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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Committee will resume its sitting.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

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

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Lewis of Georgia.

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

TITLE VI

ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 601. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to take any action to finalize (or otherwise implement) provisions contained in the proposed rule published on May 3, 2007, on pages 29880 through 29893, Federal Register, insofar as such provisions provide—

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleagues and friends, Peter Welch of Vermont and Jerry Weller from Illinois, for joining me in offering this important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, hospitals need more than just 2 months to change their coding system. It’s too much too soon. CMS needs to give them the time they need. In addition, we must not allow CMS to implement this behavior offset. I’ve talked to hospitals in my district. They’re doing everything right when it comes to coding and charging Medicare. This cut will punish the hospital that before they’ve done anything wrong. 269 Members of the House feel the same way.

Mr. Weller and I sent a letter to CMS on June 12, along with 267 of our colleagues and 63 Senators urging CMS not to take a $2 billion cut. Hospitals do not deserve a $2 billion cut. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment and help our hospitals.

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

Mr. Weller of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. And first let me thank my colleagues, John Lewis, Peter Welch, for the opportunity to join in bipartisan sponsorship of this amendment.

This amendment prevents the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services from cutting $2 billion in funding for our local hospitals, funding that’s used to provide care to disabled under Medicare. In my district alone this would mean a loss of $60 million in reimbursement for my local hospitals, having a devastating effect on the quality of care.

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

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

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

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

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

I ask my colleagues to vote in a bipartisan manner.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD


Re CMS Proposed Inpatient Prospective Payment Rule

Ms. LESLIE V. NORWALK, Esquire, Acting Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), Washington, DC. Dear Ms. Norwalk: We write to express our strong opposition to two provisions in the proposed Inpatient Prospective Payment System (IPPS) regulation. We respectfully request that these provisions be excluded from the final regulation.

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

The second proposal would reduce payments to hospitals in urban areas for capital-related costs for inpatient services, cutting payments by nearly $1 billion over the next five years. We urge you to eliminate
both provisions when the final regulation is published.

Please allow us to further explain our strong objections to the changes:

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

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

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

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

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

Congress recently opposed a component of the administration’s fiscal year 2008 budget proposal that would have significantly reduced hospital payments. As you know, both the FY08 House and Senate budget resolu-
But CMS, the government representative, has to be a partner of our deliverers, the hospitals, not an adversary. And that requires that they give more than 2 months notice, they give a heads up to the hospitals when they’re going to change a rule that has the direct and immediate impact of changing revenue streams for our hospitals. This amendment, paragraph 1, like paragraph 2, simply delays the implementation so that there will be a heads up, a time to respond, a time to study it and a time to talk about it. Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. Chairman, 269 Members of this body are on record in support of this bipartisan amendment. It is simply wrong to punish the hospital before they have done anything wrong. So I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, on this side of the aisle we’d be happy to accept the amendment. Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York. Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I again, I am one of the signatories on the letter I support it. It will help our hospitals.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Upton: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. ___. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to purchase light bulbs unless the light bulbs have the “ENERGY STAR” designation.

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

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

Mr. UPTON. No problem.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Garrett of New Jersey: Page 15, after line 2, insert the following:

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I appreciate that. I will shorten my remarks to approximately 30 seconds to say, I thank the chairman for accepting the amendment. I thank the previous subcommittee chairmen as well for accepting similar which we have done in the past, which simply says to set priorities. When we have Federal agencies send Federal employees overseas for conferences, we should put a realistic limitation on it, and this one, I think, does, at 50 employees of any Federal Department or agency for any single conference occurring outside the United States.

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

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

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

In 2002 HHS spent $36.8 million to send 236 persons to the AIDS conference in Barcelona. In 2004 HHS spent $500,000 to send 140 persons to the AIDS conference in Bangkok. In 2005 HHS spent 300 employees to a dioxin conference in Toronto.

Last year the agency sent delegations of 200 or more to five separate conferences. Many of these conferences are now covered online, allowing interested parties to attend without expensive plane tickets, meals, and hotel rooms.

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Garrett of New Jersey: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VI ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 601. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for the “Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Services”, by increasing the amount made available for the “National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute”, and by increasing the amount made available for the “National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke” by $9,000,000, $10,000,000, and $10,000,000, respectively.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I will yield.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for increasing the budget of the
National Cancer Institute in this year’s bill. I just think that we can do a little more. And this is an obviously higher priority with far broader application to the American people.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In 2001 Andre Agassi opened a charter school in Las Vegas, the Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy. It is in one of the most disadvantaged areas in my congressional district. Agassi Prep currently serves students in grades K-10, with grades 11 and 12 being added in the next 2 years, for a total of 630 students when enrollment is complete. The first class will graduate in 2009. The student body is 96 percent minority.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I’m embarrassed for what’s right with America, not what’s wrong about America. This particular school is serving a population that needs our help
and assistance. We admit here day after day that we’re not funding special needs kids enough, and we are not. This is another example of how we can help this very important population.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WASHINGTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The amendment is offered by Mr. WASHINGTON of California.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Amendment No. 62 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California. At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. 62. Funds made available in this Act may be used for the Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service, City College of New York.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

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

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

Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. RANGEL provided to me yesterday a brochure here on the Center for Public Service in New York. And this has a lot of stuff in it, admittedly, it mentions many things. But there are a few things in it. I thought were troubling, because amongst the things that it says this center will have are, quote, “a well-furnished office for Congressman Rangel.” Second, “the Rangel Library to house its Rangel archives.” And it goes on to say, quote, “The Rangel archivist librarian will organize, index and preserve for posterity all documents, photographs and memorabilia relating to Congressman Rangel.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The days that we think that education is a local issue are over. As we move toward globalization, it is going to be far more important for every
Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. I tried to make it clear, and I wish I had been better at it, that if they raised $25 million, they somehow are not doing that by removing my name from the Web site.

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

Mr. RANGEL. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Adoption of that amendment does not create any legislative intent that
would require the Department of Labor to reduce funding for the migrant and seasonal farm worker program.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. Flake: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. 171. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the American Jazz Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, for exhibits, education programs, and an archival project.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The text of the amendment for “Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration” is hereby reduced by $200,000.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair.

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

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

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

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

Here is part of the problem, I think, with earmarks, particularly in this bill. We are often earmarking funds that are in programs at the agencies that are already designated to be awarded on a competitively bid process. This jazz museum, I am sure, has submitted applications. Perhaps they have won grants over the years. But maybe this year they didn't. So what earmarks typically do are circumvent the process that's been mandated to be established with these agencies.

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

I should point out that much of what we criticize the agencies for we are doing here in spades. Earmarks are, by their very definition, no-bid contracts. We are saying to people out there, if you can't get your grant through the competitively bid process, come to us anyway, and we will earmark those funds for you. So there is no concept, no discussion on this. Try as they might, I am sure the Appropriations Committee is not in a position to adequately scrub and vet all of these earmark requests. That is simply not their role and shouldn't be theirs. That is not our job. That burden on the Appropriations Committee.

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

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

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

I should say to him, however, that this Member of Congress placed all 120 requested earmarks on my Web site in March, not at the request of anyone. I did it. I am proud of my earmarks. I want everybody to see them. I don't think there is enough money going, though, to this particular project. When I was mayor of Kansas City, Missouri, we built the American Jazz Museum. It is the only museum on the planet dedicated to the preservation of America’s only art form. Jazz is the only art form created in the United States of America. We have what is called the John Baker Collection. If students at the University of Arizona want to study the industry of jazz, the art form of jazz, and they would like to see the soundies, the only place they can see the John Baker Collection, the largest collection of old black and white soundies, is the American Jazz Museum in Kansas City.

People from across this Nation, actually from across the world, come into Kansas City. The city put money into it. Of course, as a former mayor, I know that we send unfunded mandates down to the city. So the city, particularly, since I left office, reduces the funding each year. Since people are using this museum from all over this Nation, I bet there are people in Arizona, I hope they are watching, who are using the American Jazz Museum.

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

This is the place where Count Basie organized his band. This is the place where Jay McShan organized his band. Every major jazz artist in the world wanted to play 18th and Vine. Now, there is a way, I do want to be clear about, whether Kansas City or New Orleans is the Mother of Jazz. Of course, New Orleans is wrong, and I try to help them when I can. But the point here is that we need, Mr. Chairman, to have people who are going to put up earmarks to be in a position to feel good about them and to express it. So I don't see this so much as a defense, but as an opportunity to promote what I think is one of the legitimate projects for funding from the United States Congress because it serves the people of this Nation.

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

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

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

I think that, certainly, as mentioned, just about uniquely American. I can't imagine them submitting a proposal that would not be granted. It seems like a great place. It seems to be appropriate. What is at question here is,
should the Congress be doing this? That is where I am.  
Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I just want to suggest this: I don’t happen to be comfortable with the earmarking system because it is a pain in the neck to me, it takes an incredible amount of time, and I would much rather spend that time on policy. But the fact is that it is a constitutional prerogative of the Congress to do so. And if you submit it creates a much more fair system. An example, when Speaker HASTERT ran this place last decade, when I was here a long time, and even an idiot ought to be able to pick up a fair amount of information as long as I have been here.  

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

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

But I find it incredibly amazing and amusing that we are talking about 0.19 percent of all of the funds in this bill. How much time have we spent talking about basic education philosophy? How much time have we spent talking about which of these education programs really work? How much time have we spent talking about the 41 programs? The answer is zip because some people prefer to deal with small things.  

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has 1/2 minutes remaining.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO  

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.  

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.  

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio:  

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

SEC. 1. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law here-by reduced by 4.6 percent.  

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

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

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

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

I do it because we have a spending problem. We have a spending problem in this Congress and in this government, and there is going to come a day
Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, let me first of all congratulate you for yielding, and I rise today to support the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And in 6 short years, 6 short years, our Republican friends have driven this country into a deficit situation. We're
talking projected now on a 10-year basis $3 trillion or more in deficit.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Each side has 7 minutes remaining.

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

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

The Appropriations Committee talked earlier about all the new spending, and the other side has a definition for success for them is more spending. Our side actually believes the definition of success should be success. And I always look at education. I came from the general assembly in Ohio, and one of the things you focus on so much in the general assembly budget process is primary and secondary education. And if you look at what’s happened, and this is for every State, but I can just give you the numbers on Ohio.

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

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

So we define success as actually being tested, not giving more money and hoping that things are going to happen, and if they don’t, you know what we’re going to do, give them more money next time. We don’t define it that way. We say if kids are really learning, that should be success, not the fact that we’ve given them more money.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield such time as he may consume.

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

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

Instead, we say, well, you’re misspending money and so we’re going to misspend some money with earmarking. We don’t like the way you have prioritized, so we’re not going to actually look at what’s overspent and say, all right, stop spending money this way or that way. We’re just going to add to it with our own priorities.

Let me just give an example. It’s often said we don’t ever give examples of specific programs. I’ll give you one. I believe it was last year or maybe the year before GAO came out with a study saying that the DARE program was a waste of money, basically, or we weren’t getting the bang for the buck that we should. What did we do? We increased funding for it. Instead of saying, you know, maybe it’s not run as it should be, maybe we should scale back on it, force them to change it or scrap it altogether, but instead we increased funding for it. That goes on across the board. GAO studies that we often commission are always followed by, well, they must need more money. Not the money’s being misspent. They just need more of it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That creates a problem because we’re going to have 27 million more Americans in the next 10 years. We’re going to have 12 million more seniors needing health care. We’re going to have 2.7 million more kids in elementary and secondary school. We’re going to have 2.2 million more students in college. And, unless we change our ways, we’re going to have 11 million more Americans without health insurance. That’s why we don’t want to go back to last year. We want to move ahead to tackle the problems coming at us. We see them; they’re there. We ought not to stick our head in the ground like an ostrich. We ought to deal with them, and that’s what this bill does.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.
Mr. ISRAEL. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

There were a couple of things that were said in the debate that I just want to try to get a little clarity on. I served here in the late 1990s, and I recall that Republicans, as the majority party, passed a balanced budget in 1997. In 1998, we had our first balanced budget. Now, President Clinton was President at the time, but I believe I heard we produced on the other side say President Clinton left the country with a $5.6 trillion surplus. I think they’re mistaken. I think what they meant to say is President Clinton left the United States Government with a $5.6 trillion debt.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this would almost be sad if it really wasn’t so comical. I think what a lot of folks are witnessing today is some more smoke and mirrors, and the logic show that they may have seen somewhere.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN). Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. Would the gentleman from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Sure.

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I think that the Federal Government, if they want to fund K–12, it should be in block grants to the local school districts for them to be able to spend the money to the needs of their local school districts and the needs of the State. Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You do believe in Federal spending on education at the local level?

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I know. I have been here 3 years. Mr. WESTMORELAND. You are part of a fringe, somewhat of a fringe.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I don’t think I am.

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

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

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

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

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

It’s a difference in priorities. There is not a tax increase in here, and the bottom line is we make investments into the future of our country.
I find it offensive and staggering that the minority leader can come here, along with our friends, and talk about leaving the country in better shape than they found it, or that we have that obligation. Three trillion dollars in debt...$3 trillion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time. Mr. Chairman, I would argue that every dollar we let the American taxpayer keep gets earned and returned to the economy, and that’s what ultimately allows us to deal with the $3 trillion in debt.

That’s why we are offering the amendment that we bring forward.

