

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2735

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2735, the Motor Vehicle Owners' Right to Repair Act of 2003.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON
APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE
UNTIL MIDNIGHT, JULY 30, 2003,
TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT
ON DEPARTMENTS OF TRANS-
PORTATION, TREASURY AND
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPRO-
PRIATIONS BILL, 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight, July 30, 2003, to file a privileged report, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation and Treasury, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2859 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AP-
PROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER
RELIEF ACT, 2003

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 339, I call up the bill (H.R. 2859) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 339, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 2859 is as follows:

H.R. 2859

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RE-
SPONSE

Disaster Relief

For an additional amount for "Disaster Relief" for necessary expenses in carrying

out the functions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), \$983,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 502 of H. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2003".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, it shall be in order to consider the amendment made in order by the resolution, if offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), or his designee, which shall be considered read, and shall be debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes of debate on the bill.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting the Toomey amendment to H.R. 2859 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do so to present the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, the second supplemental for fiscal year 2003. We have had considerable debate already on the bill as we debated the rule. This is a very simple, straightforward emergency bill that includes \$983.6 million for the Disaster Relief Fund, which is now a part of the Department of Homeland Security. We know that there are Members that have other interests, and the administration has other interests. We had already reported from the Committee on Appropriations a supplemental that was more far reaching than this, but it appears the proper thing to do now is to just present this emergency supplemental strictly for Disaster Relief because the Disaster Relief account has a serious problem with running out of money. I do not think we need a lot of debate on this bill.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, before I discuss this matter before us, I would like to alert Members of the House to the situation we face on the VA-HUD bill. There have been approximately 40 amendments offered to that bill. Perhaps 10 of them at this point will fall by the wayside, people deciding not to offer them. If the others simply take 5 minutes on each side and if about a third to a half of them have rollcalls, that will take

us to probably 7 o'clock tonight. I am sorry. I said that wrong. If we have no rollcalls and if we just have 5 minutes of debate on each side, it will take us until about 7 o'clock tonight. If there are any rollcalls at all, then let us say there are rollcalls on about a third of the amendments, that means we would be here until about 9 o'clock tonight. And if you have one-third of those amendments where you take at least 10 minutes a side, then we are going to be here until about 11 o'clock.

I want Members to understand that now, because I know a lot of them are assuming that they are going to be able to catch 6 o'clock planes. Unless something happens, that is not going to be true. I would urge Members to think through whether they are serious in offering these amendments. If they are, obviously they have a right to offer them. But I think Members need to understand what the realistic time frame is as well and would urge Members to take that into consideration if in fact they are planning to get out of here on a plane this evening.

Mr. Speaker, having given that notice, let me simply say that we have already made quite clear that we think that this supplemental is deficient in a number of areas, especially in the areas of fire fighting and in the area of AmeriCorps, but in my view there is no sense chewing that cud twice. We have already talked about it on the rule.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. The one concern I have in the Toomey amendment which is yet to be offered, since it was not printed in the RECORD as it was supposed to be, but, anyway, in the Toomey amendment, we are going to have an across-the-board cut. One of the items that was not exempted was fire fighting. We are already not getting the supplemental funding for fire fighting that was promised in this bill. Last year they borrowed money from all the accounts to fund the fire fighting. That is what we are going to have to wind up doing again. But then on top of that, we are going to have to have an across-the-board cut. I am told this would be 7 or \$8 million out of the fire fighting funds. I know you can defer it if the President does this and that. All I am saying is, I do not think this amendment is very well thought out, I do not like across-the-board amendments normally; and so I hope that this will at least be thought about as we get into the debate on this supplemental.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I agree with the gentleman's observation, but it is obvious we are going to be voting on the amendment so I think I will withhold my comments on it until we are actually at the amending stage.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to remind Members that the Committee on Appropriations reported a supplemental appropriations bill that I believe is still in play that would be conferenced as part of the legislative branch bill. That bill did include the money for fighting the fires. We think that is a very important issue. We actually proposed that to the administration and they agreed. They agreed to that part of the supplemental. I hope that is still in play, and I believe that it will be; but today we are faced with the real emergency of a funding emergency for Disaster Relief account.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security and, of course, FEMA falls into his jurisdiction.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this is a stripped-down version of the disaster supplemental. It is \$983.6 million purely for disaster relief activities. It fully funds all the anticipated Federal disaster relief activities for the balance of this year. The administration, you recollect, had requested \$1.55 billion for these activities, but a portion of that request was for fiscal year 2004 activities; and because we anticipate that we will be able to complete the 2004 appropriations bill before October 1, it is not necessary to include 2004 moneys in this 2003 supplemental. All fiscal year 2004 program requirements can be accommodated in the regular 2004 bill.

Severe storms, tornadoes, and flooding in the Midwest and South have taken their toll on the disaster relief fund. Combined with severe snow and ice storms this past winter and the *Columbia* shuttle recovery efforts, this fund will be depleted within the next 2 weeks. As of July 21, the balance in the disaster relief fund was \$89 million. FEMA is currently spending at \$5.7 million a day; and as expenses for Hurricane Claudette come in, obligations will jump to \$6.3 million a day. That means the fund will be gone on or about August 4.

