

not help gasoline prices to go down in this country.

Our refinery capacity has got a lot of notice lately in Congress, and this is something we can do in the short term to help that—repair hurricane damage at oil importing ports like the Port of Houston.

The Houston delegation—myself, JOHN CULBERSON, TOM DELAY, AL GREEN, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, KEVIN BRADY, MICHAEL McCaul, TED POE, and our Texas colleague on the Appropriations Committee CHET EDWARDS all recently sent a letter to the Committee and Subcommittee requesting this \$30 million in emergency damage repair funding for the next Supplemental.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the FY06 Energy and Water Appropriations Bill.

Chairman HOBSON, Ranking Member VISCOSKY, and their staffs have worked tirelessly to produce a good bill and they deserve much praise for their efforts.

This bill goes a long way in strengthening our Nation's water infrastructure. If this past hurricane season has taught us anything, it is that we must ensure an adequate level of protection for our coastal cities and those areas prone to flooding.

The modest investments included in this bill can save billions in disaster recovery needs.

Our Nation's water infrastructure is also critical to building the economy. Our waterways provide a low cost way to move agriculture commodities and manufactured goods to the world market. This bill will help maintain and strengthen these arteries, ensuring access for American producers.

This legislation also includes critical funding for Nuclear power and our ability to store nuclear waste, namely the Yucca Mountain repository. The funding level is lower than what the House agreed to earlier this year, but the lower funding is justified by the Energy Department's recent changes to the project. What is important is that the Yucca Mountain project and Federal spent fuel management moves forward.

The legislation's funding for the Corps of Engineers, nuclear energy R&D and the Yucca Mountain program helps ensure a vibrant future for American water ways, flood control and nuclear energy.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Chairman HOBSON and Ranking Member VISCOSKY for their hard work and encourage all of them to support this bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-68)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the Iran emergency declared by Executive Order 12170 on November 14, 1979, is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 2005. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on November 12, 2004 (69 FR 65513).

Our relations with Iran have not yet returned to normal, and the process of implementing the January 19, 1981, agreements with Iran is still underway. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared on November 14, 1979, with respect to Iran, beyond November 14, 2005.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, November 9, 2005.

□ 1300

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include tabular and extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2862.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2862, SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 538, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 538, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 7, 2005, at page H9713.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I am pleased to bring to the floor today the conference report on H.R. 2862, the fiscal year 2006 Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), for his support throughout the process. Together, we were able to get a strong bill passed by the House with a vote of 418 to 7. Also, I want to thank our Senate counterparts, Chairman SHELBY and Senator MIKULSKI, as well as Chairman McCONNELL and Senator LEAHY.

I also want to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) for his help and cooperation with this, and also the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Within a very tight allocation, we were able to provide funding for a variety of critical national priorities. The conference report provides \$21.4 billion for the Department of Justice, \$784 million above fiscal year 2005 and \$1.1 billion over the budget request.

The conference agreement includes \$5.8 billion for the FBI, which is \$15 million above the budget request. The bill will provide for additional agents, analysts, and support staff to address terrorism and espionage threats. And keep in mind that last week the stories broke about how the Chinese, that, unfortunately, this body gave the Most Favored Nation trading status to, has been spying aggressively against our country, and the latest spying episode dealt with the B-1 bomber.

In addition, the bill provides funding to address deficiencies identified through external reviews, including a \$20 million increase for the FBI Academy, a \$20 million increase for additional secure space, and a \$14 million increase to improve information technology program management, a \$5 million for retention and recruitment, a \$26 million increase for translators, and a \$70 million increase for the Terrorist Screening Center.

The conference agreement includes \$12 million above the request for the Marshals Service to enhance the protection of the Judiciary and fugitive apprehension programs.

For DEA, Madam Speaker, the bill restores proposed cuts for Mobile Enforcement Teams and the Demand Reduction program, and directs these efforts to focus on meth enforcement. The conference report does not include the Combat Meth Act that was attached to the Senate bill. While I

strongly support the bill's intent to address this destructive drug, there were some concerns raised about the Senate language.

The Judiciary Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee, who are the committees of jurisdiction on this subject, are addressing these concerns. In fact, today I understand the House Judiciary Committee is marking up a meth bill. I look forward to voting for Chairmen SENSENBRENNER and BARTON's bill when it comes to the House floor.