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

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

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

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

Revenues increased by 14.5 percent in 2005, 11.6 percent in 2006, and are projected to grow an additional $167 billion, or 7 percent this year, because we let the family keep more of their money, spend it on the things they want to spend it, instead of saying to them, you know what, we are going to increase spending 4.6 percent in this bill and $20 billion in this appropriation process that we have done.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That’s why Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee supported an amendment of that, $880 million to make sure that an additional 1 million people can pay their heating oil bills.

Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee, bipartisan, there are a few who say, no, no, we should continue giving tax cuts to big company executives rather than giving people the ability, helping people with the ability to pay their home heating oil costs.

There are people in our districts who can’t figure out what to do if they get cancer, how they are going to have access to health care programs. The President wants to cut medical research at the NIH by $480 million and cut preventive health care services by $220 million. That’s why Democrats and Republicans join together on the Appropriations Committee to invest $13 billion to improve health care access and help 1 million Americans receive treatment and increase investments in NIH.

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

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would rather not talk about what one party or another did for 2 years, or what one party has done in the other year, because I think there is substantial support in both parties for the bill that we have before us today. I want to walk through what the impact of this cut would be on this bill.

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

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

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

So people have a choice. What’s more important, their own accounting sheets or the lives of these investments in the country? The fact is, with the exception of the gang of four, virtually every Republican who has offered an amendment
I believe that most Americans, and I think most Republicans, would rather invest the funds now to prepare our workforce to be better trained, our kids to be better educated, and our health care system to be more efficient and more and more humane. That is what this bill is all about, and I think that there is a bipartisan consensus in this House to stick with this bill. So I would urge respectfully rejection of the amendment, as I make one other point.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

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

Before I get to the specifics of my amendment, I want to mention, we have just heard a litany of projects that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I believe, will designate the amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the America we see, every child and their parents has access to decent health care, and their parents has access to decent health care, and their parents has access to decent

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

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California.

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

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

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

In the America we see, every child and their parents has access to decent health care, and their parents has access to decent health care, and their parents has access to decent
For our parents' generation, this vision of America's future resembles their own fondest hopes. Our parents and their parents struggled so that we could enjoy a higher quality of living, better schools, better hospitals, and a safer world than what they knew. And, by a large margin, they have been successful. We believe this to be true because America is a better, more prosperous Nation because of their struggle.

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

Fortunately, this vision of an America where our best days are still ahead of us is a bipartisan vision. It crosses every economic, political, and generational line. We all want and believe that we can bring about a more secure and more prosperous future for our children and grandchildren. And we believe we can achieve this bright tomorrow without any investment, without any sacrifice on our part. They are the “get something for nothing” crowd, the “I got mine, you get yours” crowd who do not believe America needs investment. And the future? Well, the future can take care of itself.

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

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

It is indeed fortuitous that these voices are few now and were few then, that the overwhelming bipartisan majority of committee members and American voters agree that we must increase our responsibility to our Nation's future, and that responsibility requires sound investment.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I was heartened to hear my good friend Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Chairman, let me just say I appreciate the good work of the Acting Chairman. The gentleman from New York has 9 1⁄2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 11 minutes remaining.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HENSARLING. If the American people, Madam Chairman, are watching this debate, they’ve certainly seen a lot of name calling and a lot of shouting, and now we’re having our motives questioned. I personally try to not go to the extreme myself, but some colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I’m sure their purposes are noble. But I must admit in the 4 1/2 years I’ve been here, I’ve certainly been called a lot of names, I think this afternoon’s the first time the gentleman from Garland, Texas, also in my district, refers to me as a fringe. I thought fringe had more to do with curtains. But here we are as part of the fringe, I guess, because we believe that the government shouldn’t grow faster than the people’s ability to pay for it. And somehow that’s being called a fringe opinion.

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

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

And then we hear lectures from our Democratic colleagues saying well, when you guys were in the majority you spent too much money. So Madam Chairman, their response is well, we’re going to spend even more. That logic doesn’t make sense.

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

But you know what, Madam Chairman? My friends on the other side of the aisle believe upon when this money is coming from, and so they talk about their investments on behalf of the American people. Well, Madam Chairman, maybe the American people want to make their own investments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fact: This bill eliminates 41 programs that don’t make sense any more.

Fact: This bill.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, about my investment counter. And it’s not, when the gentleman refers to me or the gentleman from New York or the chairman, you’re talking about a
They want an investment in their future with their own money. So do we. But they and the gentleman from Georgia said, seen for the average American people, global economy.

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

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

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

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

How do you help families send their kids to schools? You invest money into the Pell Grant. You cut student loan interest rates in half. And the difference is that money is not going to be fractionalized, to keep more of their own money. And so our agenda, through this bill and other bills that we have passed addressed that issue.

And I say on behalf of the fringe, the American people have not been making significant investments. And this bill will help secure a strong future for the United States of America.

And so our agenda, through this bill will help secure a strong future for the United States of America.

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

And so our agenda, through this bill and other bills that we have passed addressed that issue.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I believe that the facts are a bit different. I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Pence).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Well, Madam Chairman, it is refreshing to hear some candor on the other side in their admission that there is a fringe. And that is, in fact, a matter of fact because there was a single Republican vote against this appropriations bill in committee.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. I think I may have the gentleman’s answer to where was the fringe when the giveaways to the oil
companies and the Halliburtons were taking place; why wasn’t there an effort to cut those giveaways by 1 percent.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I would like to again simply walk us through what this cut means in specific terms. This amendment would cut $257 million from the President’s No Child Left Behind education flagship program. It would cut $144 million from title I, denying more than 40,000 students those title I services. It would cut $113 million from Special Education. It would cut $70 million from Head Start, $21 million from the Child Care Development Block Grant. It would cut $27 million from LIHEAP.

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

It would cut $97 million from the Social Security Administration. Members are clamming all over me saying, “What are we going to do to keep my local Social Security offices open?” What are we going to do to eliminate the multi-month backlog in people applying for Social Security disability?” I will tell you what they are going to do. This will add to it. It will add to the problem.

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

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

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

It is an impact on the couple in my District who called 31 dentists to try to get some help with their kid who had to have the braces taken off his teeth. They couldn’t get any of them to take them because the dentists wouldn’t take Medicaid patients. They didn’t have a local clinic. So the mother held the kid down while the father took the braces off with a pair of pliers. The father was that child’s mother’s way of being a Member of Congress. The gentleman is smiling about that. I don’t think that is anything to smile about. I met that woman.

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

Mr. OBEY. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. OBEY. I understand.

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

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

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

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

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it. Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 23 offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

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

S. 2332. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is required to be deposited or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.5 percent.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

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

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

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

And as I think about that, I’m just offering the Members of Congress yet another opportunity to do the right thing, the right thing being exercising fiscal discipline, just a modicum of fiscal discipline, 1.5 percent. So the increase in this bill would go from 4.8 to 4.3. Now, some people would...
miscalculate that as a cut. It is not a cut. It is still an increase in spending of 4.3 percent.

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

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

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

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Well, another fringe offering. Now we're down to .5 percent. The solution to America's problems is now down to .5 percent. The solution to America's problems is now down to .5 percent, less Pell Grant money so the kids can go to college, higher fuel bills in the winter for people who can't pay their fuel bills. I never saw a .5 percent reduction in funds to Halliburton. I never saw a .5 percent reduction in the $13 billion in giveaways to Big Oil companies. And this is what our friends were giving to the banks and we invested that money in the kids. The $14 billion that was going to the oil companies at the times of their highest profits is going into health care and education now and alternative energy.

As I said earlier, this is very simple. We're in a globally competitive market, and many of the investments that we've made in our kids and into our future.

Now what you're saying is, with tuition costs going up 40 percent, health insurance going up $100 a year, energy costs going up $3,200 a year, that the solution to that problem and every other problem we have in the country right now is a .5 percent cut that would put additional burdens on families who were trying to send their kids to school, who were trying to live within their means, who would reduce the money that we're making into making our citizens healthier and community health clinics so that at the end of the day would allow us to prevent people from ending up in the emergency room and costs of $400 billion and billions of dollars more.

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

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

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

As I said earlier, this is very simple. We're in a globally competitive market, and many of the investments that we've made in our kids and into our future.

Now what you're saying is, with tuition costs going up 40 percent, health insurance going up $100 a year, energy costs going up $3,200 a year, that the solution to that problem and every other problem we have in the country right now is a .5 percent cut that would put additional burdens on families who were trying to send their kids to school, who were trying to live within their means, who would reduce the money that we're making into making our citizens healthier and community health clinics so that at the end of the day would allow us to prevent people from ending up in the emergency room and costs of $400 billion and billions of dollars more.

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

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

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank the gentlewoman.

I offered an amendment, it received some bipartisan support, but nevertheless, on a largely partisan basis, that amendment was defeated. That amendment would have just restored the funding to last year's level for the only office of Federal Labor Management Standards at last year's level. There they could find the money and they would be able to conduct operations. That responsibility is to find the crooks who are stealing from union members, they found a way to impose a 4 percent cut in that office. And what a shame that is.

I offered an amendment, I received some bipartisan support, but nevertheless, on a largely partisan basis, that amendment was defeated. That amendment would have just restored the funding to last year's level for the only office of Federal Labor Management Standards at last year's level. When they came to the American people, they told them they had no tax increase in American history. And already we're starting to see the major parties have to start to pay the price for some of the budget gimmicks that have been involved in making that work.

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

I offered an amendment, it received some bipartisan support, but nevertheless, on a largely partisan basis, that amendment was defeated. That amendment would have just restored the funding to last year's level for the only office of Federal Labor Management Standards at last year's level. They could find the money and they would be able to conduct operations. That responsibility is to find the crooks who are stealing from union members, they found a way to impose a 4 percent cut in that office. And what a shame that is.

I offered an amendment, it received some bipartisan support, but nevertheless, on a largely partisan basis, that amendment was defeated. That amendment would have just restored the funding to last year's level for the only office of Federal Labor Management Standards at last year's level. When they came to the American people, they told them they had no tax increase in American history. And already we're starting to see the major parties have to start to pay the price for some of the budget gimmicks that have been involved in making that work.

Now, the Democrats, while increasing their spending, it seems like almost across the board, certainly in the Department of Labor, couldn't manage to keep the spending for the Office of Labor Management Standards at last year's level. There they could find the money and they would be able to conduct operations. That responsibility is to find the crooks who are stealing from union members, they found a way to impose a 4 percent cut in that office. And what a shame that is.
would impose an across-the-board cut in No Child Left Behind. No Child Left Behind is a Federal program that local school districts must honor. It is a huge unfunded Federal mandate. And I don’t know about the gentlewoman’s school districts, but I know that my school districts come to me all the time saying, Washington is forcing us to do these programs, but they’re not giving us the money that they promised, which means that we have to raise taxes and give less to the school districts. And so I would respectfully suggest to the gentlewoman that a .5 percent cut in this bill is a .5 percent property increase in her congressional district, because those poor school districts don’t have the ability to say yes or no to those programs. They’ve just got to provide the services and find the money for it.

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

Do you support cuts in home heating oil assistance? Are you ready to stand up here and say to your constituents, yes, I am for cutting home heating oil assistance? It’s a yes or no question, it’s not complicated. Do you support cutting home heating assistance for poor people? Yes, I support it!

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. While I’m yielding my time, I’m not surprised that I don’t get a yes or no answer. I’m not surprised that the gentlewoman is not willing to stand up and say, yes, I support cutting this because I have other priorities. Home heating oil, that’s not one of them. Large oil industry profits, that’s one of my priorities. Halliburton, that’s one of my priorities. But cutting heating oil, that’s not a priority, or cutting special ed.

Let me ask you another question: do you think the cuts in college education funding, higher education funding, can be done without cutting the number of kids who have access to college? Do you think we can cut funding from this bill for higher education funding without reducing the number of kids that can go to college?

And you say, it’s just half a percent we’re cutting from higher ed, or the increase in higher ed, or however you want to phrase it. But the cut is real that you’re proposing. So what does that mean? 25,000 more kids can’t go to college?

Is that a fair number? Well, maybe it’s too much. Should we say 10,000 more American kids can’t go to college because of your cut? Is that a fair number? Would you support that? Would you support your amendment if you knew that?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and to follow customary courtesy in the process of yielding and reclaiming time.

The gentleman may continue.

Mr. SCHIFF. Through the Chair, in my remaining time, I would ask the gentlewoman from Colorado whether she is willing to support her cuts if she knows that it will mean fewer children in Colorado can go to college.

I would be happy to yield for an answer to this question. Through the Chair, to my colleague from Colorado, if her cuts mean that fewer of her constituents in Colorado can go to college, is she still willing to propose those cuts?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman’s time has expired.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Reclaiming my time, I will be happy to yield if you will answer the question. The question is, do you support cutting home heating oil assistance? It’s a yes or no question, it’s not complicated. Do you support cutting home heating assistance for poor people? Yes, I support it!

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. As you know, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Madam Chairman, I have been enjoying hearing the debate here today. As usual, sometimes Republicans and Democrats seem to be passing each other a little bit in the night. It seems to me from hearing comments now from a number of Democratic speakers that there is an implicit assumption based on all of their arguments, and that is, hey, this is important, education is important, and this is important, and heating oil is important, and all this stuff; therefore, the government has to do it all for everybody.