FEMA has done all they can to hold expenses down. They have put all non-essential projects on hold, including all reconstruction and mitigation projects. In total, \$400 million in spending is on hold. The only activities being supported by FEMA are emergency and essential services such as debris removal, individual assistance, shelter, and medical care.

□ 1315

To date for fiscal 2003 there have been 32 major disasters declared, 15 emergencies and 18 fire management events. We are at the height of the wildfire and hurricane seasons, and an active hurricane season is predicted.

FEMA estimates that they will need about \$10 million a day to support Federal disaster relief effort for the months of August and September. The

proposed \$983.6 million in this bill assumes that FEMA will fully fund these efforts as well as resume work on mitigation, repair and reconstruction projects. It also assumes there will be a zero balance in the fund on September 30.

I urge support for this supplemental. It is streamlined. It is stripped down to its bare essentials. Without it, FEMA funds will dry up August 4, leaving communities and individuals without Federal assistance and laying off personnel.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman does an excellent job in his work and his subcommittee in dealing with this. I am wondering if he could report to us why it is that there is a shortfall of resources for FEMA for this year.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, unanticipated disasters. There is no way obviously to accurately predict what Mother Nature is going to do. This is not a huge amount of money, as it goes, for disaster relief. It is simply replenishing or allowing that fund to be able to exist until we can get through the next 2 months.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman continue to yield?

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, is it not true, however, that the President requested back in February an additional \$1 billion for FEMA to be made part of the omnibus appropriations bill, and that that \$1 billion request was not used for FEMA, but rather for other accounts within the omnibus appropriations bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, that is something I will yield to the big chairman on. I am not conversant with the details of it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was so fouled up last year by some insistent demands of certain Members that, yes, we had to do 11 of the 13 bills in February of this year.

If the Committee on Appropriations would have been permitted to do our work like we have done this year, by the way, we would not have had those kinds of problems where we had to make adjustments in order to cover the balance of the 2003 issues. And I would suggest that what was done was done in agreement with the leadership, it was done in agreement with the President of the United States; and I make no excuse for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, again, the chairman has, if not the toughest job, one the toughest jobs on Capitol Hill, and I do not take anything away from that.

My concern about what we are doing with regard to an emergency supplemental, as the gentleman correctly said when he started, is that an emergency, by definition, and has been by definition since the early 1990s, is something that is unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated. And when the President makes a request for \$1 billion in order to fund FEMA accounts for problems that while they maybe have not yet manifested themselves, we know there will be forest fires, floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, windstorms, et cetera.

And I think the concern I have and others may have, is that when it is requested, it is not funded as it is traditionally and unfortunately the case for FEMA, and that money is used for other accounts, that we find ourselves now having to take time on the floor to go and do what should have been done in February.

That money has now been used for other accounts, and that is the concern that I have as the Committee on the Budget chairman, and I know a number of other people have, with regard to the process that we are taking here today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman's concern. I do not necessarily agree with it, but I understand it.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to myself.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that, as I have indicated, we believe that there are a number of other items which should have been included in this supplemental. They were not. The majority determines that; so we have no objection to that which is included in the proposal, and I would certainly intend to vote for it.

I would say with respect to the comments of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, it is my observation that in the world sometimes things change. Events occur, natural disasters occur, matters of a war here and there occur. Things change, except in the world of the Committee on the Budget. So I guess nothing that the Committee on Appropriations does will ever satisfy people who prefer a static world, but I quit worrying about that a long time ago.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, let me just report to the ranking member that I have supported all of the appropriations bills on the floor this year.

Mr. OBEY. I have not.

Mr. NUSSLE. I understand that, but my point is that the Committee on the Budget tries not to meddle other than when it writes the budget itself, which is our prerogative as a committee to write.

And I would just say, I think the gentleman might acknowledge that a war does not have its own account. FEMA has its own account to anticipate natural disasters, to anticipate emergencies; and as the gentleman knows, this is an unfortunate, but yet somewhat traditional exercise that goes on to underfund FEMA, knowing full well that we have a difficult time saying no to natural disasters, so that those resources can be spread among other accounts.

We can all decide how we are going to vote on this, but I would only encourage the very distinguished ranking member, who I know is concerned about this practice, that we prevent this from occurring in the future.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Let me simply say I am familiar with the gentleman's history on disaster funding. I personally would prefer that there would be no federally financed disaster programs.

I have introduced legislation which would require every State in the Union to buy into a federally run insurance plan so that on an experience-rated basis States would, much as they do with Worker's Compensation, prepay for any expected disaster short of a gargantuan tragedy. We have not been able to get that considered by either party, so we are stuck with what is left.

I am much more concerned with whether this estimate is real than whether it fits within the niceties of the budget resolution, to be frank about it. I do not think that God gives us 2 weeks' notice before we have a hurricane; so we do not have time to send down a proper budget amendment. So I think we do the best we can.