The conference report fully funds the ATF's request and includes a \$20 million increase for Violent Crime Impact Teams to help those communities most impacted by gangs and violent criminals. There is a growing problem of gang and gang violence throughout the country.

The conference agreement provides \$2.7 billion for State and local law enforcement, \$1.1 billion above the administration's request, including \$416.5 million for Byrne Justice Assistance grants and \$405 million for State Criminal Alien Assistance. And that funding really was due to Chairman LEWIS, and also Mr. DREIER and Mr. KOLBE, when we dealt with that issue on the floor. That was a big issue.

The bill also includes \$109 million to address critical DNA backlogs, \$387 for violence against women prevention and \$343 million for juvenile justice.

There is \$16.5 billion included for NASA, including funding for the President's vision for space exploration. We have also restored funding for aeronautics research, which the administration had proposed to reduce.

For the National Science Foundation, Madam Speaker, the bill includes \$5.65 billion, which is \$48 million above the request. This increase for basic scientific research and science education is critical to ensuring that we continue to lead in innovation and competitiveness, which is necessary if we are to retain our position in the world economy.

Many people are concerned that with the test scores in math, science, physics, chemistry and biology, and the number of engineers we have, we are falling behind. So even in this tight period of the budget, we were able to dramatically increase that, and there will be a conference that was directed by the supplemental appropriations in December, chaired by Congressman VERN EHLERS and also Chairman BOEHLERT and others, with some of the best minds to come together to attempt to deal with this issue. Rather than just talking about it, they will constructively deal with it and get the administration on board. So I would hope and I pray that the President will address this issue in his State of the Union message next year.

The conference report includes \$888 million for the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide the necessary resources to protect investors from corporate fraud.

For the State Department, we have provided \$9.6 billion, including \$1.6 billion, the full requested level for embassy security upgrades. It also includes \$1.53 billion for public diplomacy programs including international broadcasting, focusing on expanded programs for the Arab and Muslim world.

At the Department of Commerce, the conference report provides \$6.6 billion for the Department of Commerce and other trade-related agencies. Increases will result in more accurate economic statistics, improved weather forecasting, and more accurate and timely census data.

The bill also includes an increase for the Nation's trade agencies. This will help former Member Mr. Portman to negotiate, enforce and verify free and fair trade agreements. It also has an amendment offered by Congresswoman NORTHUP, which is very, very important with regard to this whole issue of negotiating treaties.

Overall, Mr. Speaker, the conference report agreement represents a sound and fair resolution to the many issues we faced in conference, and it does so in a fiscally responsible manner. I would urge my colleagues to support this conference.

Before I reference some people, I want to say there is another issue we attempted to deal with and were not able to get agreement on, and that is to direct the Department of State in a period of 60 days to come up with a policy to deal with how we take care of the families of those who were lost in the bombing of the American Embassy in Beirut in 1983; the October bombing of the U.S. Marine barracks, where 241 Marines were killed; the Tanzania Embassy bombings; the Kenya Embassy bombings, and the USAID employees that were killed.

It was a strange experience because we were operating in good faith, trying to get this, and some lawyers who got involved in this process really created a roadblock and a problem for this. Now, because of those lawyers, this is not being carried. So we are going to be doing a letter to Secretary Rice asking that the State Department come up with a program and a policy and deal with this.

We have a moral obligation to the families, the families of those killed and those still alive with regard to the hostages in the Iranian Embassy. We have to deal with those issues and, hopefully, deal with them without the lawyers being involved. I think we have to help and work with the families.

I also want to thank, Madam Speaker, at the end here, to thank the members of my subcommittee staff who have put in very long hours to produce the FY 2006 Science, State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriation bill. With the addition of Science to the subcommittee, the staff has had to work even harder this year to produce a bill that I believe will help the country.

I want to particularly thank Mike Ringler, clerk of the subcommittee,

who has led the subcommittee through the House appropriations process. I would also like to thank Christine Kojac, John Martens, Anne Marie Goldsmith, Joel Kaplan, and Clelia Alvarado for their tireless, and if I could underline in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the word "tireless," if I could put a black line under it so people would see it, their tireless efforts. Their work is much appreciated.

In my personal office I want to thank Dan Scandling, my Chief of Staff, and Jan Shaffron, who has been with me for 25 years, and J.T. Griffin, Samantha Stockman, and Courtney Schlieter for their efforts and working with the subcommittee.