I think the other assumption, and this is the assumption that I make, is that Americans are buying an awful lot more government than we can afford. That is what my constituents are telling me. That is common sense. Going back to my district, things are getting more and more expensive. We keep increasing everything that government does.

The idea is, well, you are not compassion- ate because you don’t want to add more money to government subsidies to do this and government subsidies to do that. Hey, the logical conclusion on that is the government would get 100 percent of your paycheck. I don’t think that is how we are getting government.

I have also heard people say that we are in a global economy, as though being in a global economy somehow excuses that the Federal Government should do everything for everybody. I am not buying that assumption. The reason we are competitive in a global economy is because of free enterprise. There is one thing about a safety net. But we are buying too much government.

Add insult to injury, now the Democrats have just passed the biggest tax increase in the history of the United States. They are griping about one-half of 1 percent of a cut in one little bill in discretionary income, and they are adding the average of $3,000 per household across this entire Nation. Now, it would be interesting enough if they just add $3,000. The trouble with doing that this year is, that is what you are going to get the next year and the next year after that and the next year after that. But the spending is even more.

So we are hearing an objection, and it is all couched in this, oh, don’t you want to help poor people. In fuel oil heating bills and about education and stuff. The trouble is, we are spending too much. What part of that don’t we get? So somebody offers this timid little amendment for one-half of 1 percent, and it is like the wheels are going to fall off.

I have to say in answer to the questions, look, we are just buying too
much government. We have to start somewhere. I appreciate the gentle-
woman’s amendment. She is at least starting on one piece of one bill here. While I call it a little bit of a timid amendment, I am certainly prepared to vote for it.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman. I yield myself such time as I may con-
sume.

Madam Chairman, I would yield to the gentleman if she cares to answer this: The committee report states that the committee recommends $15,027,000 for prevention grants to reduce the abuse of runaway youth. Does the gentle-
woman advocate a .5 percent reduc-
tion in a $15 million budget to prevent the abuse of runaway youth, which was supported unanimously in the com-
mittee?

Madam Chairman, I will yield to the gentle-
woman.

If the gentlewoman can’t answer, I will ask her to give us an answer to this: the committee report, unani-
mosly approved in committee, rec-
ommends $2,430,000 for community-
based child abuse prevention.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. Members are reminded to ad-
tress their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I ask the gentle-
woman whether she is ad-
vo- cating a .5 percent reduction in a $42 million line item for community-based child abuse prevention. I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman for an an-
swer.

Mr. FEENEY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mr. ISRAEL. I will yield to the gen-\t
tlewoman for an answer, since it is her amendment. I will not, at this time, yield to the gentleman.

If she were to yield to the gentle-
woman, since it is her amendment.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. If I may answer your question, first, I would like to point out that, I just realized this, up to the time I ask the gentle-
man, if he would choose to an-
swer this question.

The committee report recommends $9.5 million, out of a $2.5 trillion Fed-
eral budget, $9.5 million for the adop-
tion incentives program. I would ask, Madam Chairman, whether the gent-
leman supports a .5 percent reduction in adoption incentives.

I would also ask, Madam Chairman, this: the committee recommends a total level of funding of $141 million for the Community Based Abstinence Edu-
cation program. That is the level of funding that the committee, on an unan-
imous basis, Republicans in the main-
stream and Democrats in the main-
stream, agree on.

I will yield to the gentleman, Madam Chairman, if he can say is it the posi-
tion of the fringe that we should actu-
ally cut by .5 percent $141 million for Community Based Abstinence pro-
grams.

I will yield to the gentle-
man.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman that under his logic that $141 million proposed in here is actually a cut, because it is a cut from $150 million. It is a $9 million cut from $150 million. Why aren’t we spend-
ing $150 million?

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I re-
claim my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. You see, you only can measure from what-

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I re-
claim my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members are re-

dined to follow customary courtesy in the process of yielding and reclaim-
ing time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, may I ask how much time I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1 1/2 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I would just state at some point, two plus two has to equal four. It can’t equal what you want it to be; it has to equal four.

These are the amounts of funding that are in this bill, reported by Repub-
licans and Democrats. Every single main-
stream Republican, every conserva-
tive Republican on the Appropriations Committee, supported these numbers. The gentlewoman says, no, no, we have to shave .5 percent from these num-
bers.

I am still waiting to hear whether a single Member on that side would pub-
licly say that they want to cut adop-
tion programs, abstinence programs, runaway youth programs, child abuse programs.

I will yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN of Ohio). Madam Chairman, I hate to interrupt this beautiful debate going on, but I think it is im-
portant for us to make a point. We of-
fered our friends in the fringe an oppor-
tunity within the first 100 hours we were here to strip $14 billion from the oil companies, corporate welfare that they were getting from the United States taxpayers, and you all voted against it, or at least most of you did. We offered a chance from the oil companies. But you choose to come here now and take it out of the hide of the students and the middle-
class families who are trying to make ends meet.

That is the difference. This is a change in priorities. You had a chance for $14 billion from the oil companies. You were silent. Now you choose to do it for programs that are going to make us stronger in the long run.

So I thank the gentleman. I thank the Chair, I thank the ranking member for putting together such a great bill here, and I think we should leave it as it is and not ask the people who have had increased energy costs, a 40 per-
cent tuition increase, now to say wait a minute, we don’t want to help you with that. We want to cut that by .5 percent, too.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, since we had a rudimentary arithmetic thing here, two plus two equals four, I just want to remind my friend, Madam Chairman, that a 4.9 percent increase minus .5 percent still equals a 4.3 per-
cent increase in spending.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Florida (Mr. FEENEY).

Mr. FEENEY. I thank the gentle-
woman.

I would suggest that the real math is that this amendment would still antici-
pate a $6.5 billion increase, yet it is being called a cut.

I had to come down from my office, because I heard that if you were an ad-
vote for taxpayers, you are now part of the fringe of this Congress. If you are an advocate for fiscal responsi-
bility, suddenly you are part of the fringe. Sadly, I would have to acknowl-
edge, if you care about fiscal responsi-
bility and taxpayers in this Congress, you are becoming part of the fringe.

I believe the budget expenditures by 4.3 percent is somehow going to lead to the end of civilization and the death of all of the children out there and throwing people out of hospital beds.

I would remind all of my colleagues, we have a 10th amendment in this coun-
try. Over the years, we now have a $150 billion-plus annual budget to deal with things like labor, health care and edu-
cation. It isn’t a question of whether we are going to spend money in America on health care and edu-
cation. It is a question of who does the spending and who gets to control it.
I would ask every American, as the Federal budget has skyrocketed and we have taken control and micromanaged their health care and education, has public education gotten cheaper? Has it gotten better? Has America's health care system, when we spend so much money on health care, gotten cheaper and gotten better?

Winston Churchill once famously said, there is nothing one government learns so readily from the last as how to spend other people's money, i.e., the taxpayers.

Sadly, this new majority did not learn the lesson that some of us learned in the last several Congresses: We are spending too much, we are abusing American taxpayers, and the notion is that if you care for children, if you care for people that need health care, you have to confiscate as much money out there from taxpayers and working people as possible and you have to micromanage the way it gets spent on their behalf.

The bureaucrats are happy. The regulators are happy. The politicians in Washington are fat and happy. But the American taxpayer and the people that need real education services and need choices in health care are not happy.

With that, on behalf of the fringe that cares about taxpayers in this Congress, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, as I hear the comments from my friends on the other side of the aisle, I would almost remember when my children were small and they actually believed in Santa Claus. They thought that whatever they wanted, they could have. We had to learn some lessons. They had a wish-list, and then we had to live within our means.

When I think of the good things, and, by the way, I am very happy to hear that my friend on the other side of the aisle supports abstinence education, when you spend $600 billion in these areas, there is a finite amount of money. When you are promoting government programs, you are reaching into the pocket of the taxpayer. That is the only place we get our money, from the American taxpayer. And as we think about the largest tax increase in history, I think we ought to realize this burden, and I just picture this enormous burden on our children and our grandchildren that we are leaving.

In the meantime, we can be proud of our spending, because we are spending for very noble things, and there are very many noble things in this bill.

But there were those of us who were budget hawks then that said our party not only should cut taxes but should restrain spending. We were saying that and we are saying it now as we see the majority party going down the road at an even more rapid pace, spending more money, including that enormous burden on our children and grandchildren.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I will make the same observation as I made last night. What we have going on here, in my judgment, is Operation Diversion. You have a bunch of people in this House who are perfectly comfortable with the fact that the tax policy that they have voted for will deliver $57 billion in tax cuts this year to people who make over a million dollars a year. That is five times as much money as the increase that we have in this bill about the President’s request.

And you have people who have voted for the war in Iraq, which has spent $500 billion in a case of mistaken identity as they mistook the stocky guy with the mustache, Saddam Hussein, for the tall guy with the beard, Osama bin Laden, and that mistake has cost us $600 billion when you take into account the President’s newest request. That is 60 times as much as the addition we have above the President’s budget for these programs.

They voted for all of that, and now they want to scramble away from the deficits and the debt that that has produced. And they try to divert the attention of the public and say, oh, the deficit is not that bad. The real mess is the fact that these crazy Democrats are trying to put more money into education and more money into health care and more money into job training.

Well, I plead guilty. We are trying to do these things, we do believe that these are investments. We think that kids are better off if you put more money into education than if you take it away. And we think society is better off economically and morally if we do more to help people who need health care more than less.

Now this amendment would cut the following amounts from the bill: It would cut $128 million from this bill for No Child Left Behind. It would cut $7.5 million from IDEA. Republicans and Democrats alike have spent the last 2 days trying to increase funds for IDEA; now they want to cut it back by $56 million.

They want to cut from this bill $78 million for Pell Grants, despite the fact that college costs have exploded. They want to cut $48 million from this bill for the Social Security Administration.

They want to cut $69 million from this bill out of programs that we have here to try to discourage women from having abortions. Now if they want to vote for that, be my guest. We don’t happen to think, and I think there are significant numbers of our friends on the other side of the aisle who didn’t happen to think that is a good idea.

We do have to make choices, and the basic choices here are do we want to defend the 2 percent increase in these programs above the President’s level, because that is what it is, it is a 2 percent difference. And if you don’t believe my definition, then take a look at CQ and National Journal because that is the way they define it.

Do you want to put 2 percent more into the health and education of the country, into the training of our workforce, or do you instead want to use it for additional money in Iraq and additional money for tax cuts for the most wealthy people in this country, most of whom would gladly see a reduction in their take if we could improve the quality of our workforce and the quality of our education and the quality of our law enforcement?

I plead fully guilty to agreeing with them, and I would ask for a “no” vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE). The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. Campbell of California:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section: Sec. 1. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.25 percent.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, first of all, I am happy to stand up here and identify myself with, as the majority party says, “the fringe.” You know, you may have noticed recently that the approval ratings for this Congress are not
very good. In fact, I think the latest I saw was that only 17 percent of Americans believe that this Congress is doing a good or a fair job. So I guess that being on the fringe of this Congress is meaning that we agree and associate ourselves to keep their own budget to spend on what they want. And they believe, Madam Chairman, even if the other side doesn’t. Americans believe, and they are right, that government wastes some of their tax money. And what this proposed amendment does is it would increase spending on this bill by 4.6 percent instead of 4.8 percent. It is a reduction over what is proposed by a quarter of a percent. A quarter of a percent. It still provides an increase of $8.8 billion over last year.

So under this amendment if there is a government program that is scheduled to get a million dollars, it would instead have to struggle through on $997,500.

Madam Chairman, I would ask you, I understand that it appears that the Members of the majority party believe that life as we know it will end if that budget is cut from $12.5 million, as I mentioned to you before, is a cut from $12.5 million. So the question I would ask you back is, well, why is it not $12.5 million?

Mr. ISRAEL. I reclaim my time. The gentleman has argued that a cut’s really not a cut because the rate of spending is increasing. The rate of spending does not increase in this program, Madam Chairman. It is the same spending as last year, which means that the gentleman’s cut is an actual, concrete, documented reduction in Abandoned Infants Assistance from last year.

Madam Chairman, I would go on to another program and through the Chair ask the gentleman if he would like to, since he was unable to give me a yes or no answer on the last example, I will provide another one.

Madam Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman if he would like. Is the gentleman advocating an actual cut in community-based child abuse prevention? Because the funding for community-based child abuse prevention is not increased in this budget, not by a penny, and so the gentleman’s cut actually reduces it below last year’s level.

Madam Chairman, does the gentleman advocate to his constituents a cut in community-based child abuse prevention? And I would yield to the gentleman if he desires to respond.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Thank you for yielding. You know, the question before us is this: Now, is it not 100 percent of those programs that cut was the case, you could take every program and through the Chair ask the gentleman if he would like to, since he was unable to give me a yes or no answer on the last example, I will provide another one.

Madam Chairman, I would ask the gentleman through the Chair whether he is standing on this floor advocating an actual cut in the Abandoned Infant Assistance Program match.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Thank you. You know, the question before us is this: Now, is it not 100 percent of those programs that cut was the case, you could take every program and through the Chair ask the gentleman if he would like to, since he was unable to give me a yes or no answer on the last example, I will provide another one.