I think the difference between the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Florida is that the gentleman from Iowa is free to pull numbers out of the air on the Committee on the Budget and describe the world as he and as Committee on the Budget think it ought to exist. But then the Committee on Appropriations and other legislative committees in this place have to implement what happens, and I think it is a whole lot more difficult to implement than it is to pronounce.

So all I would say is, given the limited nature of the recommendations here, I think this is reasonable. I personally believe that this is not going to be enough money in the FEMA account. I think we should have done something on fire fighting. I think we should have done something to prevent 20,000 people from being fired in AmeriCorps, and I recognize we are going to have to continue to agree to disagree.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to my colleagues, I had a chance last night to meet Mike Brown, who is the Under Secretary for Emergency Preparedness and Response, which used to be FEMA, and I asked him a couple of questions about this problem.

First of all, he said they will have to start shutting down offices all over the country, I think it was by August 8, if we do not get this money. I also asked him can they borrow the money from other accounts? No. They do not have a way of doing this like the Forest Service and the Department of Interior. The BLM does; they can borrow money from other accounts.

EPR, Emergency Preparedness and Response, does not have that authority. So we have to appropriate this money. That is why all of a sudden this supplemental reemerged because it became very clear we could not, in good conscience, doing our jobs, leave here without appropriating the money for FEMA.

We have got disasters all over this country, as we speak, that require this funding. And as I said, I wish we had taken care of fire fighting; I wish we had taken care of AmeriCorps. But at least we have to take care of this. It would be totally irresponsible, and I hope in the other body they will also understand that they have got to pass this as well, though I know there is concern over there about this coming at the last moment.

In my mind, this has to be done.

And I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, I invite any Member of this House on either side of the aisle who is disquieted about this to call my office and indicate their willingness to join me in sponsoring the legislation that I have described that would set up an experience-rated fund into which States would contribute, so that the Feds do not always get hit with the cost of these things.

But absent that kind of legislation being on the books, I think we have no choice but to provide enough money to meet what we know will be unscheduled, irregular natural disasters.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart today because of the fire fighting funds being stricken from this bill.

This is an enormous problem for those of us from the West. Outside the city of Bend, Oregon, a fire burned 600 acres yesterday. This morning that fire is up to 4,000 acres; it is burning. The Forest Service tells us they will run out of money to fight these fires next

week. OMB says we can borrow from other accounts; they can get us through until the fall.

Here is what happens year after year after year after year. We get through all the paperwork and the environmental process to be able to go out to do the healthy forest things that need to be done to thin the forests, get out the flammable fuels, do all that work.

We get into fire season. We have not budgeted for it properly. We pull the money out to fight the fires. And what does the Forest Service have to do? They borrow from the accounts, and they are ready to do the work to make America's forests healthier by doing the thinning, and they put the work off for another year. We come back in the fall and the winter, we replenish the accounts for the fires, and we do the process all over again. We delay what we need to do to fix problem that will get us to where we do not have as expensive a fire to fight, because it would not be as catastrophic.

Mr. Speaker, if I could enter into an unscripted colloquy with the chairman, my concern is this.

Do we have any assurance from the Forest Service that they will be able to go ahead with these contracts that they are planning to let for this summer and the work that they are planning to do, to do forest thinning and fuels reduction and categorical exclusion work to make our forests healthier and safer, or will any of those funds be pulled back to go into fire fighting instead?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first let me explain that I agree with everything the gentleman is saying. And I would tell him that just last week when the Committee on Appropriations reported the first supplemental for this particular season, it included a substantial amount of money for fighting fires.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. And we are appreciative of that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this supplemental is still in play. It has not gone to conference, but it is still in play as part of the legislative branch appropriations bill.

This is a different bill. This one is intended to move smoothly. That is a joke, by the way.

However, that particular bill is stalled, so we are moving this one because this is a real emergency for FEMA. The ability to borrow money to fight the fires is there. They can do that.

□ 1330

However, everybody should be aware that whatever we borrow, we are going to have to pay it back anyway, so we are going to have to make up this money.

My thinking is it would have been smarter to include in this bill the fire

fighting money that is necessary. But it did not happen. I wish it had, but it did not.

We will move this bill and hopefully get to conference quickly on the other bill and take care of the problem at least of paying back the money that they have to borrow.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I understand what the gentleman says, and he has been most gracious and wonderful to work with on this issue. But the problem is, as we wait, the forests burn, the work does not get done, the issue is compounded. This is penny wise and pound foolish.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. The gentleman is absolutely accurate on this point. We would almost be better off if we took away the borrowing authority, because then they would have to put up the money. We would be like FEMA in that situation. Then they would have to put up the money, because we could not leave here without taking care of this problem.