Also, there were many other subcommittee members' staffs who were very much involved in all of this. From the minority, I want to thank David Pomerantz, Michelle Burkett, and Rob Nabors for their insight and input on the bill. And also from Congressman MOLLOHAN's personal office, I want to thank Sally Moorehead and Julie Aaronson. As in the past, we have worked in a bipartisan manner to draft this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I ask for a "yea" vote on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2006 appropriations conference report for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce and related agencies.

Madam Speaker, right at the beginning, I would especially like to thank Chairman WOLF and his staff: Celia Alvarado, Anne Marie Goldsmith, Joel Kaplan, Christine Kojac, John Martens, and Mike Ringler for their help, their outstanding work on this bill, their professionalism, and for their help in shepherding this bill with all its jurisdictions through the appropriations process.

I would also like to thank the minority appropriations staff, Michelle Burkett and David Pomerantz, and my personal staff, Julie Aaronson and Sally Moorehead, for their hard work throughout this long process.

Madam Speaker, let me especially express my appreciation to Chairman WOLF for his capability, for his adroit management of a complicated bill with a lot of jurisdictions; and I cannot stress enough the kindness and fairness that he has shown to me, to our committee staff, and to the House minority throughout this process. While Chairman WOLF and I may have had disagreements, we may not have agreed on every provision in this bill, Chairman WOLF has listened to our arguments and, where appropriate, he has looked for ways to accommodate our requests, and we thank him for that.

Madam Speaker, this is a good bill. It provides \$57.85 billion. That is an increase of \$1.6 billion above last year's

level for very diverse programs; programs that fund our Federal and local law enforcement activities; programs that invest in our government's major science activities; programs that construct and defend our embassies abroad; programs that provide support to our small businesses, and those which help promote our economic development.

There are many high points in this bill. The Department of Justice and all the law enforcement programs that it manages are at \$1.1 billion above the President's request and \$784 million above fiscal year 2005, while we are disappointed in the funding available for local and State law enforcement.

Science activity is up, with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration funded at the requested level of \$16.5 billion. That is \$260 million above fiscal year 2005.

The National Science Foundation receives \$5.65 billion in this bill, an increase of \$181 million above last year and \$49 million above the President's budget request.

The State Department and Broadcasting Board of Governors, while funded below the President's request, receives \$9.6 billion for worldwide security upgrades, diplomatic and consular programs, and international broadcasting.

□ 1315

For our local communities, we restored the Economic Development Administration's funding to last year's level, rejecting in the process the President's proposal to eliminate the Economic Development Administration.

In addition, we rejected his proposal to consolidate and shrink proposals that provide Federal investment to strengthen our local communities.

In this bill we also included language supporting the role of the economic development districts and reaffirming our commitment to the minimum 50 percent Federal match for local dollars. My constituents and those in rural areas were very vocal on these two points, and I am pleased that the chairman was supportive and that we could be responsive to those requests.

Madam Speaker, I am concerned that this year, like last year, we were not able to provide the \$80 million needed to subsidize the 7(a) loan program in the Small Business Administration. I have seen firsthand the chilling effect that increased fees have had on small businesses in my State, and I hope we will monitor the 7(a) program during the next year and evaluate to what extent this lack of funding creates a problem for our small businesses accessing needed capital.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I would like to draw special attention to section 624 of the conference report. It reads as follows, "None of the funds made available in this act shall be used in any way whatsoever to support or justify the use of torture of any official

or contract employee of the United States Government."

Madam Speaker, this provision reflects Chairman WOLF's values and his unwavering commitment to human rights. It is the chairman's initiative, and it is to his credit that it is included in our bill.

Madam Speaker, again, I want to thank Chairman WOLF, and I urge Members to support this conference report.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), a member of the Science Committee, who is also a physicist.

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I commend him for his work on this report as well as on the original House bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report of the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006. I want to recognize and pay tribute to the tremendous effort of Chairman WOLF and his staff, as well as the ranking member on the minority side and his staff, that they have exerted to meet the challenge of fairly balancing this bill.

Madam Speaker, their hard work is commendable, and I want to thank them for their tireless work.

I would like to speak in particular about one part of the bill, the National Science Foundation, better known as NSF. New to the subcommittee this year, NSF is the only Federal agency dedicated solely to supporting fundamental scientific research. While it represents a relatively small part of the overall budget, it is an extremely important part. NSF funding accounts for one-fifth of all Federal support for basic research and 40 percent of physical science research at academic institutions.

