissions</strong></td>
<td>63,273</td>
<td>70,302</td>
<td>63,800</td>
<td>+527</td>
<td>-6,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to the Asia Foundation</td>
<td>12,827</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-2,827</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Center for Middle Eastern-Western dialogue</td>
<td>6,906</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-6,906</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship program</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional funding (Sec. 122 Div. J)</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-952</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israeli Arab scholarship program</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West Center</td>
<td>19,240</td>
<td>13,024</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>-13,240</td>
<td>-7,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for Democracy</td>
<td>59,199</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-9,199</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Department of State</strong></td>
<td>10,181,354</td>
<td>9,283,309</td>
<td>9,031,825</td>
<td>-1,149,529</td>
<td>-251,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELATED AGENCY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting Board of Governors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Broadcasting Operations</td>
<td>583,107</td>
<td>603,394</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>+36,606</td>
<td>+16,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-4,800</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting to Cuba</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>37,656</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-37,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting capital improvements</td>
<td>8,446</td>
<td>10,893</td>
<td>10,893</td>
<td>+2,447</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-2,500</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Broadcasting Board of Governors</strong></td>
<td>598,853</td>
<td>651,943</td>
<td>630,893</td>
<td>+32,040</td>
<td>-21,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, title IV, Department of State and Related Agency Appropriations</strong></td>
<td>10,780,207</td>
<td>9,935,252</td>
<td>9,662,718</td>
<td>-1,117,499</td>
<td>-272,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (Transfer out)</td>
<td>(8,766,907)</td>
<td>(9,935,252)</td>
<td>(9,662,718)</td>
<td>(+865,811)</td>
<td>(-272,534)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>(-2,013,300)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(-2,013,300)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE V - RELATED AGENCIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antitrust Modernization Commission</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Civil Rights</td>
<td>8,975</td>
<td>9,096</td>
<td>9,096</td>
<td>+121</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2005 Requested</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commission on International Religious Freedom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>2,960</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>+240</td>
<td>+200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>+224</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equal Employment Opportunity Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>326,803</td>
<td>331,228</td>
<td>331,228</td>
<td>+4,425</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Communications Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>281,085</td>
<td>304,057</td>
<td>289,771</td>
<td>+8,686</td>
<td>-14,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting fee collections - current year</td>
<td>-280,098</td>
<td>-289,234</td>
<td>-288,771</td>
<td>-8,673</td>
<td>+10,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>4,823</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>-3,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Trade Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>204,327</td>
<td>211,000</td>
<td>211,000</td>
<td>+6,673</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting fee collections - current year</td>
<td>-101,000</td>
<td>-116,000</td>
<td>-116,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting fee collections, telephone database</td>
<td>-21,901</td>
<td>-23,000</td>
<td>-23,000</td>
<td>-1,099</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>81,426</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>-9,426</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HELP Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Services Corporation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to the Legal Services Corporation</td>
<td>330,803</td>
<td>318,250</td>
<td>330,803</td>
<td>+12,553</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marine Mammal Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Veterans Business Development Corporation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Veterans Business Development Corporation</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-1,973</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Securities and Exchange Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>913,000</td>
<td>888,117</td>
<td>888,117</td>
<td>-24,883</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior year unobligated balances</td>
<td>-57,000</td>
<td>-25,000</td>
<td>-25,000</td>
<td>+32,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>856,000</td>
<td>863,117</td>
<td>863,117</td>
<td>+7,117</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Business Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>318,029</td>
<td>307,150</td>
<td>318,029</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+10,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>12,840</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>+560</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surety bond guarantees revolving fund</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Loans Program Account:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct loans subsidy</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-435</td>
<td>+1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>124,981</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>124,981</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-4,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Business loans program account</strong></td>
<td>126,416</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>125,981</td>
<td>-435</td>
<td>-3,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005 Enacted</td>
<td>FY 2006 Request</td>
<td>Bill Enacted</td>
<td>Bill vs. Request</td>
<td>Bill vs. Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Loans Program Account:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct loans subsidy</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>83,335</td>
<td>79,538</td>
<td>+79,538</td>
<td>-3,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)</td>
<td>501,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-501,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>111,648</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>49,716</td>
<td>-61,932</td>
<td>-6,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)</td>
<td>428,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-428,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Disaster loans program account</td>
<td>1,040,848</td>
<td>139,335</td>
<td>129,254</td>
<td>-911,394</td>
<td>-10,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Small Business Administration</td>
<td>1,500,774</td>
<td>592,994</td>
<td>589,805</td>
<td>-911,169</td>
<td>-3,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Justice Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-578</td>
<td>+2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States - China Economic and Security Review Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>2,960</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>+1,040</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senate-China Interparliamentary Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-98</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Institute of Peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses</td>
<td>22,899</td>
<td>21,850</td>
<td>22,850</td>
<td>+157</td>
<td>+1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional funding (Sec. 122 Div. J)</td>
<td>99,200</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-99,200</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, United States Institute of Peace</td>
<td>121,893</td>
<td>21,850</td>
<td>22,850</td>
<td>-99,043</td>
<td>+1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, title V, Related agencies</td>
<td>3,246,427</td>
<td>2,229,332</td>
<td>2,237,365</td>
<td>-1,009,062</td>
<td>+8,033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TITLE VII - RESCISSIONS**

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**General Administration**

Working capital fund (rescission) | -60,000 | --- | --- | +60,000 | --- |

**Legal Activities**

Assets forfeiture fund (rescission) | -61,800 | --- | -62,000 | -200 | -62,000 |

Justice assistance (rescission) | -1,619 | --- | --- | +1,619 | --- |

State & local law enforcement assistance (rescission) | -29,380 | --- | -38,500 | -9,120 | -38,500 |

Community oriented policing services (rescission) | -99,000 | --- | -88,500 | +12,500 | -88,500 |

Juvenile justice programs (rescission) | -3,500 | --- | --- | +3,500 | --- |

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**National Institute of Standards and Technology**

Industrial technology services (rescission) | -3,900 | --- | --- | +3,900 | --- |

**Departmental Management**

Emergency steel guaranteed loan program account (rescission) | --- | -50,168 | -35,000 | -35,000 | +15,168 |
### SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Enacted</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Communications Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses (rescission)</td>
<td>-12,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+12,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. - Canada Alaska Railroad Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses (rescission)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-2,000</td>
<td>-2,000</td>
<td>-2,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, title VII, Rescissions</td>
<td>-311,199</td>
<td>-52,168</td>
<td>-224,000</td>
<td>+87,199</td>
<td>-171,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total: New budget (obligational) authority</td>
<td>62,939,025</td>
<td>64,296,244</td>
<td>61,293,861</td>
<td>-1,645,184</td>
<td>-3,002,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(59,838,310)</td>
<td>(64,935,412)</td>
<td>(61,517,861)</td>
<td>(+1,679,551)</td>
<td>(-3,417,551)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations</td>
<td>(-3,411,914)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(-3,411,914)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions</td>
<td>(-311,199)</td>
<td>(-639,188)</td>
<td>(-224,000)</td>
<td>(+87,199)</td>
<td>(+415,168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer out)</td>
<td>(-4,000)</td>
<td>(-14,000)</td>
<td>(-6,000)</td>
<td>(-2,000)</td>
<td>(+8,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>(69,000)</td>
<td>(91,000)</td>
<td>(83,000)</td>
<td>(+14,000)</td>
<td>(+8,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

I am concerned that when we look at funding for these crucial programs over time, we are systematically reducing the Federal investments in our communities. For example, the chairman has restored about $1 billion over the President's cuts to the State and local law enforcement, but the bill is still about $400 million below last year's level. Now, that is a crucial fact. As we face terrorism, as we continue to fight crime, as we have been successful with it over the last 10 years in large part because of the Federal contribution to help fund these local levels, this bill fails to have time to back off of this support; but this bill is $400 million below last year's level for support to State and local law enforcement.

Mr. Chairman, the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), went before the Committee on Rules. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) asked to be made in order an amendment to restore some of this funding and the gentleman, that would have been particularly appropriate, to offset just a small part of the tax cut that the most wealthy 1 percent in this country have received over the last 4 and 5 years, to support State and local law enforcement. I cannot think of a more fair offset from a percentage of our population, the most wealthy, who have had a tax cut of less than anyone else in our country. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is going to offer an amendment on the floor to address this issue, and I would hope that there would not be an objection against it.

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

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

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

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

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

NASA, Mr. Chairman, is funded slightly above the President’s request. The Space Shuttle's Return to Flight is fully funded, and the chairman has restored aeronautics funding to last year's level, and has increased the Science Accounts to $40 million. However, the funding for crucial science and aeronautics programs are being reduced, deferred, and ultimately will wither. The Science Account, including programs such as Solar System Exploration, Universe Exploration, and the Earth Sun System would receive less than a 1 percent increase over this budget proposal; yet the most recent successes have come from this program.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I would ask Members to pay attention to the fact that what is offered to this bill and most importantly, vote “no” on the Obey amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I note the majority leader’s reference to morality. It is difficult not to be lectured on morality by the majority leader, almost makes me laugh. But let me simply say one thing. We are here today with a bill brought by a fine Member of Congress, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Wolf), who does his dead level best to provide a fair allocation of money within the amount assigned to his subcommittee.

The problem is that because the majority party has already made its basic budget decisions, and it has made as its number one priority providing tax cuts for people making more than a million bucks, because of that, there is very little left on the table for any of the domestic programs. And so the majority is now bringing to the floor bills which are inadequate for education, inadequate for science, inadequate for health, inadequate for law enforcement.

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

So he abolished the subcommittee.

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

My first choice was to go to the Rules Committee and ask them to allow me to offer an amendment to scale back the size of the tax cut for those making a million dollars or more a year by $2,000. That means those poor devils are going to have to get by with a $383,000 tax cut next year. The majority party denied that. They force me now to look for other sources within the bill. So what I have done is to look at the places where this bill has increased over last year, because local law enforcement has been cut by a billion dollars. So what the amendment does, it says let us scale back our plans to go to Mars by 2030 and instead make as a higher priority providing better law enforcement for grandma and grandpa back home.

That is what we are trying to do. I make no apology for it.

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

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill. As we all know, this is a difficult budget year. The American people have expressed, both Democrats and Republicans, strong concern about the budget deficits and are asking Congress to
move in a direction of a balanced budget. That is what this bill does, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) needs to be commended. It has a slight decrease in the State Department and Commerce Department funding, a slight increase in Justice Department funding, and as has been pointed out an increase in the science account.

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

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

I want to specifically address the issue of the President’s space initiative. And one of the things that I have been increasingly concerned about in my position as a legislator is the fact that people in education tell me we just do not have enough American kids going into science, mathematics, and engineering. And those same educators tell me over and over again the thing that motivates kids and finally, today, we have that vision. President John Kennedy gave it a clear vision in the 1960s; and, finally, today, we have that vision again. We are talking about going back to the Moon and on to Mars. President Bush gave us that vision, and now is not the time to cut back.

We have a critical situation where, in many of our colleges and universities, the majority of people pursuing graduate degrees in science and engineering fields are foreigners. They are not Americans. We are not graduating enough American citizens in these fields, and there is no better way to motivate our young people, young kids in grammar school, in secondary school.

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

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

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

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

As in past years, I wish our 303(b) allocation could have been more generous, but that is not the fault of this committee. However, I am impressed with how much the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) was able to accomplish with the allocation he was given.

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

Many important priorities were funded in this bill, and some of the highlights include increases for counterterrorism and counterintelligence activities at the FBI, restored funding for DEA’s mobile enforcement teams, and the demand reduction assistance, much more than requested for the MEP program, funding levels for NOAA that I hope we can continue to increase as we move through the process, significant contributions to international organizations that I hope can be increased to the requested level before the final bill is completed.

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

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

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

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

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

I want to, at this time, personally thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for their efforts and the hearing we held on the Victims of Crime Act funding, by not removing these funds and giving them to other projects.

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

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

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

More importantly, there are numerous victims of crimes organizations in the United States that fought to save these funds. They include Justice Solutions, the National Association of VOCA Assistance Administrators, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, the National Association of...
Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), a distinguished member of the subcommittee.

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

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Ranking Member MOLLOHAN) for all their work on this bill.

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

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

Through the microloan program, 170 intermediary lenders nationwide provide loans and technical assistance to our smallest businesses, many of which cannot secure loans from restrictive SBA programs or conventional banks. Since its creation 13 years ago, the microloan program has provided over 21,000 microloans totaling $250 million, which averages to $12,000 per job. Yet, 46,000 jobs have been created at roughly $3,500 per job.

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

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

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

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

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

Space exploration is a technology engine for this country. We need this vision to encourage the next generation.
of skilled workers and to drive innovation. Telling kids that they need to study math and science rings hollow unless there is a real reason to do so, like space exploration.

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

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

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

I thank the gentleman for his time.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his willingness to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies.

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

The Math and Science Partnership program budget has been greatly diminished since 2002, when it was funded at $160 million. This year the committee was able to fund the program at $80 million, which will prevent NSF from starting any new partnerships. This spring, 76 Members of Congress signed a letter supporting the funding of this program at $200 million for fiscal year 2006. In addition, the National Science Board, the guiding body of the National Science Foundation, has publicly stated, and I quote from a letter I recently received, "Should funding become available to restore some of the cut programs, clearly, retaining the MSP program in NSF is the highest priority."

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

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

I would appreciate Chairman Wolf's willingness to consider, in the event that any additional funds may become available in the future, that his committee examine the possibility of devoting such funds to the Math and Science Partnership program. I believe this program must be able to fund some new partners and target the partnerships in this most needed of areas. I recognize that the gentleman's committee has taken steps to address the educational areas of greatest need to improve in math and science education, and I look forward to working with him on this endeavor.

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


Hon. Vernon J. Ehlers, Representative from Michigan, to the Distincted Chairman of the Committee on Science, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies.

I am very grateful for your continuing strong support for NSF during this difficult fiscal year. NSF has the mandate, the history, and the expertise to ensure that we are well positioned to continue to improve U.S. science, technology, and innovation. NSF also has a significant role to play in preparing our young people to be the workforce of the future.

The proposed NSF FY 2006 budget begins an end to the commitment for large experimental programs in the Math and Science Partnership (MSP) program. NSF's FY 2005 budget provided $12 STEM education. The proposed budget also reduces critical areas of education research, such as the MSP program. NSF's FY 2006 budget begins an end to the commitment for large experimental programs in the Math and Science Partnership (MSP) program. NSF's FY 2005 budget provided $12 STEM education. The proposed budget also reduces critical areas of education research, such as the MSP program. NSF's FY 2006 budget provides $12 STEM education. The proposed budget also reduces critical areas of education research, such as the MSP program.
In 1983, the NSB Commission on Precollege Education in Science, Mathematics and Technology published its recommendations for U.S. students to become first in the world in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Most of the recommendations of this report are still relevant today. Some progress has been made in precollege STEM education through implementation of model programs, but much more is needed. As a workforce with basic STEM skills has become more essential to American economic competitiveness and national security, it is now critical to our future that our precollege education system is prepared to perform its essential role in U.S. STEM education. Today it clearly lags.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

WARREN M. WASHINGTON, Chairman, National Science Board.