Madam Chairman, I would ask the gentleman through the Chair whether he is standing on this floor advocating an actual cut in the Abandoned Infant Assistance Program match.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Thank you. You know, the question before us is this: Now, is it not 100 percent of those programs that cut was the case, you could take every program and through the Chair ask the gentleman if he would like to, since he was unable to give me a yes or no answer on the last example, I will provide another one.
Mr. ISRAEL. Reclaiming my time, I’m suggesting that it was more than a quarter percent when it came to a $13 billion tax cut for the biggest oil company executives on Earth, and it was more than a quarter percent cut when it came to fraudulent payments to Halliburton.

But when it comes to runaway youth, domestic violence, law and order, abandoned infants, anti-gang programs, I would rather that the money go to those investments rather than to special interests.

So I would ask, again, to the gentleman through the Chair, is the gentleman advocating a cut in adoption opportunities because the adoption opportunities program, Madam Chairman, is funded without an increase at the same level as last year. Would the gentleman agree, Madam Chairman, that the cut that he proposes means an actual cut in the program for adoption opportunities from last year’s level? At least I think that two plus two equals four or four minus two equals two. Can we at least agree on that, Madam Chairman?

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I guess that you have proposed a cut in that program if it’s already below where it was. So I guess you had proposed a cut in that program. So I would ask you, I guess, if you cut that program, you must have some reason that you believe that it should be cut.

Mr. ISRAEL. I reclaim my time one more time, and then I will reserve the balance of my time. The gentleman has offered an amendment to actually cut programs. We have listed, Madam Chairman, a variety of programs that didn’t receive one penny of increase in this budget, in this appropriation. The gentleman has offered an amendment to actually cut programs.

And I’m not asking the gentleman specifically this question, but I’m asking myself this question: why is that? Why is that that the Infants Assistance could be funded at last year’s level and somehow that’s appropriate? Is it less important than it was last year? Is it less important than the many unauthorized things that this bill funds? Why is it that we’re not doing more, as the past Congress always tried to do more, in IDEA? Why is it that NIH, in the debate we heard yesterday, the National Institutes of Health, didn’t deserve the funding that the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee found a funding source for for that to be raised? Why is it, if inflation is a factor, that we don’t care at least at an inflationary level about Abandoned Infants Assistance? Why don’t we care at least at an inflationary level about community-based child abuse prevention?

The gentleman from California is saying the level was being held right at quarter of 1 percent, one-quarter of 1 percent, a growth of still almost $7 billion, but instead, we’re funding the unauthorized Full Service Schools Act. Now, why are we funding the unauthorized Full Service Schools Act, but we’re not making cuts to the adoption opportunities at at least last year’s level? I’m amazed by what I’ve heard here on the floor.

Why is it we’re funding the unauthorized sexual education program? Why is it that grants to local education that could be funded at $25 billion, because that’s what the Congress in the past says we could allow, are only funded at $15 billion or so?

Part of the problem here is, once again, we’re authorizing on an appropriations bill. We’re trying to come up with new programs instead of fulfill the promise of the last programs. IDEA took major growth in funding in the last 10 years, but we haven’t sustained that level in this bill because we’re trying to fund new things.

And I just close by saying that every American knows that $7 billion is an increase and 4.9 percent is an increase, as was 4.3, as is 4.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I’m pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California, a member of the committee, Mr. SCHIFF.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to address some of the arguments.

I wanted to say my friends on the other side of the aisle, in fact, my friends on the other side of the aisle in committee, the Republican Members, uniformly supported this bill and support this bill. So I have to say that I address these remarks to a minority of the minority, the self-applied fringe that we’ve been describing or talking to today.

The beginning of their argument was, well, we want across-the-board cuts, we don’t really want to have to identify what we’re cutting. That’s a little hard to sell back home, so we’re going to do across-the-board cuts. That’s a little more palatable. We said, well, let’s look at where we’re cutting, and then the argument was, okay, they’re not cuts. They’re reductions in the increase.

So then we point out, well, actually you’re giving the impression that everything’s being increased. Everything is not being increased. Many things are being kept flat. So aren’t we really cutting those things that are flat in the budget? And my friends in the minority of the minority said, yes, I guess that’s right. I guess we are really making real cuts with these across-the-board proposals, but let’s not really look at what we’re cutting. That’s not very attractive.

And my friend says, okay, so if we’re making real cuts, could we make the end of the world if we’re making real cuts? Well, I guess it depends on who you ask.

One of the things we’re making a real cut to is the bone marrow program. Is the end of the world if we make a real cut, in real dollar terms, to the bone marrow program? Well, it may not be to any of us at this moment, but for some child out there, it just may be the end of the world. For some parent of that child, who’s watching their child suffer with cancer, the inability to get a bone marrow transplant and the failure of research into bone marrow
transplants, it just might be the end of the world for that parent as well as that child.

What are the things that my friend would make real cuts to? He would make real cuts to scholarships for disadvantaged students. He would make real cuts for education. Does my friend think we have more nurses than we need? He would make real cuts for emergency medical services for children. Again, is that the end of the world? Well, for one child it just might be.

He would make real cuts for organ transplantation, real cuts for the National Cord Blood Inventory. Is that the end of the world? Well, for some child, maybe not our children, it just might be.

We would make real cuts, under the gentleman’s amendment, to children’s mental health. Is that the end of the world? Well, for a child who ends up taking their own life, it just might be the end of the world.

It sounds a lot more palatable when we say, well, it’s a 1 percent cut or it’s a half percent cut. Is that the end of the world? Well, for one child it just may be.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time each side, I suppose, has remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes. The gentleman from New York has 6 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, you know, this is so interesting listening to this fiscal debate and talking about are we the fringe. Well, let me tell you, FRINGE is a great acronym, and let me tell you what FRINGE is a great acronym for.

And I think it is very appropriate for those of us on our side of the aisle because fringe means this: Fiscal responsibility includes no government excess. Fiscal responsibility includes no government excess. Now, Madam Chairman, that is what the people tell us they want. Get this fiscal house in order.

That is what they want. They don’t want you to spend more. They want you to spend less. Government does not have a revenue problem. Government has a spending problem. All of this about across-the-board cuts don’t work.

If I may tell you why across-the-board cuts do work, the reason is this. You have the opportunity within a department to decide where you would like to reduce. I would recommend, as with many of our States, you go in and you make those reductions out of the bureaucracy, not our education. Does my friend think we have more nurses than we need? He would make real cuts for emergency medical services for children. Again, is that the end of the world? Well, for one child it just might be.

He would make real cuts for organ transplantation, real cuts for the National Cord Blood Inventory. Is that the end of the world? Well, for some child, maybe not our children, it just might be.

We would make real cuts, under the gentleman’s amendment, to children’s mental health. Is that the end of the world? Well, for a child who ends up taking their own life, it just might be the end of the world.

It sounds a lot more palatable when we say, well, it’s a 1 percent cut or it’s a half percent cut. Is that the end of the world? Well, for one child it just may be.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time each side, I suppose, has remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes. The gentleman from New York has 6 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, you know, this is so interesting listening to this fiscal debate and talking about are we the fringe. Well, let me tell you, FRINGE is a great acronym, and let me tell you what FRINGE is a great acronym for.

And I think it is very appropriate for those of us on our side of the aisle because fringe means this: Fiscal responsibility includes no government excess. Fiscal responsibility includes no government excess. Now, Madam Chairman, that is what the people tell us they want. Get this fiscal house in order.

That is what they want. They don’t want you to spend more. They want you to spend less. Government does not have a revenue problem. Government has a spending problem. All of this about across-the-board cuts don’t work.

If I may tell you why across-the-board cuts do work, the reason is this. You have the opportunity within a department to decide where you would like to reduce. I would recommend, as with many of our States, you go in and you make those reductions out of the bureaucracy, not our education. Does my friend think we have more nurses than we need? He would make real cuts for emergency medical services for children. Again, is that the end of the world? Well, for one child it just might be.

He would make real cuts for organ transplantation, real cuts for the National Cord Blood Inventory. Is that the end of the world? Well, for some child, maybe not our children, it just might be.
child in daycare.” When you increase taxes, you are going to wipe out the hope of the first college graduate in the family. To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that is the budget they are cutting. They are cutting the Flores family budget. They are cutting their own children.

They are cutting the education program of the Mouton-Tedder family in Chandler, this largest tax increase in history, that they are imposing on the American people. They write in, “If I have to pay taxes, then I can’t afford to go to school.” Once again, Democrats cutting education budgets for families in America.

They are cutting the health budget as well. I heard from the Winters family in Tennessee Colony. “Please do what you can to stop the wasteful spending. I am retired and disabled. I am raising my three grandchildren and one great grandchild. I sometimes can’t afford my own medicine.”

Those that are being cut here are the Democrats cutting the health budgets and the education budgets of the American family. It ought to stop.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, may I ask how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2½ minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. Udall).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Chairman, we have an interesting contrast here. We have these self-described fringe legislators that are here on the floor speaking up. You might call them extremists or radicals, whatever.

But we also, in comparison to that, we have an incredible bipartisan process that has been going on this. This subcommittee met for many, many hours, the Labor-H Subcommittee chaired by our wonderful chairman, Chairman O’Neill and Ranking Member Walsh, met for many hours and came up with a bipartisan bill.

Then that bill was presented to 66 Members of this House in a full appropriations hearing, and it was approved. Not a single Member of the 66 Members voted against that bill. They all approved it, sent it on to the floor. You have this marvelous work product that Members have put many, many hours into, and they have labored over. They were all laboring over education, health care, and worker protection. That is really the thrust of what we are doing here today.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. How much time do I have remaining, Madam Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1 minute.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, I stand here as a member of this fringe that is happy to associate with the 83 percent of Americans who think this Congress is doing a poor job.

We have got a lot of talk about cuts, but there is one thing that’s clear. There is an increase in this bill as written. There is an increase of $6.6 billion in the deficit over what there would be if this bill held spending flat. That is an increase in raiding the Social Security surplus, and that will lead to the making of hard decisions that our side is currently proposing both in your budget and in other bills floating around in both this Chamber and the other.

Those are increases there. This bill will not stop those increases, but just a little bit of a tick, a little over one percent, it will help to slow the growth.

I would ask for everyone’s support on this bill.

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, we have heard in this debate that the other side is not really cutting programs, they are cutting the rate of growth of programs. But we provided $1.47 billion was spent to get no increase in this budget, that in fact will be cut from last year’s. So the fact of the matter is that these cuts are real, and these cuts hurt families.

Now, this is how we get choices, and it goes back to this. Not a single member of this fringe group who disagrees with their own Republican caucus that supported this bill in the Appropriations Committee came to this floor to argue for a 2 percent cut, a 1 percent cut, or a 5 percent cut. If it came time to give $13 billion to the big oil companies, then there was plenty of money to go around.

But now the argument is we can’t afford to give people who want to send their kids to college an increase in Pell Grants. Not a single amendment was offered by this fringe group when it was time to provide Halliburton with dollar after dollar after dollar so that $1.47 billion was spent to get no increase and excessive. I didn’t hear a single one of this fringe group come to the floor and argue for cuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman’s time has expired.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, it is sometimes amazing to me just how small some congressional debates can be. We have heard a lot of bloviating on this floor today about whether something is a cut and whether it isn’t a cut. We have had a boy scout debate about dictionary terms.

But the real question to ask about this bill is simply to ask, is it adequate to the needs of the country? Do we really need to simply continue the status quo to the last year’s level, or do we need to recognize that there is more than one deficit in the country? Do we really think that we can afford to continue to avoid dealing with the deficit in educational quality, the deficit in health care access, the deficit in worker training?

Do we really think that we can avoid, or that we can afford to avoid investing to increase the number of quality teachers in this country? Do we think that we need to do more or not to help millions of kids who need a better deal in special education? Do we need to do more than we are doing now to help millions who lose their life’s work because of the forces of globalization?

Are we comfortable continuing to see the number of research grants for cancer, for heart disease, for Parkinson’s disease continue to decline, or do we think that we ought to make an investment, a collective societal investment, so that we can do more to attack those diseases?

Those are values questions. That is what we have to decide here today. This amendment is largely symbolic. It gives people a chance on both sides to talk to some more, as though we hadn’t, God help us, talked enough already.

But we are now roughly at the point where we will have to decide what our priorities are.
Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 67 offered by Mr. PENCE:

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

Sec. 1. None of the funds made available under the Public Health Services Act shall be available to Planned Parenthood for any purpose under title X of the Public Health Services Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

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

Mr. PENCE. Allow me to say there are many good things happening in federally funded Family Planning clinics nationwide. 9 million Americans served; 90 percent of whom are low income; 900,000 unintended pregnancies were averted by title X family planning funding; and it is reassuring that abortion education is required for all clients. But today, I am offering an amendment that is very simple.

The Pence amendment states that no funds under title X may be granted to Planned Parenthood. Planned Parenthood is the largest recipient of title X funding, and it is the largest abortion provider in America. Last year alone, Planned Parenthood's own annual report states that it received more than one-third of its $1 billion budget from government contracts and grants. And, again, according to their annual report, Planned Parenthood performed more than one quarter of a million abortions.

Millions of pro-life Americans should not be asked to fund the leading abortion provider in the United States. Now, let me stipulate, I know that title X funds may not be used for abortion. And my amendment does not cut or reduce the budget for family planning in this appropriation bill; it simply prevents appropriated funds from reaching an organization that profits from the abortion trade.