Now what we do is let them borrow the money from the Forest Service, from BLM, ruin their other programs, put the agency in total chaos, and then, on top of that, we do not pay the money back. This is not good.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), I admire his legislation and will take a close look at it. The State of Oregon for many years has done precisely that, buy an insurance policy to help pay for the cost of fire fighting. Of course, that cost continues to go up; but we do participate in that. So I think it is a good idea to consider.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I rise in great, great frustration about where we find ourselves today, especially with the lack of notice that these funds were going to be cut out, when we thought they were going to be there.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, supplemental appropriation bills are too often used to fund expenses that can, on average, be predicted. They allow politicians to keep the annual appropriation budgets at a level that is less objectionable to fiscal conservatives. In effect it is a hoodwinking of taxpayers who think that Congress sticks to its budget.

In my eleven years in this House we never have supplemental appropriation bills increase deficit spending and total debt of the government.

A reasonable average of past supplementals should be included in annual budgets as a reserve fund that can be used for emergency or unexpected necessary spending. To do otherwise is not good spending policy.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Democratic motion to provide adequate funding for AmeriCorps, one of our Nation's most important volunteer programs.

I applaud President Bush for his support of community service. It is essential to provide volunteers with the means to do so. AmeriCorps has been a shining example of the difference volunteers can make in communities across the country.

Because of AmeriCorps, more than 38,000 people of all ages and backgrounds are helping to solve problems and strengthen communities through 108 national service projects across Missouri. Serving with national and community nonprofit organizations, faith-based groups, schools, and local agencies, these individuals tutor and mentor children, coordinate after-school programs, build homes and community gardens, conduct neighborhood patrols, organize local homeland security efforts, respond to disasters, and recruit and manage volunteers, to name a few of their contributions. These programs reach thousands of children, many of whom will be left without mentorship opportunities and after school guidance if AmeriCorps is not fully funded.

Mr. Speaker, I support the \$100 million in additional funding for AmeriCorps, and it should be provided for in this bill. The National and Community Service announced in June that there would be cuts of 50 to 90 percent to State AmeriCorps budgets and corps member slots. This must be remedied so that AmeriCorps and its volunteers can continue their selfless contributions to our country.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about a glaring omission from this emergency supplemental—funding for AmeriCorps. We must include \$100 million in funding for AmeriCorps. Without this funding AmeriCorps will suffer a nearly 60 percent cut and 20,000 service members will be eliminated.

Cutting AmeriCorps at a time when Americans are facing a stagnant economy, the worst unemployment in more than a decade, and deep cuts in State and Federal social programs is not just inconsiderate and wrong, it is unwise. That's why I have signed a letter along with many of my colleagues in Congress calling on the President and the Congressional Leadership to push for emergency funding for AmeriCorps. Young people who are qualified and willing to serve our communities should not be turned away. We should not be trampling on the spirit of service that AmeriCorps has inspired in so many of our young people to give back to our communities. Since 1994, more than 250,000 men and women have served in AmeriCorps, providing needed assistance to millions of Americans.

President Bush has called for expanding AmeriCorps from 50,000 to 75,000 volunteers. Volunteerism was a major theme of his State of the Union address and as recently as April 9, while speaking at a Connecticut community center where AmeriCorps volunteers mentor students, President Bush said, "We need to encourage programs to expand, to give people an outlet, a chance to participate." Words are cheap—the efforts of these volunteers are dear.

Without additional funding the service programs, as well as the volunteers and communities that rely on their help, will be devastated. The infrastructure of many small programs, which do not have the resources to sustain a significant budget cut for even one year, will be destroyed.

The people of central New Jersey will lose if this funding is not restored. In Trenton, New Jersey, the Crisis Ministry, the Trenton Soup

Kitchen, and the ARC (which helps kids and adults with mental disabilities) could all face cutbacks in AmeriCorps volunteers. These programs provide services that are vital to my district all the time, but especially in tough economic times. AmeriCorps is an outstanding program with a proven track record of meeting the critical needs of New Jersey's communities. We cannot allow it to be downsized. I ask my colleagues to include funding for AmeriCorps in the conference committee.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to come to the floor today to raise an issue that I know many of my colleagues have been very concerned about, and that is additional funding for AmeriCorps. Currently, AmeriCorps is facing a very severe funding crisis. Local programs around the country are facing severe cuts.

Thousands of social service organizations across the country depend on AmeriCorps for manpower and service for constituents. If we do nothing, many of these programs won't be able to survive or make up the difference in funding in another way. This means that fewer meals will be delivered to the elderly and fewer children will be mentored. When national AmeriCorps officials announced a major cut last month in grants for volunteer positions, leaders of hundreds of volunteer programs across the country warned they will have to reduce operations or shut down. These programs and the people they serve should not be made to suffer because of problems in Washington that could be addressed by short-term solutions, such as agreeing to \$100 million in supplemental funding for AmeriCorps.

While I realize that today's bill is focused only on addressing issues facing FEMA, I did want to make sure to note that a majority of members of this House signed letters in support of additional funding for AmeriCorps. We have heard from the wonderful programs all around this country that are doing such important work. I will continue to work to see if additional funding can be provided to improve this situation which is so critical to so many nonprofit programs in all of our districts.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). All time for general debate has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TOOMEY

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TOOMEY:

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

SEC. ____ (a) There is hereby rescinded a total of \$983,600,000 of the unobligated budget authority provided for fiscal year 2003 for discretionary accounts.