ELIZABETH HOFFMAN, Chair, EHR Committee, NSB.

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

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

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

I know they understand, and we all need to appreciate, the impact innovation has on jobs in our economy. We need to remain dedicated to investing in innovation; and I believe, as do the chairman and Wolf, that the gentleman from Virginia.

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises Members that the time for general debate for the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has expired. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) has moved to recognize the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) for purposes of a colloquy. Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the gentleman from West Virginia in a colloquy regarding the American Corners Program.

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

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

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

This program was his first contact with America, and it succeeded in doing what we are today struggling to do with youth in that corner of the world. I believe that is why I support the American Corners Program, and I hope to work with Chairman Wolf as this bill progresses to ensure strong support for this important international program.

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

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

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

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman Wolf for his bipartisan support of this program. Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) for purposes of a colloquy.

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

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

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

In my view, it would not be right to reduce funding to research operations or construction work in NIST and NOAA in Boulder in order to pay for the fence. So I would like to ask the chairman whether he agrees that if this fence is to be built, it...
should not be done at the expense of ongoing research or capital improvements to these laboratories.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his help, and I thank the chairman in the future on this issue.

Mr.吴. Mr. Chairman, I have the pleasure of speaking on H.R. 2863, the bill that establishes the National Science, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2006. This bill provides funding for a variety of agencies and programs, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, the U.S. Marshal’s Service, the Drug Enforcement Administration, DEA, State and local law enforcement grants, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA, and the diplomatic and consular programs at the Department of State to name a few.

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

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

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

I should point out that in order to stay within the 302(b) allocation the bill derives savings from adjustments to various mandatory accounts and requiring the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to accrue certain retirement benefits. The largest savings results from the annual capping of the Crime Victim’s Fund, which is set at $625 million for fiscal year 2006, and delaying the obligation of the reprogramming $12 billion until fiscal year 2007. Additionally, $62 million was recovered from a permanent and indefinite appropriation for the expenses of the management and disposal of assets from the Assets Forfeiture...
Fund. The accrual provision would technically result in $39 million in savings.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

For the first time this Subcommittee’s appropriation’s bill includes funding for NASA and the National Science Foundation. Until this year, NASA had to compete for funds with veterans and housing programs when it was part of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill. Many believe that pairing NASA with the State and Commerce department has made it much easier to provide additional increases for the space agency without offending powerful domestic constituencies.

As a member of the Science Committee’s Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, the provision of $16.5 billion for NASA, or 2% over the current level represents a positive step toward reaching our goals in space technology and exploration. In addition, the NASA total includes $9.7 billion for science, aeronautics and education amounts to 16% more than the current level and about 1% more than the President’s request. In this instance I appreciate that the committee did not agree to the administration’s request to cut the Aeronautics Research program by $54 million.

This appropriation also provides $5.6 billion for the NSF making it $171 million more than the FY 2005 level and $38 million more than the President’s request. This funding provides the necessary infrastructure that is so important and high priority public safety and crime prevention programs like the FBI and DEA at the Department of Commerce.

To extend greater research opportunities, to underrepresented segments of the scientific and engineering communities.

I also want to applaud the Appropriations Committee for directing NASA to include in its FY 2007 budget request detailed information on the prior year, current year, and requested space exploration mission. After the tragic Columbia Space Shuttle accident we have to step back and reassess our space shuttle program. Today, NASA is preparing to return to flight, but safety is still at the forefront of our concerns. The funds being addressed here are applicable to safety as well and we must ensure that everything is done to safely keep our NASA astronauts from possible harm.

I applaud the Subcommittee’s prohibition of the funding of measures that implement torture. This is quite important given the recent report by organizations such as Amnesty International and the work that the Democrats of the Committee on the Judiciary have done to bring this issue to light. I wrote a letter to both U.S. Attorney General Gonzales and Secretary Chertoff requesting a full report on the conduct of the detention facilities located at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and I hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will hold at least one hearing on this important matter.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cases coming to the Board that appear to be easy are separated out and sent to the streamlining panel. These cases are then assigned more or less randomly to staff attorneys without direction or supervision. If the staff attorney who reviews the case decides that the affirmative opinion is not appropriate, he will print out a firm decision, and then give the file to a single Board member with a cover sheet that will have an explanation for why such disposition is appropriate. The explanations typically are a few lines.

My amendment would permit this practice but only with cases that more than one Board member has reviewed and that result in the issuance of an opinion with the affirmance.
The proportion of “affirmances without opinion” decided by a single Board member had increased from 10% to over 50% of all Board decisions, beginning immediately after the new rules were proposed. At the same time, the proportion of cases that are favorable to the alien decreased. Prior to proposing the “Proceeds Reform”, the proportion of cases decided by a single Board member was much faster and easier than writing a decision and creates an incentive (whether conscious or unconscious) for Board members to meet case processing guidelines by affirming removal orders notwithstanding the merits of the appeal. Moreover, intellectual rigor in decision-making may be diminished because Board members no longer need to articulate the basis for their decisions. They need only decide whether they agree with the result ultimately reached by the immigration judge.

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

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

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

The Department of Justice has a policy of focusing on the armed forces, which are obviously a critical element of national defense. But it is also important to remember those on the front lines here at home. Local law enforcement officers need Congress’ help to ensure that our streets stay safe for law-abiding citizens.

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

During my time in Congress, every single person involved with law enforcement has made it a point to share with me exactly how important to remember those on the front lines here at home. Local law enforcement officers need Congress’ help to ensure that our streets stay safe for law-abiding citizens.

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

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

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

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

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

With the atmospheric, or dry, side of NOAA seeing a 9% increase for the National Weather Service and a 7% increase for the National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service, the cuts to the wet side of NOAA are even deeper than they first appear. The National Ocean Service will receive a 40% cut and the National Marine Fisheries Service will receive a 20% cut.

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

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

The Marine Sanctuaries program has been cut by 40% and the Coastal Nonpoint and Community Resource Improvement Grants program has been cut out completely. These two NOAA programs have been instrumental in keeping the coastal waters of my district unpolluted, allowing the waters to teem with life. The Monterey Bay Sanctuary office has been working with farmers in the productive valleys that drain into the Monterey Bay to reduce pollution from pesticides and nutrients. The farmers were skeptical until they realized they were saving money by finding ways to keep their fertilizers and pesticides on the fields and out of our ocean waters. The farmers are now bigger proponents of the program than the Sanctuary office.

The farmers don’t want the ocean waters off my district to end up as a dead-zone like the waters off Louisiana, where due to nutrient pollution, there is a dead zone the size of Massachusetts. Pollution kills more than marine life; it kills fisheries and it kills tourism—For some reason I just can’t quite picture a tourism brochure that reads “Come visit the country’s biggest ocean dead-zone.”

The State Coastal Zone Management Grants program was cut by $2 million. The National Estuarine Research Reserves program was cut by a whopping $38.7 million. These programs have been instrumental in allowing my district and other districts around the country to grow wisely striking a balance between development and wildlife areas, parks and public beach access—besides pleasing the environmentalists—have been a smart tourism investment. Without the
ability for people to access the beach and enjoy the wildlife in these natural areas, people will not bother coming to my district.

When I think about the oceans, fishing is one of the first things that comes to mind. It is an economic and cultural backbone for many coastal communities, and with American consumers poisoning their fish stocks and eating fish from China, we need to be investing in our oceans, making them healthy and productive.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues may know, methamphetamine abuse has exploded across the U.S. over the last 15 years. Many states now break up between 500 and 2,500 meth labs per year. Meth is relatively cheap, tremendously addictive, and oftentimes addicts in one exposure. It is available nearly everywhere, particularly in our rural areas.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Let me take a little broader view than just this year. If we look at some of the reductions in this bill, and just look at the 1-year reductions, such as we have here in EDA or such as we have in the State and Local Law Enforcement programs since fiscal year 2001, we see that we still have a deep reduction in some of these activities. For example, the number of full-time equivalent workyears and $11,821,000 shall be expended for the Department Leadership Program exclusive of augmentation that occurred in these offices in fiscal year 2005: Provided further, That not to exceed 28 permanent positions, 23 full-time equivalent workyears and $3,980,000 shall be expended for the Office of Legislative Affairs: Provided further That not to exceed 17 permanent positions, 22 full-time equivalent workyears and $2,764,000 shall be expended for the Office of Public Affairs: Provided further, That the applicable appropriations and those balances within the caps described in the preceding two provisos.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OSBORNE

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 21, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 21, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 21, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 20, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 19, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 18, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 17, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 16, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 15, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 14, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 13, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 12, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 11, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 10, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 9, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 8, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 7, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 6, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 5, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 4, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 3, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 2, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 1, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 20, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 19, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 18, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 17, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 16, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 15, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 14, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 13, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 12, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 11, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 10, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 9, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 8, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 7, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 6, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 5, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 4, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 3, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 2, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"

Page 1, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $12,000,000)"
fancy grant writers. They need all of the help they can get to compete for Federal money for job creation, and the Economic Development Administration, EDA, tries to provide that.

What this amendment would simply do is restore the $140 million cut by the committee for local law enforcement grants and increase funding for EDA by $33 million, restoring that cut, and it would simply pay for that cut by reducing the size of the tax cut this House has previously approved for personal income tax cuts over $1 million. It would simply reduce that tax cut by $2,000. So instead of getting on average a $140,000 tax cut, they would get a $138,000 tax cut. It is hardly draconian, but it would help take care of a significant national priority.

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

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

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

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

That is why I support Ranking Member Obey’s amendment. This amendment would provide an additional $410 million for State and local law enforcement, including COPS grants, and restore them to the fiscal year 2005 enacted levels. To do this, Representative Obey reduces the size of the tax cut for millionaires by only $2,053. These millionaires will still get a $138,018 tax rebate. That is all we need to do to restore these cuts, that small tax cut repeal would fully fund these important programs at last year’s levels and help keep our streets safe. That is a tradeoff that is worth making, and one, I would suggest, that even the top of all taxpayers would support.

Concerning the COPS program, this bill allocates only $520 million for it. Again, I am glad that the Appropriations Committee has restored a part of the destructive cuts that the President originally proposed. But we should be doing more. The COPS program has been remarkably successful over the last 10 years. According to the Department of Justice, every $1 we spend on COPS grants contributes to a decline of 10 violent crimes and 27 property crimes per 100,000 residents. Yet rather than increasing funding for this effective and important program, this bill actually would cut $80 million from the COPS program. This is the wrong thing to do. It is the additional police officers that the COPS program helps local towns and cities hire, who are on the front lines of reducing crime and also protecting our homeland.

The COPS program has provided law enforcement agencies in my district and across the Nation with critical funding to fight and prevent crime. Communities in Hunterdon, Monmouth, Mercer, Middlesex, and Somerset counties have received more millions of dollars in funding to help put additional police officers on the street. In 2004 alone, four towns in my district—Lawrence Township, Monroe Township, Spotswood Borough, and West Windsor Township—received almost $380,000 to fund various law enforcement programs. This money helped Monroe Township hire three additional police officers, and helped upgrade the law enforcement technology of Spotswood and West Windsor. Overall in 2004, New Jersey communities received COPS grants totaling $9.5 million and were able to hire 40 additional police officers.

That is 40 cops on the beat who would not have been there without this important Federal program. Since 1994, the COPS program has helped fund 4,800 additional officers in New Jersey alone. This has made a big difference for the local towns and communities in New Jersey.

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

At a time when we are asking our cops to do more to reduce crime and protect our homeland from potential terrorist related threats, we are giving them less funding to do so. Just look at the largest 44 metropolitan police departments. Of them 27, yes 27, have experienced increases in the size and scale of these violations of the law. Safety officers have hired less police officers on the beat and more crime on the street.

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

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY

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

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

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

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

Page 53, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: (decreased by $200,000,000)
Mr. OBEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

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

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

“Dear Mr. Chairman:

It has come to my attention that, during House consideration of H.R. 1300, an amendment be offered by Mr. Obey that proposes to reduce NASA Exploration Systems funding by $200 million, and redirect the NASA funds to State and local law enforcement assistance activities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

According to the Department of Justice, every dollar we invest in the COPS program contributes to a decline in 10 violent crimes and 27 property crimes per 100,000 residents. As a former city police officer and a Michigan State Trooper, as well as cochair of the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, I understand how much our local and State agencies need the Byrne grants and COPS grants to keep these successful programs going in their neighborhoods.

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

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

Local drug enforcement teams are crucial to keeping our communities safe and drug free. If the Byrne grants are cut from last year to this year, we would lose 21 drug enforcement teams. We have to provide this funding so our drug enforcement teams can do their jobs. We must listen to what the police are telling us and fully fund the Byrne grants program.

I urge support of the Obey amendment and showing our support for law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line each and every day to keep our communities safe and drug free.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Obey amendment. The $200 million funding cut to NASA’s exploration program proposed in this amendment would jeopardize U.S. jobs and jeopardize space launch capability. These cuts would threaten personnel reductions in existing NASA exploration systems’ workforce across the Nation and could impact more than 1,000 employees. This cut will take money directly from work on the new crew exploration vehicle, a much needed vehicle that will replace the space shuttle...
Mr. Chairman, Congress has and will continue to support our men and women who fight crime in our communities. Of course we are going to do that. The issue today is not whether Congress supports law enforcement. It is whether Congress supports the economic and national security that our space program provides. Since 1969, America has led the world into space, and it is time to renew that vision. Our venture into space not only keeps America at the forefront of exploration, but they also are vital to our economy and our national security. This new national vision sets America on a course toward the Moon and Mars, and we should embrace this dream and work to make it a reality.

As the preeminent leader in human space flight, we cannot afford to sit idle and let other nations reap the rewards of our hard work, research and sacrifice. We know that the People's Republic of China has developed a human space flight program that encompasses everything from low-Earth orbit to exploring the Moon and Mars. As the new NASA administrator said recently and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) just pointed out, we need to retire the shuttle as quickly as possible and begin flying the new crew exploration vehicle to the international space station and the Moon. These requirements and these funding cuts that the gentleman from Wisconsin proposes will have a direct impact on that momentum and the President’s vision for space exploration, a vision that will advance our national economy and prestige internationally. America’s space program continues to be an engine for our national economy. Exploration brings jobs and technological growth to America. Nearly every State in the Union benefits from the development of technologies needed to propel our space mission. At a time when we are cutting resources. The COPS amendment needs to be addressed.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT). Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Obey amendment. This is a delicately balanced bill and the Obey amendment would destroy that balance. The account that the gentleman from Virginia cites is reducing funds that support a space science, space science, and aeronautics programs. All of these programs are at a critical point and are struggling for funds. At a time when we are trying to keep important Earth science missions on the drawing board, at a time when we face increased costs for both the Hubble space telescope and its planned successor, the James Webb space telescope, at a time when we are contemplating significant changes in our aeronautics program, at a time when we are trying to create new technologies to return to the Moon, this arbitrary cut proposed in this amendment is simply not appropriate.