It is time the American people stop funding the Nation's largest abortion provider, and I urge support for the Pence amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin such time as he may require.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I really wish that the gentleman had not offered this amendment, and let me be very frank. I spent most of the last 6 months trying to convince Democrats, primarily liberals, who are now in control of the House, not to try to use their new majority to change any language in this bill that had anything to do with abortion or family planning. I have asked the gentleman to provide bipartisan support for this bill, to recognize other people's values as well as their own. I have asked them, therefore, to leave alone the six abortion-related or family planning provisions which are in the law which many on this side of the aisle oppose and some on the other side of the aisle oppose.

I have asked them to leave alone the Hyde amendment; I have asked them to leave alone Dr. Weldon's amendment. And I had some real fights on this side of the aisle about that, not just with people in my caucus, but with a lot of outside groups. A lot of like-minded, yet it is a waste of time.

And what it does, at the last minute, is to blow up a consensus which we have tried to build over the last 3 days that we all ought to be willing to live under the same laws that we were living under when the Republicans were controlling this House and when they passed the legislation that I am now defending. So I would simply ask the gentleman, in the interest of our being able to work together on these issues, to withdraw his amendment.

He doesn't like Planned Parenthood. I don't care whether Planned Parenthood gets money or not. What I do care about is that the women who are served by Planned Parenthood get the services to which they are entitled under the Constitution. And so I would ask the gentleman, in the interest of the bipartisan neutrality that we have tried to build over the past 2 months, to consider withdrawing the amendment, and I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, with acknowledgement of the gracious remarks of the chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Pence amendment.

Planned Parenthood claims to work to reduce abortions, but happens to be the number one abortion provider in this country. This raises an obvious question: Why are taxpayer dollars being used to subsidize the largest abortion supplier in the United States? Planned Parenthood receive funding in the name of their family planning services; however, there are many clinics in which family planning and abortion services are co-located in the same building, share a common set of basic resources, out one door and into the other.

Abortion services generate more net revenue when clinics can rely on Federal dollars to pay for lighting, heating, building maintenance, and even rent. Planned Parenthood receives a record breaking $305 million in taxpayer funding, and they made record profits last year. And what did they do with those record profits last year? Planned Parenthood performed 265,000 abortions, the most abortions in a year.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this Federal backdoor subsidy of Planned Parenthood, the world's largest abortion provider, and support the Pence amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Title X of the Public Health Services Act reaches our most vulnerable populations—primarily poor, minority, and rural; and is a primary source of reproductive health services for low-income women, lowering the rate of unintended pregnancies, reducing the need for abortion, and decreasing infant mortality and morbidity. It is good public policy. For many women, Planned Parenthood is their only source of health care. In some States like Wisconsin, Utah, and my own Connecticut, Planned Parenthood is the only title X provider. It sees 65,000 patients a year in Connecticut alone. It would devastate our public health infrastructure in our State.

This amendment would be devastating, especially for the thousands of women whose sole source of medical care are these clinics. This amendment plainly discriminates against the uninsured, leaving the most vulnerable in our society in the most helpless situation. If we truly do value, if we value, as we say we do, women's health, we cannot sabotage the X, we cannot strip Planned Parenthood of funding, and we cannot pass this amendment.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I want to respond substantively to the gracious comments of the chairman whose work on this legislation I acknowledge heartily. But as to the issue of protecting all the values that the Republican majority advanced, I would hasten to remind that in the Foreign Operations bill we did great violence to the bipartisan policy. That change came. We must end the practice of funding Planned Parenthood.
I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, I would remind one of the previous speakers that there are no title X cuts in this amendment. What this amendment does is to state that Planned Parenthood cannot receive those funds. Planned Parenthood in 2005 did perform 260,000 abortions. That is something that we know. I think it is also important for us to note that it was Planned Parenthood who was the plaintiff in the legal challenge against the partial birth abortion ban legislation that is now the law of the land.

This is the right move. I commend the gentleman from Indiana for bringing the amendment forward and for bringing to our attention the need to make certain that taxpayer dollars are not used in abortion clinics around this Nation.

Mr. PENCE. Might I ask how much time I have remaining, Madam Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1% minutes.

Mr. PENCE. I yield 50 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Madam Chairman, there is one thing regardless of where you happen to be a Congressman. Every single one of us has something in common if you are from Congress, and that is that we have people in our districts, some who call themselves pro-life and others who call themselves pro-choice, and many of them are deeply convicted of their views on this issue.

Now, the question before us today is, is it reasonable to force people who really do believe that abortion is killing children, is it reasonable to force them to pay money to subsidize that killing? Is that respectful to do that? Planned Parenthood is the biggest abortion provider in America. Is it reasonable to compel some of our constituents who believe that this is killing to take part in that?

Mr. PENCE. It is my pleasure to yield 50 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona, the eloquent Mr. FRANKS.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Chairman, abortion on demand in America is the greatest single cause of death in our Nation's history. We have killed nearly 50 million of our own unborn children since the criminal Roe vs. Wade decision in 1973. That is 15,000 times the number of lives lost in the 9/11 terrorist attack.

Planned Parenthood is the foremost proponent of abortion on demand for any reason or no reason. In the last fiscal year, this government appropriated more than $300 million to this death dealing organization.

Madam Chairman, it has been said that a government is what it spends. For $300 million, we would have aborted one penny of the taxpayers' money to an organization that kills unborn children and emotionally impoverishes their mothers is a disgrace that undermines the core essence of the United States of America and betrays everything that our soldiers lying out in Arlington National Cemetery died to preserve.

An, Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to find the courage to vote for the Pence amendment.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, the issue here is not Planned Parenthood. The issue is whether women have a right to have full access to family planning. State health departments run 57 percent of the clinics that receive Title X funds. Planned Parenthood affiliates operate 14 percent of Title X supported clinics. Hospitals and family planning clinics and other non-profits make up the rest of the Title X clinic system.

Under the law, none of these funds can be spent for abortion. But Planned Parenthood clinics use their Title X funding to provide family planning and health services to millions of women, and, like those of Medicaid women who would be hurt today by this action, not Planned Parenthood.

I would urge a vote against the amendment. It seeks to me that we ought to be content to live under the same arrangements that we were content to live under when the Republican Congresses were writing the law.

It seems to me that we need to be finding ways to avoid dividing the Congress and dividing the country because of our ideologies.

This amendment has nothing to do with abortion. It has everything to do with whether or not we are trying to find common ground on this cluster of issues, and whether or not women are going to be allowed to get the services they need in areas where the only services available to them come from the organization in question.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I would like to just say, I have voted for the ban on partial birth abortion. I consider myself a pro-life Democrat.

But I will say that this amendment will increase the number of abortions that are performed. Fifty percent of abortions are performed on women who live within 200 percent of poverty. If they don't have access to prevention, they will end up getting an abortion.

I believe that if we truly want to prevent abortion from happening in the United States of America, we have an obligation, a moral obligation, to fund programs like this and prevent unintended pregnancies. Those are the poor women who end up going to abortion clinics and having abortions.

Let's prevent the number of abortions from increasing by rejecting this amendment. And the more money we spend on prevention, that will mean we will continue to reduce the number of abortions.

And I want to thank the gentleman for working on this with us.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, this amendment is not related to abortion. This amendment is a frontal assault on family planning. Make no mistake about it. Whether you are pro-life or whether you are pro-choice or anything in between, you ought to be pro-family planning. And this amendment negates that. I would urge defeat of the amendment.

If I have any time left, I would yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and associate myself with the remarks and the eloquent statement of Chairman OBEY and my colleagues.

And I speak from the perspective of a nurse who worked for many years with women and their families in the community I'm from. Title X is our Nation's primary program to provide family planning services. According to the Guttmacher Institute, Title X has been so successful that for every public dollar invested in family planning, $3 are saved in Medicaid separately for pregnancy and newborn care.

In hundreds of communities across this country, the nonprofit Planned Parenthood is the major implementer of precisely the reproductive health care necessary to carry out effective family planning and to reduce unintended pregnancies. And they are contributing, these nonprofit organizations, to the successful implementation of Title X services.

So I urge my colleagues to stand for family values and to vote against this amendment so that you can protect your constituents' access to proven, effective family planning services which have as their goal to reduce unintended pregnancies.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Thank the Chair for yielding, and at this time I would yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Pence amendment as strongly as I can advocate. The Title X program provides comprehensive family planning services, as well as a wide range of other preventative health care services, including breast exams and instruction on breast self-examination, pap tests for early detection of cervical cancer or pre-cancerous conditions, testing for high blood pressure, screening and appropriate treatment for sexually transmitted infections, HIV screening, counseling or adoption, foster care and pregnancy termination referrals to specialized health care.
Pursuant to Federal statute, no Title X funds may be spent on abortions.

The question was raised, is it reasonable to ask us, members of Congress, to fund abortions when we find abortions so abhorrent? But that’s not the question before us.

The question before us is, is it reasonable to deprive women of reproductive information and services to prevent unintended pregnancies, and therefore, every child? Or is it the question of whether or not to have an abortion? And the answer is no.

This is about family planning. Planned Parenthood is the nation’s leading reproductive health care provider. For over 90 years Planned Parenthood has provided low-income, uninsured and underserved women with vital reproductive health care services they need.

I’ll conclude by pointing out Planned Parenthood operates health care centers in every State in the Nation, serving over 5 million, men, women and teens and their communities each year.

The services Planned Parenthood provides are needed, and to deprive them of this funding, I think, would be a colossal mistake.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, at this time I would yield such time as he may consume to the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. I thank my colleague from New York for his extraordinary courtesy. And let me say, I regret that this debate will only take 15 minutes. It is a serious matter, and I think the dignity with which it’s been conducted thus far is evidence of the capacity of this Congress to discuss even the most contentious issues of our time in a manner that reflects civility and forbearance on the institution.

Now, that being said, let me clear up a few points. This is not, as the chairman said, “a frontal assault on family planning.” There are no cuts in Title X in the amendment. The Pence amendment states plainly that no funds under Title X may be granted to Planned Parenthood.

Planned Parenthood is the largest recipient of Title X funding, and it’s also the largest abortion provider in America.

And as to whether we are living under the same arrangements, as the chairman said, and I respectfully quote, “same arrangements under a Republican President.” It seems to me a short time ago we saw this major- ity overturn much of the decades long Mexico City policy that prevented Federal dollars from going to organizations overseas that provide abortion for fee.

I think this Nation needs a domestic Mexico City policy. And frankly, if the common ground that this Congress has reached means tens of millions of Federal tax dollars going to the largest abortion provider in America, that is not a common ground I can accept.

Say “no” to Federal funds for Planned Parenthood in Title X. Say “yes” to family planning funding through Title X. Say “yes” to the Pence amendment.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Chairman, I oppose this amendment, which is nothing less than an attack on the nation’s most trust- ed reproductive health care provider. The Amendment would single out Planned Parenthood for exclusion from the Title X program, at odds with the principles repeatedly articulated by the United States Supre- me Court.

Planned Parenthood is the nation’s leading reproductive health care provider. The vast majority of services that Planned Parenthood provides are services to prevent unintended pregnancies, and test and treat for sexually transmitted infections, as well as breast and cervical cancer screening.

The vast majority of Planned Parenthood patients have incomes at or below 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level, women who are four times more likely to face an unintended pregnancy. For many women, and es- pecially those in rural areas and underserved communities, Planned Parenthood is their only source of health care. Title X helps 575 Planned Parenthood clinics to provide over 3 million women with family planning services each year.

Madam Chairman, if we are to reduce the number of abortions in this country, as Mr. PENCE clearly desires, we must get serious about prevention. Each year publicly funded contraceptive services help women prevent 1.3 million unintended pregnancies, which would otherwise result in 533,800 births, 632,300 abortions and 165,000 Medicaid births.

In the absence of publicly funded family planning, the number of abortions each year in the United States would be 40 percent higher than it currently is. In fact, from 1980 to 2000, Tide X clinics helped women prevent nearly 20 mil- lion unintended pregnancies, nine million of which would have ended in abortion. By re- stricting Title X, Mr. PENCE’s amendment would likely increase the number of abortions, particularly among our teenagers.

We should oppose Mr. PENCE’s amendment because it is judged by the grim fact that the quality of life of low-income women in this country, but moreover, we should oppose it because it does not make good public health sense. Gut- ting funding for family planning will never bring us towards a day with fewer abortions, it will only increase the devastating costs imposed on society by unintended pregnancies among young women and teenaged girls.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chairman, the activi- ties of Planned Parenthood are a concern for many of us. In Alabama, there was an unsuccess- ful attempt to close a Planned Parenthood clinic, and the baby was born with severe injuries including a hole in her heart. Planned Parent- hood has always been a glaring exception to the inhuman attack on the quality of life of low-income women in this country, but moreover, we should oppose it because it does not make good public health sense.

Funding for family planning will never bring us towards a day with fewer abortions, it will only increase the devastating costs imposed on society by unintended pregnancies among young women and teenaged girls.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Chairman, I urge support for the Pence Amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chairman, I am dismayed that this Congress, including Members of my own party, has once again decided to use Federal funds for the abortion industry and cripple the economic lifeline to hundreds of small communities throughout rural Alaska.