(b) The rescission made by subsection (a) shall be applied proportionately—

(1) to each discretionary account described in subsection (a); and

(2) within each such account, to each program, project, and activity (with programs, projects, and activities as delineated in the appropriation Act or accompanying reports

for the relevant fiscal year covering such account, or for accounts not included in appropriation Acts, as delineated in the most recently submitted President's budget).

(c) The rescission in subsection (a) shall not apply to budget authority provided for any of the following:

- (1) The Department of Defense.
- (2) The Department of Homeland Security.
- (3) The Department of Veterans Affairs.

(d) If the President determines that the full application of the rescission required by subsections (a) and (b) to any program, project, or activity in fiscal year 2003 would be excessive, the President may postpone all or a portion of the rescission for such program, project, or activity, and apply the remaining amount of such rescission to budgetary authority provided for such program, project, or activity for fiscal year 2004.

(e) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall include in the President's budget submission for fiscal year 2005 a report specifying the reductions made to each program, project, and activity pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 339, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will control the time in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by saying we do need to fund FEMA properly; but we also need to offset it, as we often have done in the past, and that is what this amendment proposes to do.

I want to follow up on the comments of my chairman, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, who was exactly right about how we got to this point. I would like to explain that a little bit and make sure that my colleagues understand that for fiscal year 2003 the President requested \$1.8 billion for FEMA disaster relief. This is routine annual spending in anticipation of the fact that we know we will have disasters in America.

In October of 2002, the House Committee on Appropriations approved \$1.8 billion in committee. In January of this year, the Senate passed an omnibus with only \$800 million, \$1 billion below the President's level.

In January of 2003, the White House issued a statement of administration policy pointing out that this underfunding of FEMA by \$1 billion would cause a problem and we would need to go back and address this. But despite that, despite the fact that everybody knew that we were intentionally and consciously underfunding FEMA by about \$1 billion, we passed an omnibus at the lower level, \$1 billion below the House Committee on Appropriations level, \$1 billion below the President's request.

And what happened to the \$1 billion? As the chairman of the Committee on the Budget correctly observed, it was used so we could spend more money in

other areas and still pretend we were living within the overall discretionary level that we had all sort of agreed upon.

Well, the fact is, this emergency is an emergency that we have created by virtue of the fact that we chose not to fund this one category, and we all knew that low-balling FEMA would not stand. So now, predictably, we are all back to back-fill the hole that we dug for ourselves in February.

As I said before, FEMA needs the money. That is not the issue about this amendment. What we are simply saying is we ought to offset this so that we do not have just a net increase in the total amount of spending. We are just trying to stick to the budget that we agreed to.

So what this amendment does is it says let us take this \$984 million and let us offset it with an across-the-board reduction in all discretionary spending programs except defense, homeland security, and veterans programs. That adds up to about five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total spending for 2003, about three-tenths of 1 percent of the spending in the categories in which we are going to make this tiny cut. It is about 29 cents out of every \$100 dollars.

Now, some people will say, well, even that is too much to cut, especially since there are only 2 months left in the fiscal year. So we have gone on to say, okay, we'll leave it to the discretion of the President to decide whether we cannot find that amount of waste, 29 cents out of \$100 is too hard to find; and if that is the case, he has all of 2004 to offset any individual accounts he so chooses.

It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, as a very reasonable and very doable amendment. Over the next 2 months, agencies would be asked to come up with 29 cents out of every \$100. And if they cannot, they get another 12 months to do it. We have a history of offsetting non-defense supplementals; and I believe with a deficit of \$455 billion, here is a way to reduce that deficit. It is what we ought to do.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), a very important member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

To my colleagues, several of us on the Committee on Appropriations have fought now for many years to try to hold the line on spending and have a record there and are in agreement with these efforts to do this. But this is not only not workable; it is actually the wrong thing to do at the wrong time, and let me explain why.

OMB, if you have not worked with them since this administration took over, "OMB" are the three most dreaded letters in Washington, D.C. They are about the business of carving and cutting, and rightly so, in many direc-

tions. But they are not offering offsets, they do not have offsets for this spending, and the administration has requested the money without offsets because even those carvers at OMB cannot find the offsets. You gentlemen know it, and you know that it will not work because of that.

I hope we do not just cede the constitutional responsibility to spend money to the executive branch. That is not in our best interests, it is not in the constitutional best interest, and I do not want to just say, administration, you can start spending money discretionarily or saving money discretionarily. That is the power that belongs here in the Congress, and that is our responsibility.

Now, the money you are talking about offsetting in the final 2 months of the fiscal year is not from mandatory programs; it is not Social Security, Medicare, any of the mandatories. It cannot come from that. It cannot come from defense, it cannot come from homeland security. So the offsets must come from about 14 percent of the Federal budget, and then it is only for one-sixth of the fiscal year. So now you are down to a very narrow pool of discretionary funds to take the offsets from. And then it does not work out to 29 cents on every \$100. It gets into specific small accounts, most of which are already obligated, most of which are obligated to be spent in the final 2 months of the fiscal year.