I urge the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time. Mr. Chairman, it is a shame that we are debating this Obey amendment. I just want to reemphasize that we should be debating the Obey amendment that was denied by the Rules Committee, because that would be the amendment with the appropriate offset. Everybody understands, I think, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle agree that this cut that we are experiencing to State and local law enforcement, the cuts that we are experiencing in the COPS program, and the cuts that we are experiencing in juvenile justice programs, are lamentable. They are cuts from last year, and they are serious. State and local law enforcement is funded at 22 percent less than the current level. At a time when State and local law enforcement need resources, we are cutting resources. The COPS program, a tremendous program, as the gentleman from New York pointed out, is provided 13 percent less than the current level funding in this bill. Juvenile justice programs, those programs that are in the forefront of helping our youth, and addressing at-risk youth issues, experienced a 12 percent cut from the current level.

There is no question that the restorative side of the gentleman from Wisconsin’s amendment needs to be addressed. He went to the Rules Committee and tried to get it addressed in an appropriate way by having the perfect offset. The offset is a small cut to those who have earned income of over $1 million, who currently enjoy a tax cut of approximately $140,000. The Obey amendment just reduces that tax cut a little bit, by $2,000. That would have been the appropriate offset. The offset that the ranking member is using in this second amendment, which he is trying to get to, is because the Rules Committee did not give him a rule for the high-income offset, is a lamentable offset.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON). Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to this amendment. Americans take great pride in the accomplishments of the manned space flight program and NASA going all the way back to its earliest days, Mercury, Gemini, Apollo and beyond. And there always were people who came to the floor of this Congress and proposed programs, to NASA, and always shifting dollars to very, very worthwhile, entities.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY). Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia has done a marvelous job in balancing a lot of important competing priorities. I will tell you that Americans need to be aware of this. We have been the preeminent leader in the space flight program ever since Apollo XIII. But this amendment guts America’s future manned space flight program.

In the year 2010, we are due to retire the shuttle. Unless we move forward to a new vehicle, which is what this amendment guts, the funding to do the exploration, the design and the research for, we will have a huge gap. There are nine other countries waiting to watch what we do. The Chinese, for example, are going to have a manned space flight program any day now. Yes, it is important to have local law enforcement; and, yes, we support that;
and, yes, there is great funding in this bill that Chairman WOLF put together; and, yes, 99 percent of those monies come from local and State government.

But nothing is more important to the long-term security of the United States than space intelligence, space communications, and manned space flight. What this program does is to take $200 million out of the proposal that the President has to have a continual manned space flight program after the shuttle is retired. We basically are not going to have to have $500 million more in a million that we are going to have to have due to personnel reductions, including some of the most talented engineers and scientists in the world that will go do other things.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 1/2 minutes.

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

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

If the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) does not like the trade-off, then he ought to look in the mirror because we are doing exactly that.

Earlier we had a different jurisdiction of this subcommittee, but the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) did not like the fact that last year the subcommittee took money out of NASA in order to fund other programs including housing and veterans’ health care. So he rearranged the jurisdiction of the committees; so now it means that NASA is in competition with local law enforcement. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has given us nowhere to go.

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

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

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am in strong opposition to this amendment. I would point out to the Members of the House that this subcommittee has restored more than $1 billion in proposed cuts to State and local law enforcement. There is a total of $2.6 billion provided for crime-fighting initiatives, and the bill restores programs like the SCAAP program, $555 million to reimburse States for housing and detaining criminal aliens; $334 million for juvenile delinquency prevention; $387 million for Violence against Women.

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

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

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

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

I urge Members to oppose this amendment so we can continue to invest in the future of manned and unmanned space exploration. The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Terry:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

$285,168,840

Page 3, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $604,800)

Page 3, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $966,269)

Page 3, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $547,140)

Page 4, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $285,263)

Page 4, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $50,176)

Page 4, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $5,466)

Page 5, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $28,372)

Page 5, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $84,140)

Page 6, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $7,285,134)

Page 6, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $960,521)

Page 7, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $3,585,142)

Page 8, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $43,372)

Page 9, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $96,177)

Page 10, line 1, after the first dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $21,016)

Page 10, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $25,720,271)

Page 11, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $90,070)

Page 12, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $1,377,786)

Page 15, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $21,932,508)

Page 17, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $314,102)

Page 18, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $15,075)

Page 19, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $1,735,987)

Page 20, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $1,009,808)

Page 21, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $2,458,806)

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following:

(reduced by $285,168,840).
Just to show that there has been incredible impact in our communities from methamphetamine, and the Byrne-JAG grants go directly to our police departments, our sheriff departments to fight the drug dealers on the ground, they are our front line in the war on drugs, and it just makes no sense to me that we are moving towards a policy of nationalizing our drug crime fight at a time when it is our police officers on the streets that are fighting meth and other drugs.

At this point, I am talking about a drug that was easy and cheap to make. They just needed ammonia, Sudafed, other chemicals to make this. It is highly addictive, and it is highly destructive to our communities and to our families, and I would encourage support for this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

Lastly, NASA is cut by $70 million. Science goes down the tubes and is cut with regard to that. Embassy security, $6.8 million, and remember Americans killed in Tanzania, Americans killed in Nairobi. The million is cut from the SEC, Remember Enron, and we would take money from the SEC. Nineteen million dollars cut from the National Science Foundation. At the very time we are falling behind in engineers and math and science and physics and chemistry, and we just had the colloquy with the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLENT) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TERRY) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Lastly, there have been a number of groups opposed to this: the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, American Conservative Union, Americans for Tax Reform. If Members find something, if they need something, look at a bill and go through it. To have it equally across the board is the wrong way to go.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

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

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

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

I would also like to point out what meth does to a human being. It is the most addictive substance known to man. This is a 10-year snapshot of one woman's life. She is now pulling her life back together. But she has too many in her company. One out of five people that are meth addicts in recovery are 17 years or younger in the State of Minnesota.

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

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

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

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

I would suggest to the gentlemen that are down offering across-the-board cuts to reassess their vote on the budget resolution. We need more money in these bills for law enforcement, to provide funds to State and localities which are being cut from last year.

I oppose the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

But I just cannot help but continue to think about a young girl named Megan in a beautiful town in Minnesota that started using meth in seventh grade at age 13, and when she first took it, which she got from a friend, she said, This is something I am going to keep over and over again. She did. But when she could not afford it, her addiction, she, like too many other female addicts, was exploited into becoming a prostitute to pay for the meth she craved every day. After hitting bottom and after she was about 16, young mother, young lady was about 30 and ended when she was 40, in the morgue.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLENT).
provide anything like the authorized level of funding. That is the kind of balancing act the committee had to pull off throughout the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is $348 million in this bill for the Byrne-Justice Assistance Grant programs. We cannot through the National Science Foundation even fund two out of five of the many grant requests that NSF receives. We are not making the investment necessary for a great country like the United States to protect our technological edge for the future.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Washington received $8,06 million under the Byrne grant formulas. Without this funding, our State would not have been able to effectively work to reduce violent drug-related crimes.
Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

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

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

This amendment cuts COPS $2 million; U.S. Attorneys, $7 million; Marshal Service, $4 million; the Do Not Call, FEC, $4 million; Small Business Administration, $3 million; NASA, $19 million; DEA, $72 million; and public safety officer benefits.

Why? If we were looking to have an amendment, we would sort of exempt that out.

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

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

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

I urge Members to vote “no.”

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

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

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

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

Byrne grants provide funding for 29 vital programs such as anti-drug education programs, treatment programs and alternative sentencing initiatives, giving the States the ability to choose the programs where this Federal funding would be most beneficial to law enforcement issues faced in their State.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOSWELL

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

The amendment read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOSWELL:
Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “($2,500,000).”
Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “($2,500,000).”
Page 28, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “($2,500,000).”

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

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

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

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

The subcommittee has funded the Criminal Records Update Program at $25 million for FY 2006, which is an increase of $334,000 over the previous year. However, this falls drastically short of the administration’s request by some $30 million.

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

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

We are in 100 percent agreement: we must work together at the Federal, State, and local levels to ensure the safety of our children.
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I realize times are tight when it comes to spending, but if we can spare any additional dollars to ensure communities and our children are safe, then we absolutely must do it.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. Issa:
Page 2, line 7, insert “($5,000,000).”
Page 6, line 12, insert “($5,000,000).”

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

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

The gentleman from California (Mr. Issa) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.
Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise with this amendment today in order to increase the funding to the attorneys general for trafficking in humans that is going on rapidly throughout the country. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman Wolf) and his committee for working to bring this legislation to the floor and to highlight these problems here today.

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

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

Throughout the country, the Office of the U.S. Attorney claims that they have to prioritize prosecution of human smugglers because there are insufficient funds. We aim to deal with that here today.

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

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, this is subject to a point of order, and it is unfortunate that it is. I would pledge to the gentleman that we will do everything we can to deal with this problem.

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's assurances. I will at this time insert in the Record all of my statement and additional relevant materials.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to amend H.R. 2862 in order to increase funding for a catalytic case smuggling program, known as "coyotes." I thank Chairman WOLF for his Committee's work in bringing this legislation before us.

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

The U.S. Attorney's Office has stated in the past that it does not have the resources needed to fully prosecute arrested coyotes. Border Patrol agents who arrest many of the coyotes have compared their detention and prosecution program, stating that many are released within hours of arrest and caught again the next day. For example, the Border Patrol was instructed to release known coyote, Antonio Amparo-Lopez, an illegal alien convicted of 112 arrests. Releasing a criminal such as this due to lack of funds is completely unacceptable, and is demoralizing to the Border Patrol agents who work so hard to make the arrests in the first place.

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

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

NINETY ARE LATER FOUND IN SECOND HOME.

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

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

To begin with, anyone who crosses the border illegally, as the defendants did, has committed a serious crime. But a significant minority of illegal aliens go on to perpetrate more disturbing crimes after arriving in the United States. They include such persons as Angel Maturino Resendiz, the so-called Railroad Killer, who murdered at least nine people as he traveled the country by train, and the Mexican drug dealers who killed ranger Kris Keane in the Rio Grande National Monument in Arizona on Aug. 9, 2002. In 2003, the Federal Bureau of Prisons estimated that more than doubled since 2000, a period during which the mayor, Montgomery County Executive Doug Duncan and other Democrats have begun patrolling Los Angeles International Airport as part of a crackdown launched last year.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows: Amendment offered by Mr. Davis of Illinois:

Page 2, line 7, insert “reduced by $5,000,000” after the dollar amount.

Page 26, line 25, insert “increased by $5,000,000” after the dollar amount.

Page 28, line 6, insert “increased by $5,000,000” after the dollar amount.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me commend the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Ranking Member MOLLOHAN) for the outstanding work that they have done in crafting this appropriation.

An amendment is designed, and I actually plan to withdraw it, but my amendment is designed to raise the issue and highlight the fact that 630,000 individuals, roughly 1,700 a day, will be released from prisons to return to their communities. We can expect on an annual basis that this large number of released inmates from prison will continue for the next 5 years. Also, we must be mindful of the fact that local jails are releasing 7 million people each year. Many of these individuals are never able to find a decent place to live, cannot access various entitlement programs such as public housing, financial assistance for college, and, in some instances, food stamps, and are often times denied employment because of their past criminal convictions. Statistics show that nearly 52 percent of these individuals end up back in jail within 3 years.

As these men and women transition from incarceration to freedom, what they need most are comprehensive reentry solutions. Treatment, and rehabilitation are just as important as incarceration. These men and women need housing and employment, health care, counseling, and vocational training.
live in our communities. Therefore, increasing public safety is a primary concern of communities and neighborhoods all across the country.

Successful reentry is difficult to obtain because of the vast and extreme barriers that ex-offenders encounter every day of their lives. In Illinois just a year ago, ex-offenders were prohibited from working in 57 occupational categories without some form of waiver. For example, ex-offenders were not allowed to be barbers, nail technicians; they could not be a custodian in a hospital or school. Many of these individuals were convicted of nonviolent offenses, mainly drug convictions. So it is extremely difficult for ex-offenders to find housing and get a job after they have paid their debt to society.

I would hope that as we continue to explore budgetary preparations and appropriations, that we would recognize that if we are to seriously deal with the issue of recidivism reduction, the issue of the issue of helping individuals become contributing members of society, we must put adequate funding into reentry.

Again, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) for his support of these kinds of programs. I would like to extend a little dialogue, engage in a colloquy with him, and then I would withdraw my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the kind of resources that we are putting into reentry programs this year for next year's budget?

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman raising this issue. This is really an important issue. Before I came to Congress, I was involved in a reentry program at Lorton Reformatory, so I think what the gentleman is trying to do is a good idea.

Reentry programs are critical to rehabilitating prisoners. I support the programs and will continue to work with the gentleman. The bill includes a $6 million increase in the Bureau of Prisons and $10 million in OJP for reentry programs. You really cannot put a man or a woman in jail for 15 years and then, at the end, just open up the cell and let them out without having any programs. So what the gentleman is trying to do is exactly right. But that is the status of funding, a $6 million increase within the Bureau of Prisons and $10 million in OJP for reentry programs.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Ranking Member MOLLHAN) for their sensitivity to these issues, and I look forward to working with them throughout the year to continue to try and strengthen the possibility of reducing recidivism and helping people maintain quality life in this country.

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

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

There was no objection.

Amendment Offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by $50,100,000)".

Page 55, line 5, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by $50,100,000)".

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORN-BERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me thank the chairman of this subcommittee and the subcommittee ranking member for their hard work to date. This bill, that includes funding for NASA, the Department of Justice, the Department of State, a number of science programs, the Equal Opportunity Commission, is a tough legislative agenda, but certainly the hard work has been evidenced.

I rise today to offer an amendment that would have added $50.1 million to the NASA Exploration Capabilities provision, and to note to my colleagues when I arrived here in this body and was assigned to the Committee on Science, one of the comments I used to make is that science would be the work of the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, I still maintain that, that out of some of the opportunities for this country to boost its economic engine. The sad part about is it we find ourselves in 2005 having the least number of young people going into math and sciences, the least number of graduates out of chemistry and physics. So the vision of this Congress and the President and the American people coming together and talking about space exploration is so very important. This bill allows for $9 million to be added to this vision, and I think the moment for the future of America's space exploration mission. After the tragic Columbia Space Shuttle accident we had to step back and reassess our space shuttle program. Today, NASA is preparing to return to flight, but safety is still at the forefront of our concerns. The funds being addressed here are not only applicable to the Vision of Space Exploration, but also toward the Vision of Space Exploration, and we must ensure that everything is done to keep our NASA astronauts from possible harm.

Under this Amendment, funding for NASA Exploration Capabilities are to be taken from Department of Justice General Administration funds. This funding would restore the President's full request for NASA Exploration Capabilities. This funding would be provided for the Space Operations Missions Directorate, including the International Space Station, the Space Shuttle program, and Space and Flight Support.

The funds for NASA Exploration Capabilities are essential to the President's vision for space exploration. This appropriation comes at a time when we need to hold the fiscal reins of the Vision of Space Exploration, and we must ensure that everything is done to keep our NASA astronauts from possible harm.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on mankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of lives lost.