I am delighted that Chairman WOLF shares an appreciation for the critical role innovation has played in our economy and national security, as well as its unique tie to education and the work supported by the NSF.

In May of this year, 167 Members of Congress joined with me in signing a letter to support an increase for the budget of the National Science Foundation. Since the NSF was funded below the President's request last year, I am very grateful that the conferees saw fit to reverse this declining trend and return to sustaining the level of funding for NSF. The negotiated funding level for NSF in fiscal year 2006 of \$5.65 billion reflects a strong commitment to NSF's job of developing our future skilled workforce and laying the foundation for innovative technologies in the fields of telecommunications, medicine and defense.

Furthermore, I want to acknowledge the committee's work to restore cuts endured by several programs within

the Education Directorate at NSF. The Math and Science Partnership Program budget has been greatly diminished since 2002, when it was funded at \$160 million. I am grateful that the conferees have signaled their recognition of the importance of this program by funding this program at \$64 million, \$4 million above the requested level.

We know that other countries are investing and outperforming the United States in the area of math and science education. We will not be able to compete successfully with the rest of the world if our workforce is not on the cutting edge of these fields, and we need to maintain these important programs that support math and science education.

Also within this bill, I want to briefly mention my appreciation that the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program, MEP, at the National Institute for Standards and Technology has been funded at \$106 million. These funds will allow MEP centers across the country to continue their vital services for small- and medium-sized manufacturers that are not replicated by any other private or public organization.

Balancing many pressing national priorities within this tight budget climate is certainly a challenge. We must increase our funding of research and development because it is the foundation for increased innovation, economic vitality and national security. I look forward to continuing to work with Chairman WOLF and my colleagues to improve our support for NSF fundamental research and education programs in future years. I certainly encourage the administration and the President to increase their funding request for the National Science Foundation in the next budget that we will process next year.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to say at the outset I have a great deal of admiration for the gentleman from Virginia. I think he is one of the best committee chairmen in this House, and I think he has treated the substance of this bill absolutely down the center, and I think he has dealt with the majority and the minority in a very even-handed fashion. I respect that and appreciate that.

Frankly, I had thought I would be voting for this bill as I have for the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, and as I intend to work for the Energy and Water conference report. But I find myself unable to support this bill in the final instance for a number of reasons which have very little to do with the gentleman from Virginia or the gentleman from West Virginia. I have three basic problems with this bill.

First of all, the conferees stripped the Sanders amendment out of the bill.

I think this Congress has done a miserable job of oversight with respect to Iraq, a miserable job with respect to oversight of the PATRIOT Act and a number of other security-related issues.

I might not be so concerned about the fact that the conferees stripped out the amendment which precluded the administration from snooping into people's use of libraries, I might not feel so strongly about it if I felt that the Congress had a better record of conducting oversight hearings on this, but I do not. So under those circumstances, I think what the committee has done in stripping out that language is quite dangerous.

Secondly, I would say there is a kabuki dance going on in this town with respect to local and State law enforcement funding. This bill now effectively funds State and local law enforcement at a level which is \$1 billion less than it was in fiscal year 2001.

What happens each year is that the President makes very large cuts in that program. This committee then restores a significant portion of those funds, but still leaving us below the funding level for last year. As a result, this bill is \$300 million below last year in terms of its aid for State and local law enforcement assistance; and last year was \$226 million below the year before. I think that is headed in the wrong direction.

Lastly, I think there is one provision in this bill which is especially mean and that is the funding level for legal services. Legal services is the program that we provide in order to enable indigent people to have some access to civil courts, and yet this bill reduces funding for legal services below last year's level.

As I said in the conference, every day we come onto this floor and we pledge allegiance to the flag, and at the end of that pledge, we talk about our dedication to providing "liberty and justice for all". I do not think anybody can stand on this floor with a straight face and say that anymore. I think, if you vote to cut legal services, what you are really saying is that we stand for liberty and justice "for those who can pay for it".

I do not think that is what this country is supposed to be all about. By the time you take into account not just the nominal number in this bill for legal service, but when you take into account the across-the-board cut that has already been applied, and when you add to that the additional across-the-board cut which is expected to be applied at some point in the process before we are finished, you have substantially weakened funding for legal services. I think that is an indefensible thing to do.