So, frankly, it is not a workable solution. Even though I am all for offsetting early, you cannot wait until the end of the fiscal year and say we are going to have offsets. The money is obligated by the end of the fiscal year.

Once again, the most important thing here is that we have to carry out our responsibilities and not just say, White House, you find these offsets.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues that we have 14 months to find these offsets, not just 2.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, there is not enough time in this debate to adequately acknowledge what this practice of underfunding FEMA means to the victims. So I hope we all keep that in mind here today, because while this bill is important, it is important that we change the practice of underfunding FEMA intentionally, as we did in February to take \$1 billion out of what was requested by OMB and to spread it into all these other little goodies, knowing full well that if FEMA needed the money, we would come back here breathlessly to say, oh, yes, we need a little bit of extra money; and that is exactly what happened. That is exactly what was predicted in February, and that is exactly what happened today.

The traditional definition that we have used for emergencies has always been "unforeseen, unanticipated, and unpredictable." Well, how is it that OMB and the President were able to predict that this was going to happen in February; but for some reason now, the last minute on the last day before the recess, before, as my friend from Washington says, offices are ready to close, the lights are ready to be turned off, people are thrown in the street, and that is typically what happens, as people come breathlessly to the floor with an emergency supplemental, knowing full well in February we needed money and waiting until the last minute to try and jam it through.

We are probably going to jam it through again, and it is only, gosh, I hope my mother is not listening, it is only \$1 billion. But we have got a deficit, and I want to see all those deficit hawks, all those Democrats in particular that have been down here on the floor railing about the deficit, to come down here today and remind themselves and their friends about how important it is to not add an additional \$1 billion to the deficit.

What the gentleman from Pennsylvania says is let us find the money. If you do not like this offset, fix it in conference. That is the power you have. The chairman knows he can increase the bill in conference. You can also fix this amendment and find a true offset in conference. Let us pay for this disaster.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of February's bill, first of all, that was not our fault. We were not permitted to bring the bills in the regular period of time for fiscal year 2003. That was not our fault.

The fact that the numbers were different in February, understand that in February almost half of the fiscal year was gone, and there was not any use funding the early part of the fiscal year because it was already over with.

It is easy for the budget resolution to make assumptions. They can assume that you can find \$7 billion, for example, in the plug that was in this 2004 budget resolution. The Committee on Appropriations has to be real. What we write in our bills becomes law. It has to be real. It has to be realistic. That is what we do. We cannot satisfy everybody.

I want to compliment my friend from Pennsylvania for keeping our feet to the fire on spending. He does a really good job. And we try to balance out those who want to spend more and those who want to spend less, just to make sure that we do a responsible job in funding the government and funding essential operations. So I compliment the gentleman. Sometimes I agree with him, and sometimes I do not.

In this case, I must disagree with him. I do so because his amendment would cut money from the FBI, Drug Enforcement Agency, technology for State and local enforcement. It would

cut for embassy security, it would cut NIH, Centers for Disease Control, Head Start, special education grants, grants for disadvantaged students. Cuts would also deal with HIV-AIDS and child survival, world hunger programs, aid to Israel, and the list is very long.

Remember, there are only 2 months left in this fiscal year. If this was across-the-board for the whole 12 months, it might not be so bad, but this is only for 2 months left in the fiscal year.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the chairman, what portion of all Federal spending is actually appropriated by the appropriations?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The answer is the discretionary spending is about one-third of the total government spending. It is amazing to me how some of those who are constantly arguing about discretionary spending vote for the big mandatory programs, the back-door spending. So it is two to one.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is that two-thirds of the Federal spending that the mandatory accounts account for? Are those accounts adding to the Federal deficit even as we speak?

□ 1345

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Absolutely.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Has the Committee on the Budget done anything about mandatory spending?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have not found much success in the proper committee's dealing with that.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield? Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will yield after I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY.)

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY.)

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

Mr. Speaker, one observation, and then one question.

I do not appreciate having to take lectures from the Committee on the Budget. Let me tell my colleague the sleight of hand that that committee played. They pretended that they provided additional money for veterans. They pretended that they provided additional money for education and for special education in order to get the votes of the moderate Republicans in here for the resolution.

And then, after they pretended, on an account-by-account basis, that they had provided the money, then that same Committee on the Budget provided \$7.2 billion in undistributed reductions and assigned those reductions to our committee, without having the guts to spell out what those reductions should be.

And then they squawked when the gentleman from Florida tried to distribute those reductions. That is what is going on here.

The difference is that the gentleman from Florida has to run a real railroad train, it is not an Alice in Wonderland train.

Now, with respect to the amendment at hand, I simply want Members to know how they are going to vote. I mean, the Republicans are running this show, so it is immaterial to me which of your factions wins the argument on that side.