I am here today to support my Amendment which would fund NASA Exploration Capabilities for an additional $50,1 million, the funds to be taken from the Department of Justice General Administration funds. This funding would restore the President's full request for NASA Exploration Capabilities. This funding would be provided for the Space Operations Missions Directorate, including the International Space Station, the Space Shuttle program, and Space and Flight Support.

The funds for NASA Exploration Capabilities are essential to the President's vision for space exploration. This appropriation comes at a time when we need to hold the fiscal reins of the Vision of Space Exploration, and we must ensure that everything is done to keep our NASA astronauts from possible harm.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on mankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of lives lost.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on mankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of lives lost.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on mankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of lives lost.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on mankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of lives lost.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on mankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of lives lost.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on mankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of lives lost.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on mankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of lives lost.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on mankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of lives lost.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on mankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of lives lost.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on mankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of lives lost.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on mankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of lives lost.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on mankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of lives lost.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on mankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of lives lost.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on mankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of lives lost.
There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, the unanimous consent request is to limit debate on this amendment and all amendments there-to, to a total of 20 minutes equally di-vided between the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Velázquez) and a Mem-ber opposed.

Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that and would rather than 15.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, the unanimous consent request is to limit debate on this amendment and all amendments there-to, to a total of 20 minutes equally di-vided between the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Velázquez) and a Member opposed.

Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous con-sent to an amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Chairman, today’s small busi-nesses are having a difficult time in ac-cessing affordable capital due to recent changes to the 7(a) program. This amendment will change that by restor-ing funding to its fiscal year 2004 level. As you can see from this chart, the cost of the 7(a) program on small busi-ness has doubled, translating into an additional $1,500 to $3,000 in upfront costs. And for larger loans, fees are now more than $30,000.

In addition, SBA has proposed even more fees on top of those that were im-plemented last year, and projections are that these fees will only continue to increase year after year.

Clearly, these actions are having a negative effect. As you can see from this chart, the dollar totals going into the eco-nomy have dropped, small businesses are receiving less capital, and the number of active lenders making a loan has de-clined by 30 percent. These actions have resulted in a highly unstable pro-gam, as you can see from this chart.

History has shown that operating loan programs without a government commitment is a recipe for failure. For proof, look at the SBA venture capital program which has been credited with in-vesting billions of dollars in small businesses. Four years ago, it was taken to a zero subsidy rate. The argument is that it would make the program more stable. Well, today that program is shut down because it simply became too costly. By voting for this amendment, you are ensuring that the 7(a) program does not suffer the same fate.

The offsets for this amendment can come from the IT account of the State Department, the Justice Department, and SBA. This is a small price to pay for job creation. The 7(a) program is a proven job creator. For every $33,000 in loans, one job is created. With just a minor investment from our govern-ment, we can empower this Nation’s entrepreneurs to do what they do best, create jobs and build this economy.

This is the same amendment that was offered last year that passed with the remaining bi-partisan support. The only thing that has changed since then is that our Nation’s small businesses have now had to endure a year of in-creased costs, and they have told us that these costs are hurting them. We cannot let this happen again.

Fifteen trade associations, including the National Small Business Association; the Independent Community Bankers of America; the Credit Union National Association; the American Hotel and Lodging Association; and the U.S. Black Chamber of Commerce, rep-resenting businesses and lenders from across the country, are supporting this amendment and calling on Congress to restore this funding.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentle-man from Virginia (Mr. Wolf) will control the time in opposition to the amendment. The gentleman is recog-nized.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. If we were to pass this amendment, then you can never write to your constituents and say you really care about the defic-it. And I know the gentleman from Illi-nois, Mr. Manzullo, goes to great lengths to speak about this. We dealt with this program last year. We are now at a record level of loans. So if you vote for this, you will never be able to write and say that I am concerned about the deficit.

The 7(a) program has been operating at record levels without subsidy appro-priations since the beginning of fiscal year 2005 when the fees on lenders and borrowers reverted to the pre-2003 level. The SBA administrator con-firmed to us that the program is running strong, does not require a subsidy. Since lending levels are no longer tied to appropriation, the program has been able to meet the demand.

The program is on track. Mr. Chairman, to far exceed the previous lending levels and in fact may come close to the $16 billion authorized level.

Media reports all over the country have touted the recent success of the 7(a) lending. To highlight this, I have articles which we will put in the Record if it is appropriate at this time, from the Chicago Tribune, Cincin-nati Press Courier. Here are some of the headlines: “SBA programs looks
sound.” “ ‘Stable funding turns banks on to SBA lending.’ In fact, lending to every segment of the population, including women and minorities is up from last year’s level.”

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 27, 2006] SBA PROGRAM LOOKS SOUND

(By Rob Kaiser)

Holiday magic isn’t the likely reason the U.S. Small Business Administration and its numerous critics appear in harmony for the first time in years.

A more likely explanation is the $16 billion stocking stuffer for the SBA’s flagship 7(a) loan program, which will likely keep it from suffering short-falls in 2006 that drew the ire of banks and small-business owners this year.

“ ‘The risk of a cap or a shutdown is basically nil,’ ” said Tony Wilkinson, president of the National Association of Government Guaranteed Lenders and a frequent SBA critic.

Such an outlook is a vast improvement from recent years, when frequent loan limits and speculation about shutdowns sent bankers scurrying to submit loan applications and left many business owners in limbo—often without loans—when expected loans suddenly evaporated.

To achieve the peace, bankers grudgingly accepted a return to paying higher fees as the Bush administration got its wish to wipe away a nearly $80 million subsidy that had been supporting the 7(a) program. In return, the bankers expect to inherit a more stable program.

Such stability would have saved Julie Valenza a lot of time and money.

Valenza was close to purchasing her second Jimmy John’s sandwich franchise in January when the $250,000 loan she expected to secure through the 7(a) program suddenly stalled when SBA stopped accepting new applications due to a funding short-fall.

To salvage the deal to purchase an existing store in Westmont, Valenza recruited her sister as an investor. “ ‘At least I didn’t have to bring in a stranger off the street,’ ” she said.

Still, the setback delayed the purchase by two months and means Valenza now has to split the store’s profits.

Paul Andreotti, an executive vice president at National City Bank in Chicago, said SBA loan applications are now running strong.

Without 7(a) loans, many business owners would have to finance growth on their credit cards or through other expensive means.

“If it weren’t for 7(a) loans, banks couldn’t be as aggressive and provide as much capital,” said Andretti, whose bank is putting together a 7(a) loan so Valenza can open a third Jimmy John’s location in Oak Lawn.

While he’s not happy to see the fees climbing, Andreotti said, “ ‘In the long run I think it will benefit small businesses.’ ”

 Fees for the 7(a) program are now 2 percent on loans up to $150,000, up from 1 percent. Loans between $150,001 and $700,000 carry a 3 percent fee, up from 2.5 percent. Loans for more than $700,000 still carry a 3.5 percent fee.

The loan applicant usually pays these fees. Banks, however, collect another fee, which has also increased recently.

The SBA guarantees 85 percent of 7(a) loans up to $150,000 and 75 percent of loans for more than $150,000.

Previously, the highest loan guarantee was $1 million, but under the new legislation that figure was raised to $1.5 million. This means the SBA now guarantees 75 percent of a $2 million loan, the largest 7(a) loan available.

Still, not everyone in the SBA universe is sold that the recent compromise was the best solution.

“ ‘Clearly there were members of Congress that felt this was worthy of receiving an appropriation,’ ” said James Ballentine, director of community and economic development at the American Bankers Association.

Ballentine said some business owners as well as leaders may be dissuaded from taking part in the program because of the fees.

Early indications, though, are that participation in the 7(a) program is at record levels.

From Oct. 1, the beginning of the fiscal year, through Dec. 10, the program has done more than 18,000 loans, worth nearly $2.8 billion. During the same period last year, the program did fewer than 15,000 loans, worth $2.4 billion.

In all of the last fiscal year, the 7(a) program did nearly 75,000 loans, worth $12.6 billion. The program has $16 billion in loans available for the current fiscal year.

“ ‘We think that should be sufficient,’ ” said Jodi Polonet, senior vice president of Business Loan Express LLC in New York. “ ‘We are satisfied.’ ”

Mr. WOLF. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), the chairman of the Small Business Committee who last year supported this amendment, is now supportive of the program continuing to operate without a subsidy appropriation. He has written a Dear Colleague letter, and I hope every Member has read that Dear Colleague letter in support of the status quo. This would really hit Justice Department programs and State Department programs.

So in summary, Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to provide a subsidy appropriation for 7(a) loan programs. With the legislative and appropriation changes made last year, the program is running strong. The offsets are not a good idea.

I urge Members to oppose the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, when SBA claims that the program is doing record levels I have to say that they said that they would do $16 billion. Today they are $2 billion behind, and they are clearly not going to achieve a record level.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LA TOURRETTE).

Mr. LA TOURRETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee.

In my district in northeastern Ohio, locally owned small businesses are the foundation of our communities, from tool and die makers to landscapers to mom and pop corner hardware stores. The Small Business Administration 7(a) program has a proud history of ensuring that these small businesses will continue to have access to affordable financing.

As the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) has noted, changes were made to the 7(a) program last year that dramatically altered its funding structure by eliminating the Federal Government’s contribution and making the entire program self-sustaining.

Having seen in my district on the amount of funding provided to small businesses since the program was altered, and I have heard the arguments that the program is actually more stable and that lending has not dropped off.

And while I have nothing but respect for not only the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) but also the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman MANZULLO), I have to ask myself what could have been. If a furniture maker in Middlefield, Ohio, wanted access to capital to expand his facilities but decided against it because the fees on the 7(a) loan would have been too much of a burden for his business, how many others could have been harmed? If we had continued the Federal participation in the 7(a) program?

And I listened intently and I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) when he talked about the spirit of the last couple of amendments on the Byrne issue when across-the-board amendment cuts are not a good idea. And I agree with that. But I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) for where we found the offsets. They come from the IT accounts at the Justice Department, the State Department, and the Small Business Administration.

It is my understanding, and if I am wrong in this regard I am sure the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) can correct me, that relative to the Justice Department, it comes from a proposal to sell off and replace computer broadband and replace with narrow band, allowing them to sell the broadband, and it will actually be recouped to finance that.

Secondly, in the State Department they are charging fees on visas which would also allow those upgrades. And relative to the IT account in the Small Business Administration, the upgrade that needs to take place in the country is the small business community. And I would just indicate that, you know, on this side of the aisle we champion all the time that small businesses in this country are the backbone, the drivers of this economy. The 7(a) program needs Federal participation to not only be as good as it is today but to be better tomorrow.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), the chairman of the SBA committee, such time as he may use.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio’s (Mr. LA TOURRETTE) district, in all of 2004, he had 185 7(a) loans totaling about $30,400,000. For 2005, year
to date, it is 319 loans totaling nearly $20 million in loans. So it just amazes me that the gentleman from Ohio would say that we need to spend $79 million worth of taxpayers' money.

Last year, I led the fight to add in $79 million for the 7(a) program. I was under the assumption that it was absolutely necessary to have the Federal Government subsidize small business people who wanted to get a loan. And I took a look at this, and I said what kind of a message does this send? There is no constitutional right to have loans subsidized by taxpayers of this country for people to get involved in businesses. And, in fact, that sends the wrong messages. People getting involved in business should realize that it is a free enterprise system that works.

And what we did last year was something epochal: 7(a) loan program last year for the first time did not depend upon a government handout. Small businesses do not need government handouts to start businesses.

My dad was in the grocery store business. He was in the restaurant business. He would have never thought about applying for a loan that was subsidized by taxpayers.

And so what happened last year, the subsidy was taken away. Taxpayers saved $80 million that was spent in areas, other areas, as important as it is. And the problem that I have is when you have the government subsidy, then the program is subject to shut down. That is what happened 2 years ago when the SBA 7(a) program in December ran out of money. The 7(a) program shut down. Small business people could not plan. The lenders had no idea what was going on and chaos broke loose in the 7(a) industry. We do not need the 7(a) subsidy.

As the chairman of the Small Business Committee, I have spoken to people all across the country thanking me for saying, you know, we are paying a little bit more for our loan, but we realize that by the small business people paying a little bit more for their loan and the amount up front gets rolled over to the eventual length of the term of the loan, that makes not only more money available, but it makes the program predictable.

So I would encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the Velázquez amendment. Vote "no" to spending $80 million in taxpayer funds.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to how much time is left on each side.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York has 4 minutes remaining.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have two additional speakers, and I ask unanimous consent for 2 more additional minutes on each side.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the Small Business Administration 7(a) loan program is a proven success. In past years it has provided 30 percent of all long-term small business loans in this country, making it the largest source of public or private financing. So one would assume that such a proven program would be supported by everyone.

However, last year we found out that when there was a choice between more tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans or helping our small businesses, the administration and the Republican leadership were all too willing to change that 7(a) program in conference, so that expenses and risks would be borne by the small businesses themselves.

The result of this change is exactly what we predicted. Fees for loans of less than $150,000 have nearly doubled. Fees for larger loans went up by $3,000 to $5,000. Fifty lenders have dropped out of the program. It is much harder for small businesses in rural areas and small towns to get loans.

Most significantly, 7(a) lending has decreased every quarter since the new fees were added, and the amount of the average 7(a) loan has dropped by $75,000 since the changes have been put in place.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support for the Velázquez amendment. (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, in looking at the figures for the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN) district, my colleague, for fiscal year 2004, there were 193 loans, that is 7(a) loans, totaling $31 million. So far, to date, in fiscal year 2005, 7 months, there are 177 loans at $26 million. That is almost there.

At this rate, the number of loans in 2005 will greatly exceed the number of loans in 2004, showing that when the subsidy was cut and the taxpayers saved $79 million, more loans were given in the gentlewoman from Illinois' (Ms. BEAN) district than when the subsidy was in effect.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have two additional speakers, and I ask unanimous consent for 2 more additional minutes on each side.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It is time that Congress steps forward to support the small business community through access to affordable capital. The Velázquez amendment will reduce fees to small business owners and lenders and create an environment which will foster critical domestic job growth and the local economic expansion so vital to the Eighth District of Illinois and to communities across the Nation.

I urge my colleagues' support of this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, in looking at the figures for the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN) district, my colleague, for fiscal year 2004, there were 193 loans, that is 7(a) loans, totaling $31 million. So far, to date, in fiscal year 2005, 7 months, there are 177 loans at $26 million. That is almost there.

At this rate, the number of loans in 2005 will greatly exceed the number of loans in 2004, showing that when the subsidy was cut and the taxpayers saved $79 million, more loans were given in the gentlewoman from Illinois' (Ms. BEAN) district than when the subsidy was in effect.
Small businesses are the driving force behind job creation and productivity-enhancing technology. The 7(a) loan program has been a worthwhile investment for taxpayers, as statistics demonstrate impressive returns insofar as job creation and business creation, especially. Mr. Chairman, they are economically disadvantaged areas like the territory of Guam that I represent.