I would point out that these reductions are being made at the same time that NASA is being given upwards of \$2 billion to deal with a manned mission to Mars. I have nothing against going to Mars. I think in the long term it is

a wonderful expansion of the human endeavor. But I do believe that to add that kind of funding to NASA for a Mars mission and to make the kind of tax cuts for the most wealthy people in this society that the Congress is going to be supporting in the coming days, while at the same time we are cutting legal service funds for the indigent, cutting aid for local and State law enforcement grants, I think that represents a wrong set of priorities. I think it is taking us in the wrong direction.

I note that this subcommittee has been reorganized at the demand of the ex-majority leader on the other side of the aisle, Mr. DELAY, who last year, representing Houston, wanted to see to it that NASA had a clear track to funding increases. So he did a very effective job of representing his district by moving NASA into this subcommittee where it has to compete against programs such as I have just mentioned. And as a result, NASA is at the front of the train and some of these other priorities are at the back of the train. I regret that.

I do appreciate very much the dedication that the gentleman has shown to the science budget. I think the National Science Foundation is one of the keys to our future economic growth. I congratulate him for that. But in the end, for the reasons I have cited, I am going to feel constrained to cast a "no" vote on the passage of the conference report.

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

I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). On the issue of legal services, we are above the administration's request, but I understand what the gentleman is saying. I am somewhat sympathetic to it, too. But for the record, we are \$12.5 million above the administration's request. But the gentleman's comments are telling.

On the issue of oversight on the war, I agree with the gentleman. I have been to Iraq three times, and I have come up with a proposal asking the administration to have fresh eyes on the target, 10 people who are men and women of integrity and honesty and character to go and come back and report.

□ 1330

So I think the gentleman is right. I feel very strongly we should have major oversight on the operation of the war. Also, I think the administration has to do a better job, and I think oversight would tell this if it were to come back and tell the ramifications of failure. I think should we fail in Iraq, the ramifications to this country are very serious with regard to terrorism. So by having oversight, I think those ramifications would come out. But I agree with Mr. OBEY. I think there should be much more aggressive oversight.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report with deep gratitude to the ranking member and the chairman and excellent staff work. I believe that Chairman WOLF, while he does not like for people to talk about him, is a man of conscience, and I believe that the God who created us speaks to us and through us through our conscience, and I am grateful that he is so sensitive to the needs of humanity.

We talk a lot about terror. There is terror in a lot of homes in this country because methamphetamine production has crept into our communities, particularly in rural America. It hit Tennessee really hard. And in this bill, the staff and the chairman and the ranking member have responded very well, and I am grateful for that because we have got to attack this problem. At a time of need to tighten our belts and get back towards a balanced budget, we have to do some things, or it is going to cost us a whole lot more later.

In Tennessee we started with a U.S. Attorney-led partnership of local, State, and Federal governments and a task force that has now grown to the whole State, and it is a model for the Nation on cooperation between local, State, and Federal governments so that they can interdict, they can actually get a conviction, not just an indictment but a conviction; and we now are second in the Nation in attacking this problem and busting these labs and running these people back into the woods.

We have got to change State laws and Federal laws, but it takes support; and this committee has been very responsive, and I am grateful for that; and I think the House should support this continued effort to fight methamphetamine production in this country.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO). There is no member of the minority of our subcommittee who has made a greater contribution to the jurisdictions, to the funding in our bill than he.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for the very kind words.

I rise in support of the conference report, and I congratulate the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from West Virginia for not only the way in which they continue to work together but the way in which they work with all members of the subcommittee and, indeed, all Members of the House.

I am especially pleased that we were able to fund the Census Bureau at the higher House level. This will allow for the continuation of the important American Community Survey which provides accurate and up-to-date information on housing, demographic and socioeconomic conditions in our country. As we know, there was a period of

time there during conference negotiations where this program was in danger.

I am also glad that NOAA was funded at a higher level than that included in the House bill. In the aftermath of the recent hurricanes, we all recognize the important role of our National Weather Service.

This is the first year, Madam Speaker, that the Science portfolio was added to this subcommittee's jurisdiction, and I am satisfied that both NASA and the National Science Foundation received more funding than was appropriated in 2005. NASA has a vital role in maintaining our Nation's leadership in science and technology through its educational programs, in particular, and in its broad portfolio of university-based research. I am happy that the National Science Foundation's funding will allow for the continuation of their education programs, which benefit so many of our students.