But if this amendment passes, you will be cutting \$15 million from the FBI. You will forcing Israel to write a \$12 million check back to us because they have already gotten their money. The Drug Enforcement Agency will have to cut \$5 million. The Colombian drug initiative, which was just defended in this House this week, you will have to cut \$1 million out of that. You will have to cut \$15 million out of the Cancer Institute. And you will have to cut \$600,000 out of Meals-on-Wheels.

Now, I am not going to debate whether you ought to do any of that stuff; I simply want Members to know what they will be voting on if they vote for the amendment.

I would also simply say that I hope, and I am confident, that this amendment has more to do with concerns about budget than it does a Pennsylvania Senate primary.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) and remind my colleagues that we have enacted across-the-board spending cuts in 3 of the last 4 fiscal years.

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I come to this floor in the reality of representing a district, 10 counties of which are, at this hour, recognized as Federal disaster areas. The flood of 2003 saw the waters of the Wabash River and the St. Mary's River rise and devastate families and homes in much of the eastern Indiana district that I represent.

But there is another rising tide that I am here to support the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) on as he seeks this amendment's passage, and that is the rising tide of red ink that is engulfing the American taxpayer, and a modest effort today that we attempt to stem.

The Federal deficit today stands at \$455 billion, and I would offer humbly, with deep respect for the gentleman from Florida and his outstanding leadership of this Committee on Appropriations, that now is not the time to add another \$1 billion, another new massive player to that deficit.

Two important points, I think, in this discussion. We have heard from the Committee on the Budget chairman, and I would not enter that debate

between chairmen, as unwise as that might be, but it is accurate to say that the dollars that are being asked for today are not in the budget resolution that we passed narrowly on this floor.

Number two, in defense of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the House Members gathered here on both sides of the aisle, the money that we are considering today was in the House bill. We did our work, it seems to me important to say today; the House Committee on Appropriations met the President's request for FEMA, and somewhere in the midst of the conference committee, it was lost.

As people across the 10 counties of my eastern Indiana district struggle against the weight of the flood of 2003, I think we ought to try and do two things at once today: pass the Toomey amendment; speed much-needed relief by the end of this day to make sure FEMA has the resources it needs, but speed relief to the American taxpayer who earnestly desires that we confront the rising tide of red ink in Washington.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time. I want to associate myself with his remarks and the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

I must say, I worry about the Interior Appropriations, an across-the-board cut like this, especially since it would affect forest fire fighting. It would also affect forest health. Those would both be cut. And all of the other accounts would be cut at a time when we are going to have to borrow money from those accounts to fight the fires of this year, because we do not have enough money in the budget to do that.

So I would say to everyone here, I think that the prudent thing to do, since we do not know all of the consequences of the amendment, and we know that a number of them are bad, and it is the last two months of the year, is to defeat the Toomey amendment and pass the supplemental.

The President of the United States happens to be the person, by the way, who is asking for this money, and he did not ask that it be offset. And this OMB has been as tough on spending as any in modern history.

So they want it as an emergency. They do not want to see their programs cut any further.

So I think, with the risk to fire fighting across this country, we should defeat the Toomey amendment.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time just to respond to my very distinguished appropriations chairman and subcommittee chairman to report to them that I heard their personal conversations to me about the need to take on mandatory spending and not

just fight about discretionary spending. That is why in the budget this year we not only asked for the 1 percent from all of the mandatory spending; the first time that has been done, it was because of the interest of the Committee on Appropriations, in particular, that we took on that task.

No, it did not complete the final version of the budget, because there were not enough people who were gutsy enough to do it. I know the gentleman from Kentucky is. I am, as well.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, assuming, and the gentleman is correct about its being in the budget as a request, but where is the reconciliation bill that makes that happen?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is a fair comment. But to suggest that the Committee on the Budget has not been doing its work with regard to mandatory spending is what troubled me in the gentleman's comments.

The gentleman is right that the proof will be in the final product, but I would just say that the committee has attempted to at least fix this problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa and ask him to yield to me.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman did not misunderstand my comments. I agree, the gentleman has, as chairman, done more than previous budget chairmen to recognize the problem with mandatory versus discretionary; and I compliment the gentleman for that.

My comment relative to and in response to the question of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) about the two-thirds, one-third is a fact. But again, that was not to be a criticism of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, because I know that you and I have talked, and I know that you understand totally and you agree that if we cannot control mandatory, we are never going to control discretionary.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, if I can reclaim the time and just report that we have had one successful bill that already has moved to the floor that reduced, for waste, fraud, and abuse, \$33 billion in a mandatory program called Medicare. It was part of the bill that was voted on and passed by this House.

So, again, to suggest that nothing has been done is not correct.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

I would just remind my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations that in addition to the Committee on the Budget, I offered an alternative budget that actually would significantly re-

strain the growth of mandatory spending. Very specifically, I frequently vote against many mandatory spending programs as well.