Perhaps for this reason a similar amendment introduced last year garnered broad support from both sides of the aisle, and therefore, I urge my colleagues to send a strong message that the House continues to value the importance of this program by again voting to restore funding for the 7(a) loan program.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for an unanimous consent request.

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California rises given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my firm support for the amendment offered by my colleague Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and for continuous and increased funding for the Small Business Administration 7(a) loans programs.

Designed as a public-private partnership, the 7(a) program helps small businesses that otherwise could not obtain a commercial bank loan.

By minimizing the risk to lenders, the SBA's 7(a) loans program secures access for small businesses to the affordable capital they need to start, develop and flourish.

7(a) loans are the most widely used SBA program. These loans provide critical funding for start-ups, real estate acquisition, business expansion, recapitalization, working capital, and machinery and equipment purchase.

The 7(a) loan program has proved to be an insightful and successful initiative.

Just in 2003, these loans benefited more than 70,000 small businesses. And over the last decade, they provided resources for over 424,000 small businesses.

Today's 7(a) loans provide 30 percent of all long-term loans for small business lending.

Unfortunately, the budget under consideration today, fails to provide the resources that small businesses in this country require to continue flourishing.

It fails to restore funding for the SBA's 7(a) loan program and to decrease the harsh conditions that small businesses confront to access affordable capital.

I would remind my colleagues of the critical importance and contribution that small businesses represent for our country.

Small businesses are the most important driving force of our economy. But they require access to capital in order to continue as the catalyst for the U.S. economy.

The reality is that the 7(a) program is that of investment, cooperation and success.

It is a national partnership for growth, productivity and welfare.

For all these reasons, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, which will benefit all Americans.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to close if the gentleman does not have any other speakers.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would close when it is appropriate under the rules.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a vote for helping small businesses. Today the program is more costly, $3,000 more, and half a billion dollars less is going into the economy. We have also seen a 50 percent drop in lenders, which has a particularly negative impact on rural communities and is not a picture of stability, but the good news is that we can fix this. By voting "yes" on the VELÁZQUEZ amendment, we can return the 7(a) program to a source of affordable capital for our Nation's small business owners.

Almost 20 national groups, from the National Small Business Association and the Hotel and Motel Association to the Independent Community Bankers and the Credit Unions, say that this is a problem, and they want us to fix it. For the small commitment on the government's part, we can create jobs and create economic growth, two of the most important things we can do right now. That is why I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, the same amendment that was voted last year overwhelmingly.

Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, that when SBA claims that they are doing record levels, what they do not say is what they are comparing the program's performance to a time last year when it was shut down and operating under a $750,000 cap. When compared to the last quarter before fees were raised, the program actually shows a decline of over $500.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote for the VELÁZQUEZ amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields to the gentlewoman for an unanimous consent request.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote for the VELÁZQUEZ amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields to the gentlewoman for an unanimous consent request.

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

The numbers cited by the proponents of this amendment say that SBA's numbers are deceiving. I understand that he sent in opposition to the amendment he sent in opposition to the same amendment that was voted last year.

I have information here on the gentleman's numbers. If you go deeper into these statistics, you can see that 7(a) loan volume has increased fourfold for women and minority entrepreneurs in fiscal year 2005, up 52 percent to African Americans, up 49 percent to American Indians and Alaska Natives, up 46 percent to Asian Americans, up 32 percent to Hispanics, and up 16 percent to Asian Americans.

At this pace, Mr. Barreto goes on to say, "SBA will likely surpass the fiscal year 2004 figures for both dollars guaranteed and the number of loans approved; especially if you consider that the fourth quarter of the fiscal year traditionally witnesses the highest volume of loans."

He closes by saying, "Mr. Chairman, I believe these number speak for themselves, and they do speak for themselves, 'and should serve to reassure supporters that the 7(a) program is running strong without need of a subsidy or a reduction in fees.'"

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO). He was on the other side last year. Not many people in this institution do that. I mean, he got up and said, yes, this is right, and I am proud to endorse him for that. I think it is the right thing to do.

The thing that I worry about, if anybody is listening to this, if we roll this
back in this tight budget, where do we find the money? I mean, if there was really a crisis with regard to small businesses, I would be for this amendment, but the loans are up, and if they are up, and to take all this, if I can just ask the gentleman, how much would this amendment take, $79 million? We just had a debate on meth. If we are going to do anything, let us put $79 million in meth. If we are going to do anything, let us put $79 million in fighting the drug trade.

But we are going to take $79 million when we do not have a problem. Let us give it to the war on terrorism. Let us give it to the first responders, but not to a program that does not even need it, does not even want it, does not even ask for it.

I understand what they are saying, but if this amendment passes, I am going to go home very discouraged tonight. I think the passage of this amendment, in my own mind, if this amendment is passed, it will tell me, and it should be telling the American people, that we will never, ever be able to deal with the deficit again. There is no need for this, they are not asking for it. These numbers show that loans are up by 24 percent. The chairman for the committee who was for this amendment last year is now against it, and there is just no hope. It is a Katie-bar-the-door, we are going to spend whatever we need to spend.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My colleague is for deficit reduction, with this amendment we will reduce the deficit by $32 million. Then, if we pass this amendment, $78 million we leverage in our loans, and if we reduce half a million jobs at a time when the economy is struggling to replace the jobs that we have lost.

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I just do not think the American people could ever understand that by spending $79 million of additional money that we will help the deficit. I urge a “no” vote on the amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Velázquez amendment and thank the gentlewoman from New York for her efforts to help small businesses. I am pleased that this amendment will reinstate funding for the 7(a) loan program and ensure that small businesses will once again be able to benefit from its lending power.

As a former small business owner, I know the frustrations and worries small business owners have had as this program has been repeatedly targeted by the Bush administration. Small businesses are one of our Nation’s leading employment opportunities but few business owners are able to start up or expand without the help of loans.

The president likes to talk about an “ownership society,” but his budget hurts middle class Americans by denying funding for this program. How can we have a strong middle class if we don’t extend opportunities for people to start their own businesses? This just doesn’t make sense.

Renewing our commitment to the small business administration’s 7(a) loan program will not only provide our businesses with access capital but also the economy as a whole. This program gives people a chance to start a business of their own and make a positive impact on their lives and their communities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important amendment and our small business owners.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Velázquez amendment to the Science-State-Justice Appropriations bill. I thank the gentlelady from New York for her leadership and the opportunity to speak in favor of the Section 7(a) Small Business Loan Program.

The 3rd Congressional District of Colorado is a rural district with many small businesses that have benefited from the SBA’s lending programs.

In 2004, the Section 7(a) provided 25.4 million dollars in loans to small businesses within my congressional district. As you know, this program helps provide capital to small business owners who are unable to access traditional financing alternatives. These small businesses provide the economic engine that drive the economy in my congressional district.

Small businesses able to take advantage of this program have added new jobs to the economy. The Section 7(a) program has created approximately 742 jobs in my district alone. It is vital that these small businesses have the resources and capital necessary to operate, otherwise rural communities will continue to fall further behind the rest of the country in economic growth.

The Section 7(a) loan program is a proven success; it provides critical assistance to small businesses and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment. I thank the gentlelady for the opportunity to speak on behalf of this important amendment.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Velázquez Amendment and in support of America’s small businesses. It is vital that we as the United States Government do all we can to foster the growth of jobs in our economy. To accomplish this we must provide the businesses with enough affordable capital to start and grow. Mr. Chairman, this will create those jobs. I am sad to say that we have not done enough to help out the small businesses that need it most.

Over the last decade we have drastically reduced the availability of capital. These companies have been undercapitalized, which make it hard for them to grow and succeed.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Velázquez Amendment and in support of America’s small businesses. It is vital that we as the United States Government do all we can to foster the growth of jobs in our economy. To accomplish this we must provide the businesses with enough affordable capital to start and grow. Mr. Chairman, this will create those jobs. I am sad to say that we have not done enough to help out the small businesses that need aid.

Consider that one new job is created for every $33,000 that SBA’s 7(a) program guarantees. And consider that in just the past decade, SBA has approved over four hundred thousand loans, for more than $90 billion. You
can do the math: that’s a total of 2.7 million new jobs in just the last ten years. But with the lack of appropriations in FY2005, the average origination fees on small business loans doubled, creating between $1,500 and $3,000 in new costs for the average small business owner. The result is less business access to capital, less expansion, less hiring, and less economic development.

In the past decades, we’ve all seen that many of the country’s strongest local economies are sprouting in areas famous worldwide for their technological prowess: California’s Silicon Valley; North Carolina’s Research Triangle; Boston’s Route 128 Corridor. Central New Jersey’s growing high-technology community—Einstein’s Alley—belongs squarely on that list. Establishing a center of technological innovation in central New Jersey will enhance New Jersey’s continued future as one of the greatest states in the Union. Without support from the state’s small businesses, though, such a technological center could never evolve.

Strengthening New Jersey’s economy and reinforcing its role as an innovation leader will benefit all New Jersey residents. A research-based economy will require regional improvements in transportation and telecommunications, which will help reduce traffic and produce more efficient transportation options for us all. A research-based economy will require a larger tax base, which will drive down individual tax rates. And a research-based economy will demand quality schools and livable communities, in order to attract the best and the brightest entrepreneurs and employees to our region.

Central New Jersey has long lived and thrived on the frontier of scientific and technological innovation. Einstein’s Alley will be home to vibrant communities, cutting-edge companies, and productive workers whose unique assets and shared vision attract new, innovative industries and create many more good jobs to add to what we already have. None of that will be possible, however, without extended small business support. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge every Member of this body to vote to restore the SBA’s 7(a) program to its FY2004 funding level.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). The time of the gentleman has expired. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ).

The Acting Chairman announced that the nays appeared to have it.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN, Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) will be postponed.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, the nays have the last word.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Chairman, I know where I can spend $29 million of those dollars real quick.

I regret today, and I say this because I really truly regret, because I have great respect for the chairman of the subcommittee, but I have to oppose this legislation because it fails to include the funds necessary to implement the Pribilof Islands’ environmental cleanup agreement between the State of Alaska and NOAA.

The Pribilofs are an island in the middle of the Bering Sea. Two of the islands are inhabited today, St. Paul and St. George. Neither was inhabited until the 1780s, when the Russians forcibly relocated residents of the Aleutian Islands to the Pribilofs to harvest the then-valuable pelts of the North Pacific fur seal and the stellar sea lion.

The Russians retained ownership of the land and the profits from the harvest. After the United States purchased Alaska, the Federal Government treated the Pribilof residents no better. Like the Russians before us, we retained ownership of all the island property and the fur seal profits. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and its successor agency, the municipal government, overseer, and landlord of the islands’ residents.

The profits from the fur seal trade offset the entire purchase price of Alaskan, $7.5 million, in less than 20 years. Profits from the fur seal trade no longer offset the expense of managing the islands, when the decision was made to transfer ownership and responsibility for the islands to the residents.

This was not a humanitarian undertaking. The profits were gone, so the Office of Management and Budget saw no need to continue to own the islands. The framework for this transfer process was laid out in the 1983 amendments to the Fur Seal Act.

Unfortunately, the transition plans have not gone smoothly, quickly, or efficiently. In 2000, Congress adopted further amendments to the Fur Seal Act that were designed to get the process back on track. Significant progress has been made. However, additional environmental cleanup work remains to be done.

Unfortunately, the bill before us provides no meaningful funds for the cleanup, not even the insufficient $7.3 million requested by the President. It includes $3.5 million to be divided between three environmental cleanup projects, one of which is the Pribilofs. It also allows the agency to reprogram something NOAA can already do.

I cannot deny that, prior to the year 2000, NOAA’s project management was terrible. Right now, though, it has improved. In the year 2000, the agency brought in new project managers; and these managers, especially Dave Kennedy and John Lindsay, have defined the scope of the project, established meaningful cost estimates and time tables. From 1996 through 2000, NOAA cleaned up 11 sites. Since 2000, the agency has cleaned up 75 sites. Nine sites remain.

Of course, these timetables and cost estimates are only meaningful if sufficient funds are provided to carry them out. This year, no cleanup work will be done because of the funding cuts. This means the cleanup will not be finished in 2006 as planned, but will lapse into 2007.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to this section, the Clerk will continue to read.
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The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For expenses necessary for the administration of pardon and clemency petitions and immigration-related activities, $215,685,000.

DETECTION TRUSTEE

For necessary expenses of the Federal Detention Trustee Program, not to exceed $212,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Trustee shall be responsible for managing the Justice Prisoner and Alien Transportation System in accordance with the Federal Detention Trustee Program Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 18a), regardless of the year of collection, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2006, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2006 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $28,451,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES

For necessary expenses of the Offices of the United States Attorneys, including antitrust and kindred laws, $214,402,000, of which not to exceed $10,000,000 is authorized to be used for transportation of protected witnesses: Provided, That any transfer pursuant to the previous proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the United States Parole Commission as authorized, $1,210,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $20,000 for expenses of collecting evidence, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia, $665,821,000, of which not to exceed $10,000,000 for litigation support contracts shall remain available until expended: Provided, That, in addition to reimbursable full-time equivalent workyears available to the Office of Inspector General, $66,801,000, including not to exceed $25,000,000 is authorized to be made available for making advances for expenses arising out of contractual or reimbursable arrangements with other Federal agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking, $506,940,000, of which $50,000,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That any amounts obligated from appropriations under this heading may be used under authorities available to the organizations reimbursed from this appropriation.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including legal services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 109, $1,220,000.

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND

For necessary expenses of the United States Trustee Program, as authorized, $214,402,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the United States Trustee System Fund: Provided, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, deposits to the Fund shall be available in the amounts necessary to pay funds due depositors: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $214,402,000 of offsetting collections pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 588a(b) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation and remain available until expended: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated is increased as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2006, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2006 appropriation from the Fund estimated at $0.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

For fees and expenses of witnesses, for expenses of contracts for the purchase and maintenance of armored vehicles for transportation of protected witnesses: Provided further, That not to exceed $7,000,000 may be made available for the purchase, installation, maintenance and upgrade of secure telecommunications equipment and a automated index back to store and retrieve the identities and locations of protected witnesses.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, COMMUNITY RELATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Community Relations Service, $9,659,000: Provided, That notwithstanding section 105 of this Act, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for conflict resolution and violence prevention activities of the Community Relations Service, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to the Community Relations Service, from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: Provided further, That any transfer pursuant to the previous proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For expenses authorized by 28 U.S.C. 524(c)(1)(B), (F), and (G), $21,468,000, to be derived from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund.