When health crises arise, options are often extremely limited in rural Alaska. Health issues or emergencies that require hospital care often involve costly air transportation that can take as much time and money as a flight from New York to Los Angeles, if weather permits. For local health care, the typical rural community health facility is aging, small and inadequate to provide necessary services. In one of its earliest decisions, the Denali Commission des- ignated rural health care as a top priority for Commission support and is continuing its work to provide safe and affordable infrastructure which will improve health care delivery for rural Alaskans.

Through its health care program, and in partnership with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and Alaska health providers, the Commission is working to ad- dress the infrastructure needs of communities statewide to ensure all Alaskans receive safe and reliable health care.

In 1999, the Commission was granted au- thority by Congress to address rural Alaska health care issues. This authority authorized the Denali Commission to plan, construct and equip health, nutrition and child care projects across the state. Potential projects include rural hospital, health care facilities including drug and alcohol treatment centers. In 2001, the Commission identified rural primary care facility needs in more than 288 rural communities, and esti- mated the cost of needed rural primary care facilities to be $253 million.

Since then, more than 200 communities have sought assistance from the Denali Com- mission. And in addition to constructing sev- eral essential village primary care clinics, the Denali Commission has funded major design initiatives for needed replacement hospitals in Nome and Barrow. It has now completed clinics in over 65 of these remote communities.

Now, in 2007, Congress is telling the Com- mission that they no longer see a need for the Denali Commission. They are looking to cut $39 million when the real need in my State is several times that amount. Have the health care problems in rural Alaska been miracu- lously fixed overnight? Have any Members of the House visited Alaska and seen firsthand that rural health care is no longer an issue for Alaskans? The answer to both is a resounding “No.”
and the future security of our country depend on our investment in health, education, and insuring that the needs of our workforce are addressed. H.R. 3043, as drafted, includes increased funding for many programs important to our state and local education, health, and labor programs.

The bill addresses increases in funding at all education levels from early childhood to higher education. Although most of these increases are still below FY 2005 levels, it is the beginning of reversing the decline in Federal funding which has not been compatible with increasing costs related to NCLB (which imposed new and stronger mandates on our State and local education agencies). H.R. 3043 provides for $1.6 billion over last year’s level to fund NCLB programs, especially for Title I programs to help poor children. The bill also provides for increased funding for Head Start centers, as well as special education grants that benefit 6.9 million children with disabilities.

I would like to extend my support to the Gwen Moore—Tom Cole-Bobby Scott-Carol Shea-Pleasant that will put an end to the harmful Upward Bound (UB) evaluation that is being conducted by the Department of Education. The Upward Bound program has been threatened both financially and administratively and I am hopeful that my colleagues will remain firm in their positions that threaten to eliminate this long-standing program. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment that would eliminate the Absolute Priority program, which is an evaluation tool used by the Administration to justify the elimination of the UB program.

As the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Health Braintrust, I would be remiss if I did not mention the positive direction that this bill takes the health and well being of Americans, and the important steps it takes to bolster our health care infrastructure.

This bill increases funding for critically important programs, such as HCOP and other provider training programs, as well as for critically important Federal agencies and offices, such as the National Center for Minority Health Disparities at the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and SAMHSA.

Unlike the President’s budget, this bill represents the positive direction we need and should take to ensure that our health care system—at every level, from research, to training, to actual care—has the capacity and resources to adequately treat the millions of Americans who access it. I am enthusiastic about provisions in H.R. 3043 that provide funding in my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, for follow-up glioma screening and perinatal care. These programs are an important part of bridging the gap for the elderly, low income and uninsured individuals.

Despite its numerous amendments and three days of debate, the bill as written provides funding for programs that help to improve the Nation’s education, health care and labor programs. I urge my colleagues to support its final passage.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I rise today to oppose the amendment offered by my colleague from Indiana, Mr. PENCE to the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2008.

Mr. PENCE’s amendment would deny Federal funding under Title X of the Public Health Services Act to Planned Parenthood health facilities throughout the country. As a supporter of Planned Parenthood and the services that it offers to my constituents in my central New Jersey district, I firmly oppose this purely political amendment.

This should not be an anti-choice or pro-choice debate about one of the many services that Planned Parenthood provides. In fact, according to Federal statute, no money from Title X can be used for abortion services. Title X makes grants to public and private nonprofit organizations to provide family planning and related health care services to low-income women. Therefore this debate should be about prevention. It should be about continuing to provide women with the necessary tools for proper prevention, including contraception and education. It should be about protecting women’s health by providing women with access to reproductive care.

Planned Parenthood’s 841 affiliates provide reproductive health care services to 5 million men and women annually including 84,500 in the state of New Jersey. 63 percent of these patients receive reproductive health care services and 37 percent receive family planning services. Through family planning services Planned Parenthood estimates that its services prevent over 631,000 unwanted pregnancies each year. Planned Parenthood, as the Nation’s oldest and largest family planning provider, is responsible for preventing 60 percent of unwanted pregnancies and we should not act to prevent women from getting the reproductive health care they need. I urge my colleagues not to support the Pence amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The only purpose this amendment serves is to decrease access to family planning services and to mischaracterize the critical, life-saving work of Planned Parenthood affiliates.

Let me be clear. Under current law, Title X funds can not be used to pay for abortions. Nothing in the underlying bill changes that. Therefore, I am left to assume that the services the sponsor of this amendment wishes to cut include family planning, cancer screening, prenatal care and deliveries, fertility information and support groups, and support and advocacy for victims of sexual assault.

I am proud to defend the hundreds of Planned Parenthood affiliates, including the Hudson Peconic affiliate in my Congressional District. The dedicated work this affiliate and others like it engage in are the reason that more than five million men and women have access to any health care at all.

Their commitment is something that should be recognized and commended, not demonized. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. MALONEY of New York. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Pence amendment, which would deny Federal funding to one of the most important family planning and women’s health organizations in the country. Current law prohibits using Title X funds to provide abortion services. Planned Parenthood has not violated this law. In fact, Planned Parenthood uses completely separate funds to provide these services.

Seven out of ten of the services that Planned Parenthood provides are related to pregnancy prevention and women’s health. The majority of their work focuses on low-income women, a population at greater risk for unintended pregnancies. Oftentimes a local Planned Parenthood clinic is the only place women have access to basic health care, including birth control. In addition to family planning assistance, Planned Parenthood also provides cancer screening for breast and cervical cancers, as well as testing and treatment for sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV and AIDS. These are essential health services for women, and it would be irresponsible to discontinue Federal funding for them.

I urge my colleagues to support healthcare and family planning for women by voting no on this amendment.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mr. King of Iowa.

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

Section 2(c)(3). None of the funds in this Act may be used to employ workers described in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. OBEY. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. We’ve been asking Members through the day if they would drop their remarks if we accept their amendments so that Members can catch their planes. Would the gentleman be willing to do that?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I’m very amenable to that process of doing business about every time I come to the floor. I would be happy to thank you for that.

Mr. OBEY. In that case we’ll accept the amendment on the side of the
Mr. KING of Iowa. I would like to say, Madam Chairman, is that this bill is the product of 5 months work on both sides of the aisle by some very dedicated people. Mr. WALSH is the new ranking member on the subcommittee, but he has performed like an old timer. I am proud of the fact that the subcommittee worked hard on this bill, and I am proud of the fact that we have largely come together on substance.

I would hope that that would be recognized by the endorsement of many Members on both sides of the aisle when the roll call vote is opened. This bill is not a matter of accounting.

This bill is not a matter of political theory or political party platforms. This bill, more than any other, meets the needs of all of those in society who are not among the most well-connected and the most privileged. But even for the most well-connected and privileged, this bill provides a lot because all of us benefit every time a child is educated. All of us benefit every time an American citizen gets the health care he or she needs. All of us benefit every time a worker is educated so that our country and our workers are more competitive. All of us benefit when a single teacher achieves new skills. There is nothing in the world more damaging than a dull or a bad teacher, and there is nothing more wonderful than a well-trained, intelligent teacher.

So I would urge Members to recognize that the issue isn’t whether some program is defined as a cut or an increase. The issue isn’t whether we like the President of the United States or not. The issue is whether or not we are building the kind of country we want to have over the next 10 years. To do that, it takes investments. And, yes, investments cost money. And, yes, I plead fully guilty to wanting to provide even more than we can in this bill. But it is essential if we want to remain competitive. It is essential if we want to have equal access to opportunity in this country. It is essential that we invest in bills like this.

And I thank the gentleman from New York for his assistance in trying to do just that, as well as every other member of the committee and subcommittee.

There is a reason why there were no votes expressed in opposition to this bill in all of this because that is because this is the people’s bill. It is the product of input from each and every Member from the most conservative to the most liberal, and I think there is not a member of the subcommittee who would not verify that.

With that, Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

For my part, it was a great experience going through this 5 months with you. It was a lot of work. I think I speak for the staff as well when I say we are all pretty tired from all the work that we have done. And of course, they had to put together a continuing resolution and a supplemental to boot. So I know I join the chairman in thanking the staff for the remarkable work that they have done, both inside the aisle. These are professional people who obviously care about the issues, but they are not as concerned about the partisan aspects of this as we are.

When the chairman talked about our experience here together, we combined about 57 years of experience here in the Congress. Most of that side falls on his watch and not mine, but I am getting up there too. And it is great to be able to work with someone who has the command of these issues that he does. And I remember asking him, and I have said this a couple of times, Why on God’s green Earth would you want to be chairman of the full committee and the subcommittee also? And he said, Because, because the subcommittee issues are the issues I came here for 38 years ago. And he is making a mark on them today.

There has been some partisan back-and-forth here, which is as it should be. The Founding Fathers wanted us to have a clash of ideas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. WALSH of New York. They wanted to have the clash of ideas here. The fight should be over words and ideas and not with swords and other weaponry.

But mostly what we have done is we have found what we disagree on and talked about it. But overall, overwhelmingly, both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, agree that the issues in this bill are priorities for the Nation. Maybe we think we should spend more here or less there. But they want to spend 5 percent more, and I don’t want to discount the differences.

There are big differences between the two parties. And I am very proud that our party on our watch did balance the Federal budget, did produce surpluses before a crisis of international proportions affected us in 2001.

But suffice to say, I have great respect for the gentleman from Wisconsin. Over the years he has made me mad as anyone else because some times his arguments are just too good to argue with.

So let me just end by thanking him for honoring our requests. I think we worked out a pretty good bill here, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

Mr. WALSH of New York. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, I will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:
An amendment by Mr. Davis of Kentucky.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. Gingrey of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. Souder of Indiana.

An amendment by Mr. Camp of Michigan.

An amendment by Mr. Westmoreland of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. Lewis of Georgia.

Amendment No. 62 by Mr. Campbell of California.

Amendment No. 16 by Mr. Flake of Arizona.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. Jordan of Ohio.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. Price of Georgia.

Amendment No. 23 by Mrs. Musgrave of Colorado.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. Campbell of California.

Amendment No. 67 by Mr. Pence of Indiana.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Davis) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Davis of Kentucky:

Page 125, after line 2, insert the following:

The Chair requests the cooperation of Members in processing these votes in an expedited manner.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY

The CHAIRMAN. The next 14 votes in this series are 2-minute votes. The Chair requests the cooperation of Members in processing these votes in an expedited manner.

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. Gingrey:

Messrs. BRADY of Texas, INGLIS of South Carolina, LAMPSON and PRICE of Georgia changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

The amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Messrs. GARY G. MILLER of California, SHAYES and LOEBBACH changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

The amendment was adopted.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The next 14 votes in this series are 2-minute votes. The Chair requests the cooperation of Members in processing these votes in an expedited manner.

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. Gingrey:

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Gingrey) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. Gingrey:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by Mr. SOUDER: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 7. (a) In the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 151 et seq.),

the text of the amendment is as follows:

...(insert text here)....

[THE UNFINISHED BUSINESS IS THE DEMAND FOR A RECORDED VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER]
Mr. KIRK changed his vote from "no" to "aye.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:
Ms. HIRONO. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 674, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. FINKLER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 674, I was on official business outside the National Capital region in my capacity as chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. McINTYRE. Madam Chairman, during rollcall No. 674 on H.R. 3043, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "aye" when I should have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMP OF MICHIGAN

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinanced business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Camp of Michigan:

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

TITLE VI
ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS Sec. 601. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement any policy prohibiting a Medicare beneficiary from electing during a coverage election period described in section 1851(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-21(e)) to receive health care benefits under title XVIII of such Act through enrollment in a Medicare Advantage plan under part C of such title.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 192, noes 228, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 675]
So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 675, I was inadvertently voted "no" but intended to vote "aye."

Stated against:
Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 675, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN
The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains on the vote.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 675, I was inadvertently voted "no" but intended to vote "aye."