But what we are here today to try to do is not cut a dime out of FEMA. What we want to do is just say, let us offset this. It is 29 cents out of \$100. It is not for two months, it is over 14 months, and any single individual line item, if the President thinks it is unreasonable to try to find 29 cents out of the \$100 because there are only two months left, and no doubt there are many categories in which that would be difficult, there are another whole 12 months, all of fiscal year 2004, to find those offsets.

This is not that hard. Any family can find 29 cents out of \$100 in their family budget. Any business can do likewise. We have an obligation to do the same thing for our taxpayers, especially at a time when we are running the kind of deficits that we are.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, and when this amendment succeeds, which I hope it will, and I am sure every Blue Dog is going to vote for it, because I hear them all the time talking about how upset they are about the deficit; well, here is an absolute, straightforward way to reduce the deficits. I am looking forward to a lot of votes from that side of the aisle. I am looking forward to the passage of my amendment, and then passage of the underlying supplemental.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

As a fiscal conservative I certainly can appreciate the spirit of what this amendment seeks to accomplish. But as a member of the House I cannot support the abrogation of our constitutional "power of the purse" responsibilities to the executive branch.

The funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency in this supplemental is precisely the level to meet the unexpected—and emergency—disaster expenses the Bush Administration has said it requires.

The amendment before the House stipulates that the executive branch make unspecified cuts to unspecified programs. Funds could be cut from the FBI, DEA, FEMA, Special Education, NASA, transportation and other projects that this House has already acted upon. It is the responsibility of the legislative branch to make these types of funding decisions not the executive branch.

Early on in my tenure I had the chance to support a recession bill that pared back billions in previously appropriated funding. So my dispute with this amendment is much more about process than substance.

This underlying bill is fiscally responsible. It is important to note that it is almost \$1 billion below the original amount requested by the President. If we are serious about fiscal responsibility, we should identify specific programs for specific reductions. This amendment shirks the difficult choices in favor of an easy vote.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment and pass the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Toomey amendment.

Just before I came here for this series of votes, we were meeting with the FBI. The FBI needs additional resources because they have taken personnel out of crime fighting and drug fighting and are now putting them in with regard to homeland security. They need more people. Then they have taken people off the streets that are working on drugs. So this would not be good for the FBI, aside from the homeland security.

Lastly, across-the-board cuts never work. The best way to do something, if there is a particular program that you want to cut, you go after it. But across the board, to make the FBI take that cut now, and DEA, would not be good for the country, not good for crime, and not good for the fight against drugs.

So on that, I strongly urge a "no" vote on the Toomey amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 339, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

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

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the previous order of the House earlier today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) are postponed.

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2861, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 2861 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 338, no amendment to the bill may be offered except:

pro forma amendments by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or

their designees for the purpose of debate;

an amendment by Mr. WALSH striking provisions in title III and title IV, which may be offered en bloc;

Two amendments by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, each regarding medical care for veterans;

an amendment by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey striking section 114, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. EDWARDS regarding medical care for veterans;

an amendment by Mr. STEARNS regarding medical and prosthetic research;

an amendment by Mr. KIRK regarding sharing agreements with the Department of Defense;

an amendment by Mr. NADLER regarding the housing certificate fund, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. FATTAH or Mr. DAVIS of Illinois regarding public housing, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. NADLER regarding housing opportunities, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by Mrs. CAPPS regarding science and technology programs on the Environmental Protection Agency;

an amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida regarding environmental programs and management;

□ 1400

an amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) regarding environmental programs and management;

an amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) regarding hazardous substance Superfund, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) regarding NASA;

an amendment by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) regarding beneficiary travel;

an amendment by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) regarding the Clean Air Act, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) regarding the Buy America Act;

an amendment by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) or the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) regarding veterans integrated service networks;

an amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) regarding veterans;

an amendment by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) regarding Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services;

an amendment by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) regarding redesignation of Hawaiian counties;

an amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) or the gen-

tlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) regarding homeless assistance grants, debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) or the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) regarding environmental programs and management;

two amendments by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) regarding NASA, each of which shall be debatable for 5 minutes;

an amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) regarding human testing of pesticides;

an amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) regarding VA clinics, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes.

Each amendment may be offered only by the Member designated or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Except as specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. An amendment shall be considered to fit the description stated in this request if it addresses in whole or in part the object described.

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

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly will not object because we have been working on this for a long time, but I would still like to point out to the Members of the House that while I certainly welcome this time agreement for planning purposes, Members need to understand that if everyone included in this agreement exercises the full amount of time listed in this agreement, we will still be here about 9 o'clock this evening. So if people are trying to catch their airplanes and they have amendments, many of these amendments are subject to a point of order and many of these amendments are probably not going to get very many votes. So I think Members need to ask themselves how much time they want to take in situations like that.

The committee is doing everything it can to get Members out of here so they can catch their planes, but we will need the cooperation of the individual Members, or it is not going to happen.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to confirm what the gentleman has said.

I recall yesterday the dialogue between the minority whip and the majority leader that if we work things out that Members could probably consider leaving here about 5 o'clock. And I know that, if we continue to do everything that is on this unanimous consent list, that is just not going to happen. So Members need to be aware that