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

INTERAGENCY CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for the identification, investigation, and prosecution of individuals associated with the most significant drug trafficking organizations, including money laundering organizations not otherwise provided for, to include inter-governmental agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking, $506,940,000, of which $50,000,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That any amounts obligated from appropriations under this heading may be used under authorities available to the organizations reimbursed from this appropriation.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for detection, investigation, and prosecution against the United States; including purchase for police-type use of not to exceed 3,686 passenger motor vehicles, of which 3,039 will be for replacement only; and not to exceed $70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530C, $3,741,132,000; of which not to exceed $150,000,000 shall remain available until expended; of which not to exceed $25,000,000 is authorized to be made available for making advances for expenses arising out of contractual or reimbursable arrangements with State and local law enforcement agencies while engaged in cooperative activities related to violent crime, terrorism, organized crime, gang-related, cybercrime, and drug investigations: Provided, That not to exceed $205,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses; Provided further, That not to exceed $100,000,000 shall be available for reimbursement of personnel and expenses of contracts for the portable and mobile use of telecommunications equipment for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, not to exceed 31,668 positions and 30,525 full-time equivalent workyears available to the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund, to include inter-governmental agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies while engaged in cooperative activities related to violent crime, terrorism, organized crime, gang-related, cybercrime, and drug investigations: Provided, That not to exceed $7,000,000 may be made available for the purchase, installation, maintenance and upgrade of secure telecommunications equipment and a automated index back to store and retrieve the identities and locations of protected witnesses.
Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and any amendments thereto, conclude in 15 minutes, and that the remaining time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) will control 7 1⁄2 minutes and a Member opposed will control 7 1⁄2 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume and first of all would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his great work in helping local law enforcement, but I rise today to speak on an issue that is more than something I believe in; it is who I am.

The COPS program is an essential program to our local law enforcement, and I am here today in support of it. I spent 33 years of my life as a cop. I worked my way up the ladder; I served as patrol officer, jail guard, detective, lieutenant, and finally the sheriff in King County in Seattle, Washington. I became a cop because deep in my heart I believed I could make a difference in the community and that I could protect it. The COPS program enforces that ideal.

Since 9/11, we have found our local cops in an unusual dilemma. They are expected to do more at the same time the scope and the responsibility of first responders on the front lines is increasing without parallel funding. Even in this amendment, restoring COPS funding to its original level of last year still allows for very significant increases to the Federal law enforcement agencies.

In my experience, local and Federal law enforcement are most effective when they are working together. Teamwork is the key. You would not play a football game by sending some of the players out onto the field with pads and helmets and others with no equipment at all. In a team, all players should be trained equally in law enforcement, where our fights have to be balanced, our attacks have to be balanced both local and Federal.

In the war on drugs, in the war on terror, in the national fight against gangs, local police officers and Federal agents are all working together towards the same goal of making our country safer. According to Attorney General John Ashcroft: “Since law enforcement agencies began partnering with citizens through community policing, we have seen significant drops in crime rates.” Now that crime has dropped, we are going to cut the funding that has kept our communities safe? That is absurd.

Local cops are the ones on the front lines, they are the men and the women keeping our families safe daily, protecting our children in school, monitoring gang violence, the first responders who are there when you call 911. You do not pay a lesser price for your family’s safety than you do for homeland security.

We are in a new era of both family and national security. Both our first responders play a dual role, as the first ones on the scene in the case of a terrorist attack and the first ones on the scene in everyday emergencies as well. One is not worth less than the other. Cops must be well prepared and equipped for any emergency they are sent into.

Mr. Chairman, this program is vital. Across the country it procures equipment, combats domestic violence, puts cops in schools, fights meth gangs, and much, much more. I urge my colleagues to support the COPS program and vote for this amendment today.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and yield myself 5 minutes.

My father, as I said in one of the other amendments, was a policeman. The fact is when I think of the name COPS, my dad used to tell me never to call policemen cops, and I even have a hard time saying the word cops, while I know it is the title of the bill. My father was a Philadelphia policeman for 20-some years.

I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. I understand what the gentleman is trying to do, but perhaps the money for this in this bill is the FBI and its efforts to protect the Nation from terrorist attacks.

Thirty people from my congressional district died in the attack on the Pentagon. The first CIA person killed in Afghanistan was from my congressional district. This amendment cuts the FBI by $50 million while the threat of terrorism and espionage from countries, such as China, and the spread of gangs increases.

I would tell the gentleman that I met with a group of local law enforcement people around the country, and some were from Washington State, one police chief, and gangs are an important issue. We have a carve-out of $60 million in this bill with regard to gangs.

We must provide the FBI, though, with the sufficient resources to combat these threats. This amendment would go the other way.

The bill funds the FBI at the requested level when you account for the Administration’s proposal to reduce the FBI’s appropriation by $50 million and reduce it to $78,289,000. The committee rejected this proposed transfer, as members on both sides asked us to do.

If you combine the requested increase for the FBI salaries and expenses and proposed reimbursement for the FBI under OCDETF, this bill is equal to the request. A reduction now of $50 million from the FBI will reduce the number of funded FBI agents by 365. Now, why would we want to reduce the FBI by that amount?

According to the testimony of Director Mueller, there could be, and probably is, al Qaeda sleeper cells operating in the U.S. The committee heard testimony that Hamas and Hezbollah have operatives in the U.S. In fact, as I said to the Director: “Are there Hezbollah operators in the United States?” His answer was: “Yes, there are Hezbollah.” And keep in mind, Hezbollah are the ones who blew up the 241 Marines in Beirut.

That group that blew up the American Embassy and the 241 marines in Beirut, that man who put that effort together, still walks the street. We know the dangers of Iran, and the Director says Hezbollah and Hamas are here, and we want to take 365 agents away.

Time Magazine reports that more than 3,000 companies in the U.S. are suspected of collecting information for China. China is spying against our companies in the United States, and I urge all Members to get that FBI briefing.

The Department of Justice estimates there are approximately 30,000 gangs with 800,000 members impacting 2,500 communities. This amendment would basically take away all of the money in the bill for gangs. If you happen to have horror on the Members who vote for the bill, fighting against the bill for several weeks ago, this money takes out all of the money for last year as well as this year. There is so much to save...
Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

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

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

Mr. REICHERT. The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERY). All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question was taken; and the Act was agreed to by the Yeas and Nays: The Yeas were:...
the goals of such programs; and purchase of not to exceed 1,043 passenger motor vehicles, of which 937 will be for replacement only, for police-type use, $1,766,173,000; of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be available until expended; and of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: Provided, That, for expenses to reimburse full-time equivalent workyears available to the Drug Enforcement Administration, not to exceed 8,371 positions and 8,270 full-time equivalent workyears shall be supported from the funds appropriated in this Act for the Drug Enforcement Administration.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BAIRD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAIRD:
Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $10,000,000)"
Page 36, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $10,000,000)"
Page 39, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $10,000,000)"
Page 39, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $10,000,000)"
Page 40, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $10,000,000)"

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington? There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment which would reduce funding for the Bureau of the Census. As chairman of the House Government Reform Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census, I appreciate the important role of the census in providing information about the American people and our economy. It sounds pretty simple, paperweights versus crime fighting, and certainly the statements concerning our needs for crime fighting are compelling. But it is just not fair.

The census provides information vital to how we as a Nation operate. Every 10 years, each congressional seat

The chairman and I have worked very hard in trying to balance these accounts. They are delicately balanced because of the bad allocation that we received. The Census Bureau in order to do its job has to prepare early. It looks like a lot of money. It is a big job. It is extremely important that it is done right. While I am totally supportive in increasing these local and state law enforcement programs, the offsets are just untenable, this one included. I rise to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is no coincidence that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), as a former sheriff, spoke earlier about the problem with meth. I rise to address the same problem concerning our needs for crime fighting, and certainly the state and local and state and local prosecutors and law enforcement agents for investigation and prosecution of offenses. Of that $10 million, $3 million would be set aside for prosecutors and law enforcement agents in rural communities, and we would also provide $10 million to DEA to combat international trafficking.

Mr. Chairman, it is no coincidence that the remaining time be equally divided between the gentleman from Washington and myself such time as I may consume.

That is why I cofounded the Methamphetamine Caucus, a bipartisan caucus. We must get our hands around this.

We have a war on terror internationally, but I can tell Members the terror in our communities is being caused by methamphetamine. I used to treat meth addicts. It is a devastating drug. That is why I cofounded the Methamphetamine Caucus, a bipartisan caucus. We must get our hands around this.

This is a reasonable offset. It will provide, frankly, not enough additional funds, but a significant message that we are going to intercept international narcotrafficking and bringing in methamphetamine precursors and finished product?

We have a war on terror internationally, but I can tell Members the terror in our communities is being caused by methamphetamine. I used to treat meth addicts. It is a devastating drug. That is why I cofounded the Methamphetamine Caucus, a bipartisan caucus. We must get our hands around this.

This is a reasonable offset. It will provide, frankly, not enough additional funds, but a significant message that we are going to intercept international narcotrafficking and bringing in methamphetamine precursors and finished product?

We have a war on terror internationally, but I can tell Members the terror in our communities is being caused by methamphetamine. I used to treat meth addicts. It is a devastating drug. That is why I cofounded the Methamphetamine Caucus, a bipartisan caucus. We must get our hands around this.

This is a reasonable offset. It will provide, frankly, not enough additional funds, but a significant message that we are going to intercept international narcotrafficking and bringing in methamphetamine precursors and finished product?

We have a war on terror internationally, but I can tell Members the terror in our communities is being caused by methamphetamine. I used to treat meth addicts. It is a devastating drug. That is why I cofounded the Methamphetamine Caucus, a bipartisan caucus. We must get our hands around this.

This is a reasonable offset. It will provide, frankly, not enough additional funds, but a significant message that we are going to intercept international narcotrafficking and bringing in methamphetamine precursors and finished product?
is reapportioned based on census data. The decennial census is the fundamental guarantee of fair representation. Every seat in Congress is apportioned and established according to the decennial census. Also, each year the Federal Government allocates almost $300 billion in funds based in part on census data.

Also, census information is not just used for the decennial census. Annually, the Census Bureau produces information on international trade statistics, and important economic census information is utilized by businesses as they plan locations in how to grow. Actions taken for our economy are based upon information annually and on a regular basis that is produced by the census.

I ask my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment. An amendment to remove funds from the census budget is an amendment that would reduce the accuracy of congressional reapportionment and redistricting and impair the ability of the Federal Government to allocate funds for important programs that aid communities nationwide. Vote “no” on this amendment.

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

Some years ago, I was treating a meth addict. I asked him to tell me what it was like to be hooked on methamphetamine. He said at the time, Doctor, if my children were in a corner of this room and said, Daddy, we need you. He said, I love my children. But if methamphetamine were in the other corner and my body said I want methamphetamine, and this grown man in his 40s who looked to be about 60 because of the ravages of this drug, this grown man burst into tears and he said, Doctor, I would go for the methamphetamine because I cannot help myself.

It is about priorities. We have to stop this drug. It is killing our citizens. We think the census wastes money. I think the money could be better spent on protecting the lives of our citizens and the safety of our communities and schools. I urge a “yes” vote on this. It is a reasonable offset and the money will be well spent on interdicting international imports of this drug and on local enforcement and training.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in very strong support of this amendment, the work of the committee, and the administration’s and OMB’s allocation for the census. I, for one, will continue to do all I can to make sure that the Census Bureau has the capabilities to provide the Congress, and this Nation, with the ability to provide all of us with high quality data needed by the public and its elected representatives to make informed public policy decisions.

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

I rise in opposition to the amendment, but the gentleman makes a good case. On the paperweights, we are going to do a letter to the census saying no paperweights and no gifts and things like that. If that is the case, we ought to deal with it. We ought not, though, take it from the census. I think if the gentleman can work with us, we can work from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRUNNER), we really need to do something beyond what we are doing with regard to meth.

This year the bill is $8 million above. I agree with the gentleman. I do not know how this amendment is going to come out. Hopefully, it will fail, because I do not think we want to go after the census as the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLORAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) said. But the gentleman is right. Something really has to be done almost beyond what we are doing for meth. So I commit whether you win or lose on this, we will get together and see what we can do, but I would hope that we could vote this amendment down because by helping meth, we do not want to then torpedo the Census Bureau.

I urge a “no” vote on the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, including the purchase of not to exceed 822 vehicles for police-type use, $650,000 shall be available for the payment of attorney’s fees as provided by 18 U.S.C. 924(d)(2); and of which $10,000,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That no funds appropriated herein shall be available for salaries or administrative expenses in connection with the training and acquisition of canines for explosives and fire accelerants detection; and for provision of laboratory assistance to State and local law enforcement agencies, with or without reimbursement, $923,613,000, of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for the payment of attorneys’ fees as provided by 18 U.S.C. 924(d)(2); and of which $10,000,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That no funds appropriated herein shall be available for salaries or administrative expenses in connection with consolidating or centralizing, within the Department of Justice, the records, or any portion of the acquisition and disposition of firearms maintained by Federal firearms licensees: Provided further, That no funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay administrative expenses or the compensation of any officer or employee of the United States to implement an amendment or amendments to 27 CFR 178.118 or to change the definition of ‘firearms’ in 27 CFR 178.11 or remove any item from ATF Publication 5300.11 as it existed on January 1, 1994: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be available to investigate or act upon applications for relief from Federal firearms disabilities...
OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN PREVENTION AND PROSECUTION PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance for the prevention, prosecution, and protection of violence against women as authorized by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (‘‘the 1968 Act’’); the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-322) as authorized by section 408 of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (‘‘the 1990 Act’’); the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to遏止 (PACT) to Enforce Laws Against Trafficking in Persons Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-261); the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (‘‘the 1974 Act’’); and the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-386); $187,308,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the amount provided—

(1) $1,000,000 for the court-appointed special advocate program, as authorized by section 111 of the 1990 Act;

(2) $1,925,000 for child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners, as authorized by section 222 of the 1990 Act;

(3) $983,000 for grants for televised testimony, as authorized by Part N of the 1968 Act;

(4) $187,308,000 for grants to combat violence against women, as authorized by part T of the 1968 Act, of which—

(A) $5,000,000 shall be for the National Institute of Justice for research and evaluation of violence against women;

(B) $10,000,000 shall be for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention for the Safe Start Program, as authorized by the 1974 Act; and

(C) $15,000,000 shall be for transitional housing assistance grants for victims of domestic violence, stalking or sexual assault as authorized by Public Law 108–21;

(5) $63,491,000 for grants to encourage arrest policies as authorized by part U of the 1968 Act;

(6) $39,685,000 for rural domestic violence and child abuse enforcement assistance grants, as authorized by section 40295(a) of the 1994 Act;

(7) $4,145,000 for training programs as authorized by section 4013 of the 1994 Act, and for related local demonstration projects;

(8) $2,950,000 for grants to improve the stalking and domestic violence databases, as authorized by section 4061 of the 1994 Act;

(9) $9,175,000 to reduce violent crimes against women on campus, as authorized by section 1108(a) of Public Law 106–386;

(10) $59,740,000 for legal assistance for victims, as authorized by section 1201(c) of Public Law 106–386;

(11) $4,600,000 for enhancing protection for older and disabled women from domestic violence and sexual assault, as authorized by section 40802 of the 1994 Act;

(12) $14,078,000 for the safe havens for children pilot program, as authorized by section 1301(a) of Public Law 106–386; and

(13) $5,000,000 for education and training to end violence against and abuse of women with disabilities, as authorized by section 1402(a) of Public Law 106–386.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:
Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:
Page 19, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $2,000,000).
Page 20, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by $2,000,000).
Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $1,000,000).
Page 23, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $4,000,000).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in that form.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?
There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in that form.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?
There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto conclude in 10 minutes and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself as the opponents.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will designate the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me first of all thank the ranking member for his inquiry and also thank the gentleman. I think the time frame was not in agreement, but the issue is so important that I will proceed.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment speaks specifically to what I think is the devastating disease of child violence and child abuse. This is a simple amendment. It takes from the $300 million-plus allotment for the Edward Byrne grants a simple $2 million for child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners.