I am also pleased that the State Department funding was provided so that there would be worldwide security improvements. We must always be vigilant in guarding the safety of those who so ably represent us both here and abroad.

The FBI is the biggest winner in this bill, receiving an increase of \$547 million; and as the chairman knows and the ranking member knows, I have always felt that the FBI should get whatever resources it needs. But I would be remiss, Madam Speaker, if I did not briefly mention that I have been troubled by many of the bureau's practices of late, including its handling of the Filiberto Ojeda-Rios incident in Puerto Rico, which should not have resulted in his killing. I am also concerned about the FBI's ever-increasing use of national security letters. As the FBI continues to adjust to its new powers and responsibilities, I hope that we in this country will continue to scrutinize the FBI's activities to ensure that we do not witness repeats of the abuses that have tainted the organization in the past.

Before closing, let me just say that I have often said in subcommittee, Madam Speaker, that if in the process of getting the bad guys, we throw away the Constitution and take away the civil liberties of the good guys, then the terrorists would have won and we as a Nation would have lost. With that in mind, I support the conference report, and I ask for its passage.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his comments and for his friendship and for working together as we have over the years.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to Coach OSBORNE, a Member of Congress from Nebraska. As I was looking over, I thought of another great coach. This is a great coach. Another great coach is Joe Paterno, who, when I watched the game on Saturday, and I do not know if the gentleman from Nebraska watched the game, the announcers

kept saying that he was 79 years old and wears white socks, but what they did not keep talking about is he is a man of such honesty and integrity and character. I think the two of them must have been carved out of the same thing. I am sorry the gentleman is going to be leaving here.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I object to the gentleman's words. He is reminding me of a painful loss to Penn State.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I forgot my colleague is from Wisconsin. We are going to miss having Mr. OSBORNE here, but we look forward to working with him as Governor of Nebraska.

Mr. OSBORNE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for those kind words. I guess I would like to reciprocate by saying that I have worked with a great many people in the House and no one has been more responsive and more interested in matters dealing with law enforcement and children than the chairman. So we really appreciate it.

I am sorry that Wisconsin got beat, but everybody has got to lose sometime. Of course, Barry Alvarez is a good friend of mine, too.

I rise in support of the conference report, and I would like to particularly thank Chairman WOLF for restoring some of the Byrne grant funds. As many people know, Byrne grant funds were zeroed out in the President's budget. It was a tremendous effort to get any money back in there for Byrne grants. And for those who do not know, Byrne grants basically support local law enforcement as we attack the methamphetamine problem.

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) talked about meth a little bit earlier, and I would like to just take a second to show people graphically what has happened in regard to this problem.

In 1990 there were two States, California and Texas, that each had more than 20 methamphetamine labs. The rest of the country was relatively free of this problem. Then we look at what is present in 2004, and we see the spread of methamphetamine from west to east, just a few States in the northeast that are preserved to some degree from meth, and that will soon change, I am certain.

In most of these counties in most of these States in the western and the central part of the United States, more than half of the jail cells are now occupied by meth addicts or people who have had meth-related crimes. I would say more than half of the child deaths, child assaults, foster care cases in these regions are due to methamphetamine abuse.

So we really appreciate the restoration of these funds. It is not what everybody would like, but it is certainly going to keep these law enforcement people going for a period of time.

Also, this conference report provides funds to clean up toxic material from meth labs, which is much needed. Above all, it encourages the Drug En-

forcement Agency to establish a methamphetamine task force. Currently, we do not feel that the DEA has a comprehensive plan to attack the problem of methamphetamine, which is really covering the whole country and is certainly becoming more and more of a problem on the east coast. So this part of the bill is excellent. I appreciate the chairman's work. I would like to thank him one more time for his efforts.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

I want to begin by saying that I think that our ranking member, DAVID OBEY, has stated well the concerns that many of us have with respect to some provisions of the bill that would, in this case, cut legal services to the poor; and the stripping of the Sanders amendment was certainly a problem because that amendment would have prevented the search of library reading records by PATRIOT Act law enforcement. So I understand the concerns that have been expressed.