Stated against:
Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 675, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN
The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains on this vote.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 675, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN
A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 412, noes 12, not voting 12, as follows:

([Roll No. 677]

AYES—412

Crenshaw
Clyburn
Capps
Camp (MI)
Brady (TX)
Boyda (KS)
Bilbray
Baker
Allen
Alexander
Abercrombie

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 108, noes 316, not voting 12, as follows:

([Roll No. 678]

AYES—108

Crenshaw
Clyburn
Capps
Camp (MI)
Brady (TX)
Boyda (KS)
Bilbray
Baker
Allen
Alexander
Abercrombie

Mr. CAMPBELL of California changed his vote from "aye" to "no." Mr. LARSEN of Washington changed his vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER, Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 677, I was on official business outside the National Capital region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 108, noes 316, not voting 12, as follows:

([Roll No. 678]

AYES—108

Crenshaw
Clyburn
Capps
Camp (MI)
Brady (TX)
Boyda (KS)
Bilbray
Baker
Allen
Alexander
Abercrombie

 ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

Mr. CAMPBELL of California changed his vote from "aye" to "no." Mr. LARSEN of Washington changed his vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER, Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 677, I was on official business outside the National Capital region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment.
vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Flake) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 96, noes 327, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 679]

**AYES—96**

Akin ............................................. 
Bachmann .............................. 
Barrow ............................................. 
Bartlett (MD) ................ 
Barton (TX) ............ 
Bilirakis ....................... 
Blackburn ..................... 
Boehner ..................... 
Brown-Waite, Ginny .......... 
Buchanan .................... 
Burton (IN) ........... 
Camp (MI) ..................... 
Campbell (CA) .............. 
Cantor .......................... 
Castle ......................... 
Cole ............................................. 
Conaway ..................... 
Cooper .......................... 
Davis (KY) .................... 
Davis, Deal (GA) .......... 
Duncan ......................... 
Ehlers .......................... 
Ferry .............................. 

**NOES—227**

Achrombie ............................................. 
Ackerel ............................................. 
Adler ............................................. 
Allen ............................................. 
Altmire ............................................. 
Andrews ......................... 
Arcuri ............................................. 
Baca ............................................. 
Bachus ..........................

Baldwin .......................... 
Bean ............................................. 
Becerra ............................................. 
Berkley ............................................. 
Berman ......................... 
Berry ............................................. 
Blackwell .................... 
Bishop (KY) ..................... 
Blumenauer ..................... 
Bunt ............................................. 
Bonner ............................................. 
Boren ............................................. 
Bowser ............................................. 
Boustany ............................................. 
Boyd (FL) ..................... 
Brady (PA) .................... 
Braley (IA) ..................... 
Brown (SC) ..................... 
Burgess ......................... 
Butterfield ..................... 
Calvert ............................................. 
Capito ............................................. 

**NOT VOTING—12**

Bono ............................................. 
Bordallo ......................... 
Brown, Corrine .............. 
Cubin ............................................. 

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN**

**The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).** Members are advised 1 minute remains on this vote.

So the amendment was rejected.

**The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.**

**Stated at a time:** Mr. FLINER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 678, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

**AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE**

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN**

**The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).** Members are advised 1 minute remains on this vote.

So the amendment was rejected.

**The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.**

**Stated at a time:** Mr. FLINER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 679, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:
Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rolloca No. 680, I was on official business outside the national capital region in my capacity as chairman of the Veterans’ Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PRICH OF GEORGIA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Price) on which further proceedings were post-poned and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 136, noes 288, not voting 12, as follows:

(Roll No. 680)

AYES—136

Akin
Allen
Ackerman
Crenshaw
Coble
Blackburn
Bartlett (MD)
Buchanan
Boustany
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (GA)
Bonner
Black
Blackburn
Bartlett (MD)

AYES—165

Akin
Allum
Almarinez
Baucus
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)

Not voting—12

Bono
Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Cubin

NOT VOTING—12

Bono
Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Cubin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Price, in the chair) Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining on this vote.
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FILNER). Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 681, I am on official business outside the national capital region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no." 

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MRS. MSCRVAGE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a record on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. MSCRVAGE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote will be taken.

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). The roll is open on amendment No. 23. The ayes have it. The vote will be recorded.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The roll of those recorded voting aye is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayes</th>
<th>Noes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CHAIRMAN. The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded on the amendment. A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 177, noes 245, not voting 14, as follows:

(Report No. 683)

AVERCHERNOBLE
Ackermon
Allen
Andrews
Baker
Bake
Bonner
Boeckel
Boehn
Bonner
Boswell
Boucher
Bouz)
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brennan
Brenn
tion, this bill provides an increase of 4.8 percent for the TRIO programs, educational opportunity outreach programs designed to motivate and support students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Madam Chairman, this bill is of significant importance to my constituents. For the past twelve years, I have served as a Representative of the 18th Congressional District of Texas. In the heart of my district are several community colleges and three major universities—the University of Houston, the University of Houston-Downtown as well as one of our nations leading Historically Black College/University, Texas Southern University. In the heart of my district are also three ABA-approved law schools—the University of Houston Law Center, Thurgood Marshall School of Law, and South Texas College of Law. With the rising cost of college education, many of these students in my district are reliant on Federal financial aid to complete their education. Because investment in education system today yields high returns for the individual, as well as society, I support this measure to make college more affordable and accessible.

Madam Chairman, quality health care is close to non-existent in this great nation that we call America. As a nation with natural resources and high productivity, it is humiliating to know that 46.6 million citizens are without health insurance. If current policy plans are to continue, by 2013, the number of uninsured Americans will increase by 11 million. This is simply an unacceptable national problem and must be rectified. H.R. 3043 will expand access to health care for the uninsured by providing access for more than 2 million uninsured Americans. Funds will be directed to community health centers, which will enable them to serve an additional 4.9 million uninsured Americans. The bill also includes a $50 million initiative to assist states in providing high-risk insurance pools, thereby supporting affordable insurance for almost 200,000 medically high-risk people. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill, which invests in initiatives that will provide new access to health care for more than 2 million uninsured Americans.

H.R. 3043 invests in life-saving medical research by reversing the previous Republican disinvestment plans and providing an increase for National Institute of Health of $750 million. As once stated by Senator JOE LIEBERMAN, “by expanding our knowledge of human diseases, we can help reduce health care costs by discovering more effective treatments and by learning how to prevent onset of serious illnesses. Biomedical research is a fundamental component of a preventive care approach to health care reform.” Medical research at NIH offers optimism to millions of Americans infected with life-threatening diseases such as cancer, AIDS, Alzheimer’s, Parkinson’s disease, and many more. This bill provides an increase of $750 million, which in essence allows for NIH to support and engage in research activities that are critical to national health priorities.
our Nation will benefit from the increase in quality, accessibility and affordability of higher education with the $3.3 billion directed to student financial aid. The academic performance of our American children will be improved through the $1 billion allocation for No Child Left Behind, our citizens, especially the underserved, will have the opportunity to receive quality health care, through the $1.3 billion being directed to the Health Resources and Services Administration. This bill also allows for an investment in the skills and training of America’s workers and the workforce through the $3.3 billion directed to programs similar to Job Corps, as well as community services initiatives, such as the Community Services Block Grant. Our disabled citizens will be cared for through federal contributions for special education for children with disabilities through the funding of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Madam Chairman, I am a strong believer that our children are our future. Family is the backbone to the success of any child, as well as the success of our Nation. For this reason, all members must be granted access to quality health care, education, and job skills training. It is students like my current Congressional Black Caucus Foundation Intern, Daria Awusah, that gives me strong faith that our future is in good hands. As my constituents, she is a student at the University of Houston (which is in my district), she has worked tirelessly and endlessly to finance the past three years of her college education. It is her testimony that although not enough, financial aid has been an instrumental element in financing her education. Let us continue to support students like Awusah. I ask my colleagues to join me and support H.R. 3043. Once again, I thank you, Congresswoman OBEY, for your leadership in this endeavor. Our country’s future is dependent on the role that we take as Members of Congress through the policies that we choose to implement. Let us begin with the reinvestment in our country’s future by passing H.R. 3043.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chairman, the Act of August 25th, 1916, more commonly referred to as the National Park Service Organic Act, states that, “there is hereby created in the Department of the Interior a service to be called the National Park Service, which shall be under the charge of a director, who shall be appointed by the President.” Since 1916, the National Park Service created by the Organic Act has grown to include 22,000 people, conserving and interpreting 391 units in a National Park System that will welcome more than 270 million visitors this year. Our National Parks are a source of enormous pride for millions of Americans and examples for the world regarding the conservation of places and resources which make a Nation and a people unique. And of course, Madam Chairman, much of the credit for the tremendous success of the National Park idea is due to the professionalism, commitment and expertise of the men and women working for the NPS.

As the centennial of the Organic Act approaches, there is consensus—among policymakers and the American people—that this 100th anniversary must be viewed as an opportunity to commit ourselves to a stronger, more diverse, better trained and better equipped National Park Service. In February, the Bush Administration proposed legislation to increase funding for the NPS over the next decade in recognition of this milestone. Two of my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee—full committee Ranking Member DON YOUNG and subcommittee Ranking Member ROB BISHOP—have introduced that legislation, by request of H.R. 2959. Today, with the support of Natural Resources Committee Chairman NICK RAHALL, I am honored to introduce H.R. 3094, legislation we believe will best commemorate this 100th anniversary while also preparing the National Parks and the National Park Service for another 100 years. H.R. 3094 authorizes mandatory spending expected to total $100 million a year for ten years. The bill creates a process whereby the Executive Branch will coordinate annual proposals for how best to spend this new funding and the Congress, through the Interior Appropriations bill, will allocate the funds.

In contrast to the Administration’s proposal, H.R. 3094 identifies six specific program areas within which this increased funding is to be spent. These areas include education in the parks, environmental leadership initiative, professional development, resource protection and construction. This mix of funding priorities—investing in natural resources, bricks and mortar and human capital—will insure our parks and park employees can meet the challenge of the next 100 years successfully.

Also in contrast to the legislation proposed by the Administration, H.R. 3094 provides this new spending without requiring private matching funds. While we recognize the critical role that private giving has played in creating and sustaining the National Park System, we remain concerned regarding the ever-increasing reliance on private funds. H.R. 3094 encourages private giving but makes absolutely certain that NPS spending priorities are determined by the Congress and the Administration without regard to which projects might, or might not, be most attractive to private donors.

And finally, Madam Chairman, H.R. 3094 differs from the Administration’s proposal in that all of the spending in our bill is paid for—meaning this bill addresses the stringent PAYGO requirements instituted by the Democratic majority. The Administration’s failure to identify a source for the mandatory expenditures in H.R. 2959 makes that proposal simply unrealistic.

Madam Chairman, the American people treasure their national parks and care deeply about their future. The funding levels we provide for the National Park Service, at this critical milestone in its history, should reflect that. The initiatives funded through this legislation—especially those that involve national parks as classrooms for young people—will create new generations of stewards to safeguard our national parks for the next 100 years.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Chairman, I have always said that the working men and women of Michigan are my top priority. I believe that every working family deserves access to a quality education, strong healthcare, jobs that are safe for its workers and secure retirement plans. Today the House will consider the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations, H.R. 2954, which will fund programs families need and rely on. I rise in support of this legislation because I believe it will provide our families with healthy and secure environment in which to raise their children.

By 2014, nearly half of our nation’s growing occupations will require higher education. If we want to help families succeed and help children prepare for work in the global marketplace, then we must help them earn a college degree. H.R. 3043 will provide the Department of Education with $61.7 billion, which is $4.2 billion or 7.4 percent increase above 2007 funding. In addition, this legislation will provide $2 billion, or a 2 percent increase above what was in funding for Pell Grants to raise the maximum Pell grant by $390 to $4,700, benefiting over 5.5 million students.

This legislation will also help prepare our students for college by providing $2 billion for No Child Left Behind, an 8.4 percent increase above 2007. Specifically, $1.9 billion will go towards Title I grants, which benefit nearly 55,000 disadvantaged students in preschool, elementary and secondary levels. This funding will also provide reading and math instruction for 161,000 low-income students. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B grants will receive $174.5 million, ending the previous Congress’s habit of declining Federal contributions for special education. We also must focus on preparing workers, many of whom have been displaced due to layoffs or company closings, for second career opportunities. H.R. 3043 will increase funding for the Department of Labor, including a $227.4 million increase for employment, training, and worker protection programs. This funding will greatly help our great state of Michigan because $1.2 billion will be used to provide state grants that training and supportive services, such as rapid-response assistance to help workers affected by mass layoffs and plant closures.

H.R. 3043 will also provide for the health and well-being of our families. Currently over 44 million Americans do not have health insurance; by 2013, the number of uninsured Americans will grow by 11 million. Universal health care has always been one of my top priorities, and I believe this legislation reflects a strong commitment to improving health care in our country.

Democrats took the first step towards helping our uninsured by proposing a $207 million increase in funding for community health centers in the FY2007 Continuing Resolution, benefiting an additional 1.2 million people. The legislation before us today will provide an additional $200 million for community health centers. This bill also includes $50 million to assist states in providing affordable insurance for almost 200,000 people who are considered medically high risk and are not able to obtain health insurance in the commercial market. Lastly, H.R. 3043 will provide $45 million for Medicaid and insurance coverage for 5.5 million Medicare beneficiaries to understand and fully utilize the benefits to which they are entitled.

This legislation will go farther than just providing health care to the uninsured; it will also provide much needed resources to centers for Disease Control and Prevention and emergency responders who served during 9/11. While the administration proposed reducing funding for the Federal government’s public health activities by $159 million, this bill will increase $256 million, or a 19 percent increase above 2007. This funding will be dedicated to programs that focus on childhood immunization, state and local public health emergency
preparedness, and efforts to combat chronic diseases such as diabetes and heart disease and emerging infectious diseases. In the aftermath of 9/11, many first responders were exposed to dust and other harmful debris at the World Trade Center site. H.R. 3043 provides $50 million to improve the health monitoring and compensation for first responders, the World Trade Center emergency responders. It will also require that the Administration develop a comprehensive plan for how they will address the current health needs of these first responders. 