In a hearing in the Judiciary Committee just a week ago, a number of us presented bills trying to fight against sexual predators and those who would abuse children. We have discovered that the number one killer of children is now homicides. Even in the backdrop of this debate, we find a troubling set of circumstances in Aruba where a young 18-year-old still goes missing after celebrating her graduation and, of course, expressing great hope and aspiration for her entry as a freshman into college. The plague on children is rampant. This is a simple way of addressing the need for ensuring that we have practitioners as well as those dealing with judicial personnel and practitioners to be able to help children to recount incidences against them.

I have introduced legislation to address the question of child predators as it relates to the DNA, but this particular amendment is important because of the ways in which we work.

Just 24 hours ago there was a story noting the abuse of a 4-month-old, a sexual abuse of a 4-month-old. So the importance of this particular funding is to prevent child violence, prevent child abuse, and to be able to provide additional training for the vast number of practitioners and judges to be sensitive in their work dealing with children.

We can do more. I hope that we will pass a number of child predator bills that are making their way through the Committee on the Judiciary and other committees. But, frankly, it is extremely important that we look to make a national statement, that we are not going to take it anymore, a national statement in protecting our children and providing them with the kind of legal protection and as well sensitive judges and practitioners who will work with them.

This is not in any way affecting this legislation inasmuch as the moneys for the Byrne grant that deal with drug task forces. That certainly has my support, even as the President zeroed it out, but my concern with oversight, an amendment that I will offer at a subsequent time. But I ask my colleagues to consider their commitment to preventing child abuse and child violence, providing them with appropriate counsel and appropriate judiciary to understand their needs and to be on the front lines of saying and suggest that this is an important cause for America and making a statement.

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

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

I want to thank the gentlewoman for the amendment. I accept the amendment.

I want the RECORD to show that the committee did the best it could to fund the Violence against Women. The bill provides $5.4 billion over last year for these programs, and it is $500,000 over the President's request. I think the gentlewoman's amendment is good, and I accept it. If we move through, I want to do this, if we can maybe look to see a different place, but I accept the amendment, and I want to thank the gentleman for it.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman's reasoning, and I agree to accept the amendment.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I wholeheartedly thank the chairman and the ranking member, and I look forward to working with them if we can find an accommodating place as we move forward. But I thank them very much.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORBERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS
JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, the Missing Children's Assistance Act, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith, the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 1998, and Victims of Crime Act of 1984, $27,466,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. STEARNS

Page 22, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $10,000,000)."

Page 23, line 1, after both dollar amounts insert the following: "(reduced by $10,000,000)."

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto conclude by 10 minutes, and that the remaining time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.
The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I do not need a lot of time. This is pretty simple, this amendment. It is basically an amendment to help our local law enforcement community. Mr. Chairman, I would basically transfer $10 million from the Legal Services Corporation and give it instead to the Justice Assistance Grant, or JAG, program.

I would like to thank the chairman for finding this critical program, especially in light that the administration's budget proposed a zero funding. So he is to be commended for funding this program, and I need to compliment him on that matter.

But I have heard from law enforcement officials and across the State of Florida about how much this JAG funding helps them fight crime, and to protect and serve the citizens within their jurisdiction. The JAG program is set to receive about $348 million in funding under this bill. It is my hope that an additional, just simply an additional $10 million will help increase the numerous and substantial benefits under this program.

The Legal Services Corporation would still receive $321 million, which I and many of my colleagues would agree is still a reasonable amount of money to provide for legal services to the poor. In addition to this Federal subsidy, there are thousands of attorneys across the country who provide thousands of hours and hundreds of millions of dollars in service pro bono for these people.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not point out to my colleagues that the Legal Services Corporation has been providing free legal services to quasilegal immigrants, despite the fact that we passed a restriction in 1996 that barred local legal service groups from using Federal money for these activities. This $10 million reduction in Legal Services Corporation funding would bring it more in line, of course, with the President's request, certainly in my opinion.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an anti-legal service amendment, but merely a modest, a simple, modest, amendment to further help our local law enforcement combat drugs and fight crime. So I am not asking the Legal Services to justify its existence. I am just saying let us make a modest attempt here to send a message how important it is to keep the JAG program, and I urge my colleagues to support their local law enforcement and to support my amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in opposition to the amendment. I understand what the gentleman is trying to do. I just wanted to kind of let people know that last year's request was for roughly $300 million. At last year's level, the corporation and its grantees cannot do anything new. The level provided in the bill will not even pay for inflationary costs. The corporation actually requested $364 million, but the committee had only enough to fund the current level.

Eighty percent of the legal needs of people in poverty are not addressed. We tried to strike a balance with regard to the poor. This program helps the poor, and there have been so many good restrictions put on the Legal Services under the former leadership of former Congressman John Erlenborn. So to take more money away to cut the Legal Services Corporation could dramatically impact the ability of low-income Americans to seek and obtain justice. Justice, justice thou shalt pursue, and I think this is really an amendment that would hurt the poor, so I would hope that we would not accept this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

This is awful. Can we not find a more vulnerable group in the country to take money away from? At a time when the country is rewarding wealth by huge high-income tax cuts, surely we can find money for worthy purposes somewhere other than Legal Services. The fact is the poor people, if they are going to dream of an American dream, if they are going to participate in the American legal system that we all are so proud of, then they have to be able to have support in that effort. That is recognized. The whole premise of the Legal Services Corporation recognizes that, and its services are totally inadequate.

Fifty percent of the potential clients were turned away from Legal Services and not served at all last year. In West Virginia, we are turning away 90 percent of the people requesting services. Legal Services requested more money than we were able to appropriate to them. This is not a place to cut for anything, for law enforcement.

And the other irony here is where the gentleman finds money to support law enforcement, he finds money from folks who are living in the communities that need this additional law enforcement. I would suggest to him that he go to the high income tax people who get huge benefits from the tax cuts we have given them in the last 5 years to find his offsets to support the policing that is needed most in the communities from where the people who are seeking legal services aid in the Legal Services Corporation come from.

This is a bad amendment. It cuts a program that is desperately needed if we want to further help our police participate in the American legal system, and we should expect and want and make sure that everybody participates in the American legal system that we are all so proud of and bragging about.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I heard the argument of my distinguished colleague from West Virginia. He is arguing that a 2 percent, 2 1/2 percent cut in the Legal Services Corporation is bad, is terrible. Put that in perspective. They are getting $321 million. We are just saying take $10 million out of that and give it to the Justice Assistance Grant program, which provides grants to States. And what do those grants do? They fund law enforcement so that they can fight crime, fight drugs, and in the end they will not need Legal Services.

So my point, Mr. Chairman, is if we cannot cut the Legal Services by 2 1/2 percent symbolically to a program like the Justice Assistance Grant, which is going to help these people so they do not need Legal Services, they do not need the government-run legal program, because they will be fighting crime, then I think we are making a mistake.

So this is a very simple amendment with great symbolic reference here that one as a Member can say, I believe in my local community, I want to fight crime, I want to give grants to the States so that they can do it so that in the end they do not need these legal services. And good golly, if we cannot cut the Legal Services Corporation by about 2.8 percent, then really, Mr. Chairman, we are really not interested in trying to even look at fiscal responsibility, much less symbolic responsibility for helping our local police sheriffs in all of our congressional districts and all the counties throughout this country.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to consider this amendment. It is both symbolism and plus it helps the local police force. And, goodness gracious, the Legal Services Corporation is going to get roughly 2.7 percent now. I think a small amount considering the administration decided to zero out this program. It is only by the grace of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) that this program is back in place. So I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and be on the right side of the angels.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in opposition to the amendment. Former Congressman John Erlenborn did a great job of restraining and bringing some sense to the Legal
Services. Legal Services had an event years ago when I was running, and they criticized me. I mean, they were very political, very political, and they have changed that now.

The American Bar Association asked for $50 million, and I only did $35 million. But I think we really need to in this society make sure that we are representing the poor, too, when the rich can get representation, and it is even difficult for the middle class. And I have never been a great fan of Legal Services.

I have had some serious problems. The fact is, I will try to find the tape where they criticized me. But I think this year it is a good balance, it is a good level; and I think on behalf of making sure that the poor have legal representation, although I understand what the gentleman is trying to do, I would feel that we do not support the amendment.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. Legal Services have been political at times. The gentleman points out cases where they have been. I think it is a commendation to the gentleman, in light of the fact of how they politicize things, he is still here arguing for a complete budget, but asking for a 2.7 percent reduction, on behalf of the communities.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, securing our borders is clearly the responsibility of the Federal Government. We have had a program that was initiated in 1994 called the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, SCAAP. It has done a very good job of reimbursing the States for the appropriate incarceration of illegal immigrant criminals, people who have committed violent crimes, illegal aliens, and committed crimes. We have, unfortunately, seen not the kind of increase in that level of reimbursement that we should, so this amendment proposes that we transfer an additional $50 million to the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration to the SCAAP program.

I congratulate the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the committee for putting into place funding at the level of $355 million. I do not believe that that is adequate.

I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), and the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), in support of this very important effort to have the Federal Government step up to the plate and make sure that we meet our responsibilities.

In my County of Los Angeles alone, it costs $150 million a year for the incarceration of these criminals, and I believe that we need to provide more resources. I hope very much that my colleagues join in support of this important amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I do not oppose the amendment. I support the amendment, so in fairness I ask unanimous consent that I extend 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (GILCHREST) and 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EMERY) on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time will be divided as stated.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California has a good point. We were down in El Salvador 2 weeks ago and they told us they were pouring across...
the border, members of MS–13 and gang members. We met with gang members who told us they came across, got arrested, got into prison, and went back. It is a tremendous burden not only for my region, but also for California, Texas, Arizona, and the entire country. So I understand the gentleman’s amendment.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to express my appreciation to the distinguished subcommittee chairman and congratulate him on his fine work, not only on this issue but the very important NASA programs about which we spoke earlier.

I think this $50 million amount, which enjoys the support, I know, of the distinguished chairman of the full committee, is the right thing to do. In bringing about this reduction from NOAA, we have seen a 63 percent increase in NOAA’s administrative expenses over the last 3 years, and we have seen a constant reduction in the SCAAP funding. So I believe this is the appropriate thing to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

I want to compliment the gentleman from California on this amendment and I understand the gravity of the situation. I just wish the money did not come out of NOAA. If we look at NOAA’s budget this year, it is millions of dollars below where it was last year. Let us take a look at what that section of NOAA has to deal with: the effect of oceans on climate; the effect of oceans on the air we breathe; weather patterns that direct where the forests, deserts, and agriculture are going to be; the effect on aquaculture and fish farming on the natural environment in the ocean; ocean currents that distribute the heat and the balance of the planet. The ocean currents right now are beginning to slow down in the North Atlantic because of a redistribution of salt and fresh water in the ocean. The magnitude of the impact on that on the northeastern parts of the United States and Canada, if you look at London, on the same latitude as Labrador, the climate is like the State of Maryland. Finally, red tides, poisonous, deadly to humans, but do not impact the shellfish.

The huge magnitude of the research that is lacking now as a result of our lack of understanding of oceans on life on planet Earth is staggering. NOAA should be at the same level of funding and have the same understanding in our educational institutes as NASA.

So I compliment the gentleman in trying to fix this terrible problem with our border crossings and the criminal activity that results all across the United States, but the issue of our oceans I do not think is adequately being addressed.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, let me compliment the gentleman on his statement. I totally concur with those goals. The gentleman has never let me forget the importance of keeping oceans as a priority. The fact of the matter is, as we look at the $5.7 billion budget request for the Department of Commerce, 63 percent of that budget request is for NOAA, which we know is critically important. I do not in any way undermine the importance of it. I do believe, though, if you look at this $50 million in administrative expenses, this is something that clearly could be handled very, very easily within that massive budget of NOAA.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise only to express my strong support for the Dreier–Kolbe amendment, which recognizes that Congress has a long-standing understanding of the fact that the difficulties of immigration, the challenges of illegal immigration especially, are a Federal responsibility.

What the gentleman is proposing is not creating a grant program, but rather reimbursing for funds already spent to meet the challenge of our borders. Indeed, it is very important that we move forward in terms of funding. This $50 million amount raises the total to $105 million, only about 25 cents on the dollar relative to the national cost. It is a very important change.

Mr. Chairman, I urge everybody to support the Dreier–Kolbe amendment, and I thank the gentleman for their work.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. I will be cor-

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge that we oppose the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. The fact of the matter is, as we look at the $5.7 billion budget request for the Department of Commerce, 63 percent of that budget request is for NOAA, which we know is critically important. I do not in any way undermine the importance of it. I do believe, though, if you look at this $50 million in administrative expenses, this is something that clearly could be handled very, very easily within that massive budget of NOAA.

Indeed, it is very important that we move forward in terms of funding. This $50 million amount raises the total to $105 million, only about 25 cents on the dollar relative to the national cost. It is a very important change.

Mr. Chairman, I urge everybody to support the Dreier–Kolbe amendment, and I thank the gentleman for their work.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. I will be cor-

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge that we oppose the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. The fact of the matter is, as we look at the $5.7 billion budget request for the Department of Commerce, 63 percent of that budget request is for NOAA, which we know is critically important. I do not in any way undermine the importance of it. I do believe, though, if you look at this $50 million in administrative expenses, this is something that clearly could be handled very, very easily within that massive budget of NOAA.

Indeed, it is very important that we move forward in terms of funding. This $50 million amount raises the total to $105 million, only about 25 cents on the dollar relative to the national cost. It is a very important change.

Mr. Chairman, I urge everybody to support the Dreier–Kolbe amendment, and I thank the gentleman for their work.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. I will be cor-

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge that we oppose the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. The fact of the matter is, as we look at the $5.7 billion budget request for the Department of Commerce, 63 percent of that budget request is for NOAA, which we know is critically important. I do not in any way undermine the importance of it. I do believe, though, if you look at this $50 million in administrative expenses, this is something that clearly could be handled very, very easily within that massive budget of NOAA.

Indeed, it is very important that we move forward in terms of funding. This $50 million amount raises the total to $105 million, only about 25 cents on the dollar relative to the national cost. It is a very important change.

Mr. Chairman, I urge everybody to support the Dreier–Kolbe amendment, and I thank the gentleman for their work.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. I will be cor-

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge that we oppose the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. The fact of the matter is, as we look at the $5.7 billion budget request for the Department of Commerce, 63 percent of that budget request is for NOAA, which we know is critically important. I do not in any way undermine the importance of it. I do believe, though, if you look at this $50 million in administrative expenses, this is something that clearly could be handled very, very easily within that massive budget of NOAA.

Indeed, it is very important that we move forward in terms of funding. This $50 million amount raises the total to $105 million, only about 25 cents on the dollar relative to the national cost. It is a very important change.

Mr. Chairman, I urge everybody to support the Dreier–Kolbe amendment, and I thank the gentleman for their work.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. I will be cor-

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge that we oppose the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment. The fact of the matter is, as we look at the $5.7 billion budget request for the Department of Commerce, 63 percent of that budget request is for NOAA, which we know is critically important. I do not in any way undermine the importance of it. I do believe, though, if you look at this $50 million in administrative expenses, this is something that clearly could be handled very, very easily within that massive budget of NOAA.

Indeed, it is very important that we move forward in terms of funding. This $50 million amount raises the total to $105 million, only about 25 cents on the dollar relative to the national cost. It is a very important change.

Mr. Chairman, I urge everybody to support the Dreier–Kolbe amendment, and I thank the gentleman for their work.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.
First and foremost, just looking at it overall, this amendment would result in RIFs to NOAA. Over 100 employees, NOAA employees, government employees, would be affected, would be RIF’d by this amendment, and over 200 non-governmental researchers and staff. This amendment, from my operation of this money, Mr. Chairman; and it would have a real employee impact.

These are some of the operations it would cut, and they include research: $5 million from the NOAA core and program support; $12 million from the National Environmental Satellite Data and Information Service; $7 million from the Oceanic, Atmospheric and Research Activities; and, extremely important, and we ought to understand as we deal with this amendment, it would involve a $14.9 million, almost a $15 million cut of operations for the National Weather Service Hurricane and Other Severe Weather Warnings.

As I said in the beginning, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. It is not benign. It has a lot of very harmful effects on NOAA, an organization that has already experienced its fair share of pain as we moved this bill to the floor.

Again, this bill has been well balanced. For those agencies, the pain has been spread evenly. For us to go in and start having these kinds of severe cuts in agencies like NOAA is very harmful.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair, I was a little confused by this unanimous consent request propounded by the ranking minority member, and I do not know how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) now has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. I began with 5 minutes, and now I have 7 minutes. That sounds like a pretty good arrangement from my perspective.

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLOE), the coauthor of this amendment and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I do rise in support of this amendment, cognizant as I am of the arguments we have just heard against it and the source of the funding, and on recognizing the importance of science. I do not think there is a more important priority than we have right now than this law enforcement.

My constituent, southeastern Arizona shares about 100 miles of the U.S.-Mexico border. The communities along this border suffer the brunt of our failed national immigration policies. Last year Border Patrol apprehensions within one county, Cochise County, Arizona, alone, were more than 240,000 persons. The entire county has a population of 124,000 people. It is not difficult to imagine the strain on local resources and the increase in the strain of people trying to enter this country illegally through this relatively small section of the border. Local law enforcement must protect communities against increasingly dangerous traffickers that want to hold criminal aliens that cannot be held in Federal facilities.

The State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, better known as SCAAP, provides reimbursements to State and local governments for part of the cost of incarcerating foreign nationals who are criminal aliens. The amendment offered by my colleague from California and me would increase the amount of funding for this critical program by $50 million, and I would point out that every dollar we do not appropriate here is a dollar that is not spent by local law enforcement in the streets on law enforcement because they are having to take funds and deal with this critical problem.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that it appears that my very good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), is going to oppose this amendment, and I share the concern that has been raised about the issue of the funding for the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration. I think that oceans continue to be a high priority.

We all look at the funding level that we have at this point. As I was saying in my exchange with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), if you look at the $5.7 billion request that has been made for the Department of Commerce budget, 63 percent of that budget goes towards NOAA. It seems to me that as we look at a responsible area where we can take funds and deal with the critical State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, in fact, just last year when we had a request for $750 million, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle requested an additional $100 million. It would be nice if we could provide that support, but as the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) pointed out, we in this bill, very well crafted by the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF), have $355 million, and our sole request is that we increase that from $355 million to $405 million.

I urge strong support of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), another coauthor of this amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I thank the gentleman for bringing this forward, the gentleman from California (Mr. KOLOE) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FARR) this is very important. That is why in Arizona we will find overwhelming support for this Republican and Democrat amendment. We simply in Arizona are dealing with a porous border, and we are dealing with costs that we can do nothing about in Arizona.

It is the Federal Government’s responsibility to secure the border. The Federal Government has not secured the border. Hospitals are incurring costs, education is incurring costs, law enforcement, specifically for this, is incurring great cost, and if the Federal Government is failing to secure the border, it is the Federal Government’s responsibility to pony up. This represents still just pennies on the dollar of what are spent in Arizona, California, and other border States in particular, but at least it is something. At least it is something.

President Bush, himself a former border governor, said in 1999, ‘‘If the Federal Government cannot do its job enforcing the borders, then it owes the States monies to pay for its failure.’’ That is what we are asking for here.
SCAAP just reimburses States and localities for incurred costs for incarcerating undocumented criminal aliens. That is what we are asking for here, simply a little fairness. We need broader reform.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues and I have offered broader, meaningful immigration reform that will deal with this in the long term, but, in the short term, we need to do something for the border States in particular.

I commend my colleagues for bringing this to the floor, and I urge support for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. Dreier) has 1 minute remaining; the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. Mollohan) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. Dreier. The gentleman from West Virginia has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. He does have the right to close.

Mr. Dreier. Mr. Chairman, I would like to close on our side, but I yield 10 seconds to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Gilchrest).

Mr. Gilchrest. Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, I would like to say that the oceans are an important aspect of our national security, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Rangel. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. Stearns of Florida; and amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. Dreier of California.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBRY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 230, not voting 7, as follows:

AYES—196

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

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, not because SCAAP is not a good idea to fully fund, and I support what the gentleman from NOAA, Mr. Obey, is attempting to do. What you are doing here is choosing to cut California to help California, and choosing to cut California results in cutting what is essentially the largest population in the entire United States down the coastline. They develop, on all of the issues of the marine sanctuaries, the research that goes on, of the students that go out on the NOAA ships, all of these funds are going to be affected by this cut.

Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of things we can do about SCAAP, and I strongly support more funding, but I think California can do a better job of trying those cases in Mexico where they have been successful in incarcerating and gotten 100 percent conviction in courts in Mexico, which are a lot cheaper than incarcerating them in California. This $50 million cut really wipes out NOAA. The committee already cut half a billion dollars, and to add another $50 million, which RIFs 100 people, a lot of those people live in California.

This is a bad amendment because of what it attempts to cut, and I would strongly oppose it. I ask my colleagues to defeat the Dreier amendment.

Mr. Issa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. Obey of Wisconsin; amendment offered by Mr. Terry of Nebraska; amendment offered by Ms. Velázquez of New York; amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. Reichert of Washington; amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. Stearns of Florida; and amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. Dreier of California.

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

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

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

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, not because SCAAP is not a good idea to fully fund, and I support what the gentleman from NOAA, Mr. Obey, is attempting to do. What you are doing here is choosing to cut California to help California, and choosing to cut California results in cutting what is essentially the largest population in the entire United States down the coastline. They develop, on all of the issues of the marine sanctuaries, the research that goes on, of the students that go out on the NOAA ships, all of these funds are going to be affected by this cut.

Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of things we can do about SCAAP, and I strongly support more funding, but I think California can do a better job of trying those cases in Mexico where they have been successful in incarcerating and gotten 100 percent conviction in courts in Mexico, which are a lot cheaper than incarcerating them in California. This $50 million cut really wipes out NOAA. The committee already cut half a billion dollars, and to add another $50 million, which RIFs 100 people, a lot of those people live in California.

This is a bad amendment because of what it attempts to cut, and I would strongly oppose it. I ask my colleagues to defeat the Dreier amendment.

Mr. Issa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. Obey of Wisconsin; amendment offered by Mr. Terry of Nebraska; amendment offered by Ms. Velázquez of New York; amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. Reichert of Washington; amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. Stearns of Florida; and amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. Dreier of California.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XX, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:
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ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Hastings of Washington) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

MERRICK, CUELLAR, RAHALL, DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, FATTAH and LARSON of Connecticut changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Terry) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 252, not voting 6, as follows:

[A roll call is printed hereinafter.]

H4467

Reyes

Sullivan

Tanner

Taylor (MI)

Tezanos

Thompson (CA)

Towns

Udall (CO)

Udall (NM)

Upton

Van Hollen (MD)

Walden (NY)

Wamp

Waxman

Watkins

Watt

Wayne

Westmoreland

Wittman

Wynn

Young (AK)

Young (TX)

Young (OH)

Young (IN)

Young (VA)

Young (D)
The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noses prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.
Mr. GRAVES and Mr. KUCINICH changed their vote from "aye" to "no." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Chairwoman announced the pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) 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 Chairwoman. 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 260, noes 168, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]
The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

Mr. SERRANO and Ms. LEE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”
Mr. REICHERT and Mr. DENT changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

The amendment was agreed to.

The vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. STARNES

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STARNES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 112, noes 316, not voting 5, as follows:

AYES—112


NOES—316


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

The Clerk read as follows:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: (increased by $21,947,600).

Page 23, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: (increased by $21,947,600).

Page 65, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: (reduced by $21,947,600).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I was briefed about earlier, the Edward Byrne Memorial U.N. budget from the U.S. assessments which is making their report, I believe, are taking about .6 percent, a little less than 1 percent, of the overall U.N. budget to do this. But with that little tiny bit of money, it will translate into a 63.3 percent increase for this purpose, not enough for every law enforcement need throughout the country, but enough to meet the numerous needs that are not being met right now.

Mr. Chairman, later in this week we will be dealing with U.N. reform and pointing out that the U.N. has not lived up to its original charter. That charter sets out that the U.N.’s job is preventing war and maintaining world peace. There have been over 300 wars since 1945, when the U.N. was created. The U.N. has not died. Obviously, it is not living up to its full potential. In part it is because of its bloated bureaucracy, its inefficiency, and its bad management in so many different ways, an untold amount of wasted dollars at the U.N. The United Nations cannot even come up with the definition of what terrorism is. But let me tell the Members, Mr. Chairman, after September 11, local law enforcement agents in my district in New Jersey can tell us what terrorism is because they have seen it firsthand.

So I offer this amendment today to make sure that they have all the tools necessary to keep our citizens safe at home.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.
tomorrow or the next day, and they had some fairly dramatic recommendations to reform the U.N., and I think that is really the way to go.

Thirdly, while it is true the U.N. has failed in Srebrenica, they failed in Sarajevo, they failed in Rwanda, and they are failing in Darfur, the recommendations of the Gingrich-Mitchell can make a large difference.

Lastly, the peacekeepers that we have in some places, for instance, the peacekeepers in Sudan, keep American men and women, military, from being killed on the ground. So I would urge Members, where we are going to accept the amendment, to look at the Gingrich-Mitchell recommendations which will be coming out this week which will be dramatically reforming the U.N. on a bipartisan basis.

So having said that, I accept the gentleman’s amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. Maloney. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have amendment at the desk, and I will offer it and withdraw it.

My amendment designates $1.2 million out of the overall census budget for research on migration to improve demographic analysis and population estimates.

When the 2000 census count was announced, there was a great deal of confusion at Census Bureau. Demographic analysis, which has been the gold standard for measuring error in the census, and which had showed a substantial net undercount in the census for 50 years, showed an overcount. The population estimates, which had been used to distribute funds throughout the decade, missed almost 8 million people. There was a simple explanation for this. The Census Bureau assumptions on net migration into the country were wrong. The Census Bureau is now asking Congress for additional funds to do the research necessary to correct these estimates.

Measuring error in the census and providing population estimates for the distribution of funds are part of the core mission of the Bureau. Improvements in those activities should be funded for anything else. I am disappointed that this research has not been funded. I will, however, withdraw this amendment, and I hope that the chairman and ranking member will work to see that the necessary research gets done before the 2010 census.

The Census Bureau has at times wasted money on gadgets and promotional items instead of basic research. We need to direct their efforts back to basic research, such as the demographic analysis.

Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which would increase the funding for investigation and prosecution of consumer identity fraud.

Approximately 10 million people a year are being victimized by identity theft. Last year’s business and financial institutions lost about $52 billion, and consumers lost about $5 billion due to identity theft.

Too little is being done to effectively address consumer identity theft and credit card fraud. Presently what happens is the credit card companies just simply say, the fraud involved the fee are not always appropriately pursued. The problem is that the laws we have on the books are not being adequately enforced due to insufficient investigative and prosecutorial resources. While the Department of Justice devotes some resources towards identity theft, it is not a high priority due to inadequate resources, and so the thieves practice their wares with impunity.

Mr. Chairman, last year we passed legislation which authorized money for consumer identity theft enforcement. We have not properly funded that, and this amendment would go a long way into properly funding it. I understand, however, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman Wolf) has expressed some concerns about the offsets and the funding level in the bill already, and I would ask the chairman if he would work with us to make sure that the funding of identity theft is properly done under the bill between now and in the Senate, and in conference.

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

Mr. Scott of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Wolf. Mr. Chairman, he has my commitment to that. This is a very important issue, and we can work together.

Mr. Scott of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his commitment.

And with that, I will not offer the amendment, but will be working to make sure that consumer identity theft investigation and prosecution is properly funded in the bill.

Mr. Wolf. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Marchant) having assumed the chair, Mr. Thornberry, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Department of Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2862, SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. Wolf. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2862 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 314, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

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

amendments printed in the Record and numbered 1, 4, 10, 11, 17, 18, 19 and 21;

amendments printed in the Record and numbered 2, which shall be debatable for 15 minutes;

amendments printed in the Record and numbered 6, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

amendment by Mr. Wolf, regarding funding levels;

amendment by Mr. Hinchey, regarding implementation of laws on medical marijuana, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

amendment by Mr. Markey, regarding limitation on funds for torture, which will be debatable for 15 minutes;

amendment by Mr. Nadler, regarding health insurance records under the PATRIOT Act, which shall be debatable for 15 minutes;

amendment by Mr. Sanders, regarding FISA applications under the PATRIOT Act, which shall be debatable for 40 minutes;

amendment by Mr. Schiff, regarding protection of the Federal judiciary;

amendment by Mr. Cardin, regarding WTO action against China for currency manipulation;

amendment by Mr. Mica, regarding U.S. and Commercial Service Funding;

amendment by Mr. Shimkus and Mrs. Eshoo, regarding NTIA funding;

amendment by Mr.inslee, regarding NOAA Coastal Zone Management Program;

amendment by Mr. Fossella or Mr. King of New York, regarding U.S. fugitives residing in Cuba;

amendment by Mr. Flake, regarding educational cultural exchanges;

amendment by Mr. Flake, regarding goods to Cuba, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

amendment by Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, regarding data on racial distribution of convictions;

amendment by Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, regarding affirmances by immigration judges;

amendment by Mr. Moran of Virginia, regarding export licenses for firearms;

amendment by Mrs. Musgrave, regarding NASA Hollywood liaison;