The Labor-HHS Appropriations bill will also help keep homes warm. The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) has helped over 500,000 families in Michigan heat their homes during Michigan’s tough winters. This year it will see a critical increase of $500 million, 23.2 percent above 2008, to provide energy assistance to nearly 1 million more low-income seniors and families. The Community Services Block Grant, which provides funding to States to expand services such as housing, home weatherization, parenting education, adult literacy classes, and emergency food assistance will see a $30 million increase to $660 million. In order to help improve processing time for Social Security disability claims and hearings, the Social Security Administration (SSA) will receive $9.7 billion, $401 million above 2007. Over the years, however, SSA hearing backlogs have increased, creating a backlog in casework. This funding will help to reduce the backlog and allow the SSA to continue providing monthly cash benefits to nearly 55 million Americans each year. 

Our founding Fathers trusted Congress with the task of funding the Federal government through the annual appropriations process. While this process is never easy, it is one of the most important duties we have to the American people. Not only has President Bush threatened to veto this legislation, but he also proposed cutting funding for these programs $7.6 billion below last year. This bill invests in the health and education needs of our Nation. For too long, Congress has placed politics above the health and education needs of our citizens. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and show the American people the importance of life.

Ms. B ERKLEY. Madam Chairman, Congress created the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation program in the FY 2001 Defense Authorization Act. This program compensates workers who were exposed to nuclear radiation while on the job within the Department of Energy and who later developed cancer and other illnesses. While the program was a step toward righting the wrongs done to these hard-working Americans, it has had to suffer, there have been many problems since the enactment of this program. Many DOE workers have had difficulty proving that their cancer was directly caused by the radiation they were exposed to in the line of duty. The years-long process that the program requires workers to go through to prove they deserve compensation is intrusive and drawn out.

This is an issue that directly affects my constituents. The Nevada Test site is an area larger than the State of Rhode Island, located about 65 miles north of Las Vegas. After years of exposure to nuclear radiation, many DOE workers who were employed at the Nevada Test Site during Cold War nuclear testing are now battling several forms of cancer, and many have already passed away. Unfortunately, many of these workers have also been turned away from Federal compensation. However, there is an alternative for workers to qualify for Federal compensation. Workers at other Energy Department facilities across the country can be automatically designated as part of the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC). Workers at these locations qualify for EEOIC benefits without going through an arduous and bureaucratic process. Since the creation of the program, Nevada Test Site workers have petitioned to be included in the SEC, but have only succeeded in part. Currently, only NTS workers who worked at the site between 1951 and 1962 are part of the Cohort and therefore automatically qualify for benefits. This only accounts for one third of all NTS claimants, leaving a large group of former Federal employees who are awaiting the compensation they deserve.

Madam Chairman, I understand this appropriations bill is not the time to designate Special Exposure Cohorts. However, it is imperative that we work on this issue before it’s too late: before the victims of nuclear radiation are gone. Before their families are left behind without their loved ones. This is long overdue and we must act now.

Mrs. McC ARTHUR of New York. Madam Chairman, I join my colleagues in urge my colleagues to support this bill. Since the passage of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation program, we have seen a number of successes, including a $2 billion increase in funding for the program. This year, the President has once again proposed significant cuts to programs of $7.6 billion below 2007 levels. This is the wrong message and the wrong policy.

My colleagues and I are determined to reverse the funding cuts put forth over the past several years. This bill rejects most of the President’s damaging cuts and provides an increase of $4.3 billion (or 3 percent) over the 2007 funding levels. The bill makes college more affordable—including increasing the maximum Pell Grant by $390. The bill helps raise the achievement levels of America’s students, providing $2 billion increase above 2007 and $1 billion above the President’s request for No Child Left Behind programs. H.R. 3043 expands access to healthcare for the uninsured by investing in initiatives that will provide for new and innovative ways to reduce costs while expanding coverage. This legislation provides $200 million for community health centers, enabling these centers to serve an additional 1 million uninsured Americans. The bill provides $75 million for a new initiative of state health access grants, providing start-up grants to states that are ready with plans to expand health care coverage to targeted groups. It also includes $50 million for an initiative to assist states in providing insurance pools to support affordable insurance for almost 200,000 people who are medically high-risk.

H.R. 3043 meets the domestic healthcare and education needs of our Nation. For too long, Congress has ignored the needs of the American people. Today, I will move with my colleagues in a new direction to fully fund the vital healthcare and education programs utilized by the American people.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Chair, I yield for two reasons.

First, this has been a long and very difficult bill on the floor. I think the House should recognize the fabulous work of both Mr. OBry of Wisconsin and my colleague from New York (Mr. WALSH). They endured all this. Congratulations for a good job.

Further, I believe we ought to extend our appreciation to the Chairwoman who has done a wonderful job and a fair job in this process, Mrs. TAUSCHER of California.

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

This Act may be cited as the “Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Acts, 2008.”

Mr. OBry. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with by amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, she reported the bill back to the House with by amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 547, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMPETE OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LEWIS of California. In its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lewis of California moves to recommence the bill H.R. 3043 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly with an amendment providing that funds made available to any child welfare agency, private or public elementary school, private or public secondary school, local educational agency, or State educational agency under titles I or II of the bill may not be used for any fees charged under the Schools Safely Acquiring Faculty Excellence Act of 2006 for
Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank Members of both parties who have helped through the process. I urge a "no" vote on this motion and a bipartisan "yes" vote on final passage.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that if indeed this motion passed, this bill could be reported back to the respective committee through which it was designated, and that the bill could be reported back to the House the very next legislative day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if this issue had serious offenses from first-degree murder to child predator to domestic violence.

What I am asking this body to do is to use common sense, allow for these school districts to eliminate one more barrier to help fund these programs that we passed last session and this session. Head Start alone, one particular program had 660 teachers; of that, they were not inspected for 5 years and it was discovered, out of 660 teachers, 100 teachers and support staff had criminal backgrounds. Of that, 50 had serious offenses from first-degree murder to child predator to domestic violence.

An example of what is happening in this epidemic nationwide is we have teachers, we have professionals, we have individuals that are predators, sexual predators following our children. We need to make sure we add one additional tool, and that eliminates barrier to help fund these programs that we passed last session and this session. Head Start alone, one particular program had 660 teachers; of that, they were not inspected for 5 years and it was discovered, out of 660 teachers, 100 teachers and support staff had criminal backgrounds. Of that, 50 had serious offenses from first-degree murder to child predator to domestic violence.

What I am asking this body to do is to use common sense, allow for these school districts to eliminate one more barrier to help them pay for these backgrounds checks. It is common sense. It is a way to provide protection. It is something that we can do to ensure and add one additional guarantee for our families and our children that they will be safe within our schools.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, Jon Porter said it all. I urge your positive vote on this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if this issue were in fact the real problem, it can easily be dealt with in conference by Mr. Walsh and myself and the rest of the committee, but in fact it is not a problem. The fact is that under the bill money in the Safe and Drug Free Schools account can already be used for exactly the same.

I would also like to point out, however, that this is a program which was cut by the President to $100 million, and the House has restored $146 million above the President’s figure to take care of problems just such as this.

But the membership should also understand that this recommit kills the bill. It is dressed up in language on fees, but in fact it calls for the bill to be referred to the committee and reported back promptly, not forthwith.

And, as Members know, that is a device that kills the bill.

We have endured over the last 3 days filibusters by amendment. We have had 25 hours of amendments, sometimes repetitious amendments. We have spent twice as much time on this bill as was spent the last time that the bill was considered by the Congress.

And I would make one other point. The sponsors of this proposal could have used it to do anything they wanted to do with the bill. They could have cut the bill, they could have changed the priorities. They didn’t. And the fact that they didn’t, in my view, is an admission that, in terms of policy, this is a good bill. It is a backhanded admission that this bill ought to pass as is.

So I would ask Members to vote “no” on the motion and vote “yes” on passage. Then we can get on and do good things for America’s children, for Americans who need help to get health care, and for American workers.

Let me also take just a second to thank the House for its indulgence over the last 3 days. I know that it has often been tiresome, but I appreciate the fact that they understood that the committee was just trying to do its job.

I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This motion will be defeated because it kills the bill. If the gentleman from Nevada were serious about this motion, he would have asked that it be forthwith. That would have passed his amendment. This is not a serious amendment, I tell my friend. This is, unfortunately by the American public is so upset with the Congress of the United States: because what they see, they say that Congress is not getting its work done, and they are right. And they are right because obstructionism is occurring on this floor and on the floor across the hall. And if it were in the name of serious legislating, perhaps they would understand. But this is not serious legislating, A, because the money can be spent for that now; and, B, because it kills a bill that is for the education and the health care of our people.

Reject this spurious motion. Pass this bill.
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So the motion to recommit was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:
Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 685, I was on official business outside the national capital region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans’ Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 276, nays 140, not voting 15, as follows:

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bereczka
Berkeley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boehlert
Boucher
Boyle (FL)
Boyle (KY)
Brady (PA)
Bray (LA)
Butterfield
Capps
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hinshaw
Holt
Holmes
Holly
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson–Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnston
Johnson, R. E.
Jones (OH)
Kagan
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilder
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebach
Lowey
Maloney (FL)
Maloney (NY)


Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bereczka
Berkeley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boehlert
Boucher
Boyle (FL)
Boyle (KY)
Brady (PA)
Bray (LA)
Butterfield
Capps
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hinshaw
Holt
Holmes
Holly
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson–Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnston
Johnson, R. E.
Jones (OH)
Kagan
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilder
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebach
Lowey
Maloney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bereczka
Berkeley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boehlert
Boucher
Boyle (FL)
Boyle (KY)
Brady (PA)
Bray (LA)
Butterfield
Capps
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hinshaw
Holt
Holmes
Holly
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson–Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnston
Johnson, R. E.
Jones (OH)
Kagan
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilder
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebach
Lowey
Maloney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2116

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2116, the Freight Rail Infrastructure Capacity Expansion Act of 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLISON). Is there objection to the removal of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend the majority leader for the purpose of inquiring about next week’s schedule.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for business and noon for legislative business, with votes rolled until 6:30 p.m. In addition to several bills under suspension of the rules, and a list of these bills, of course, will be announced by the end of the week, we expect to begin consideration of the fiscal year 2008 Transportation-HUD appropriations bill.

Let me reiterate that because that will require a vote on the rule, there will be a substantive, and perhaps more substantive, votes on Monday. So Members cannot be assured that there will not be controversies on the floor on Monday night. Usually we do only suspension bills.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour business and 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. In addition to completing consideration of the Transportation-HUD bill, we have one additional fiscal year 2008 appropriations bill, the Commerce-Justice-Science, as well as the farm program reauthorization.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

I notice there is no listing at this point of an Iraq bill on next week’s schedule. I also notice that FISA modernization has not been scheduled. I wonder if the gentleman has any information about the potential for either of those two to be on the schedule for next week.

Mr. HOYER. FISA legislation, as the gentleman knows, is being worked on by the Intelligence Committee now. I don’t have a specific answer for you. I am hopeful that we will perhaps be able to address those two important issues before we leave here.

On the other, I think it is possible that we will have some legislation dealing with Iraq, but that decision has not been made. Obviously, there is still ongoing discussion both in the Senate and in this body on that subject. But whether there will be legislation next week is still in discussion.

Mr. BLUNT. I think the gentleman for that and, of course, just to ask when that decision is made, the quicker we could be told what that decision is and get a sense of the schedule on that issue, the better.

Also, I have one question the gentleman might have information on. In the conference on the 9/11 bill earlier this week, it appeared that the protection that the House had added for liability in what was called the John Doe action, where if you suggest someone you think is pursuing a dangerous course of action, you turn them in, then you are personally held liable, we had some protections added to our bill that I am told that the chairman of the conference, a member of the other body, has now said that he believes those protections would be germane, and if they are germane, we would hope that we would continue to see an argument in favor of that. But, I wonder if the leader has any information on that.

Mr. HOYER. I tell my friend that I do not have any immediate information on that particular issue. I know the issue, but where it is, I am not sure. So I don’t have specific information on that.

Mr. BLUNT. Let me ask one other question about conferences, and that would be unless this proceeds into another area.

Mr. HOYER. I can say with respect to conferences, we have every intent of doing the 9/11 conference, as the gentleman knows, and passing that before we leave for the August break.

Mr. BLUNT. I would ask on conferences, in a press report this week there was a suggestion, as a matter of fact, I think it was today, that the ethics bill might come to the House under an extraordinary procedure that didn’t actually involve a conference. I think the House changed its rules this year to be much more stringent on requiring a conference, and if I am wondering if that report has any merit to it that the gentleman would be aware of.

Mr. HOYER. I understand press reports, but there is no decision that has been made on that.

Mr. BLUNT. I just would suggest to the gentleman that we have changed the rules in a way that particular messaging between the two Houses has seldom been used, I think it is even harder to do in light of the House rules changes, and we would hope that those bills are done in conference and, of course, hope they are done in conference. In accordance with the rules that this Congress has proposed for conferences.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will my friend yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. We are very, very hopeful that the lobbying disclosure conference can proceed. As the gentleman