On balance, though, I rise in support of the bill, and I am going to tell the Members why: because I think that there is an element in this bill that is so important for this country because it affirms the notion that the first "A" in NASA, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, "aeronautics," is critical to the agency's success. And in that connection I want to thank Chairman WOLF and I want to thank Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for their hard work and their support to that end.

We have been working for the better part of this year to make certain that aeronautics was recognized as being critical; and without the help of the entire Ohio delegation on both sides of the aisle, without the help of Chairman WOLF, without the help of Ranking Member MOLLOHAN, we would not be here at this exact moment pointing out that this bill represents a victory for aeronautics.

Aeronautics research and development has drastically improved our national security, our air safety, our economy, and our environment. NASA's field centers, such as the Glenn Research Center in Cleveland, are where the actual basic research is done. There we will find unique research facilities, some of the best scientists and engineers of our time, and a track record of discovery for the public good that is the envy of the world.

One of the secrets to NASA's success has been its dual emphasis on both space and aeronautics. A successful space program is heavily dependent on a strong aeronautics program. Indeed, we cannot get to space without first navigating the atmosphere, and yet the budget for fiscal year 2006 attempted to drastically cut funding for aeronautics research. Recovery from that devastating loss would have taken decades and billions of dollars.

That is why I am so grateful to the chairman and to the ranking member and all of my colleagues for the work that they have put into the bill and showing that the members of the subcommittee share the deep affinity that I have and that others have in appreciation for a healthy, balanced National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This recognizes that a healthy NASA requires strong field research centers like NASA Glenn. Strong field centers, in turn, are dependent on their physical facilities and, more importantly, their talented workforce.

The bill protects the jobs and facilities from cuts that are driven by what accountants want instead of scientific need and instead of engineering know-how. This bill stands in defense of aeronautics, and it is a nod to the crucial role that aeronautics plays in so many facets of our daily life.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for their outstanding work in very difficult, challenging times. But this measure deserves our support, and I say that as chairman of the Science Committee. So I have a special interest, because it will bolster America's science and technology enterprise, it will foster innovation, and boost U.S. competitiveness.

Why do I support this bill? Let me count the ways, and this is by no means inclusive, but let me focus on the matters that I am most familiar with. It increases funding for the National Science Foundation to support more fundamental science and engineering research. That is the fuel that drives the knowledge economy, and that is what drives the American economy. It preserves the science and math partnership program at NSF, designed to improve the performance of local school systems in math and science education at a time we have been challenged as never before in our history.

□ 1345

It increases funding for the laboratory programs for the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

And what does NIST do in addition to performing advanced science and engineering research? It develops the technical standards that advance measurement tools to help to keep American industry competitive. It preserves the very important Manufacturing Extension Partnership, which helps keep America's small manufacturers globally competitive, improving U.S. manufacturing productivity and saving American jobs. It supports a balanced program at NASA, including increased funding for aeronautics, as the previous speaker mentioned; and it increases funding for the National Weather Service, which provides life-saving forecasting of hurricanes and other extreme events. I need provide no further example than Katrina.

At a time when government agencies at all levels were less than adequate with their response, the shining star in our crown was the National Hurricane Center and the National Weather Service. The Hurricane Center is under the Weather Service. They provided us with timely information well in advance of the hurricane hitting the coast of the gulf. It is what was done with that information that created the problems, not the information itself. That was provided completely and in a timely manner.

My congratulations go to the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from West Virginia. Under very difficult circumstances, they have recognized that we have to establish some priorities, and one of the high priorities that they have both given and this House should be giving is to invest in the science enterprise.

What is that all about? It is about our future. It is about opportunity. It is about jobs.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind comments.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a member of the full committee.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 2862, the Science, State, Justice, Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. I think the conferees did an incredibly good job, considering the tight allocations they had. And I want to thank the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and the gentleman from West Virginia (Ranking Member MOLLOHAN) and their highly competent staff.

Despite the good job, I would be remiss if I did not stand here and remind Congress of our need to deal with the recommendations that have been made to us by very important organizations, our U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy that studies the oceans, and the Pew Oceans Commission, a charitable trust which also studies the oceans, and ask our administration to propose an adequate budget for our ocean programs in the future.

It is so critical, as Americans depend on the oceans, when we think of all of the tourism from the beaches and the watchable wildlife. We make livings on sometimes turbulent surfaces, we put food on America's tables, we play on its beaches and so on. These are often critical and overlooked in our economic engine, yet the U.S. economy in 2000 was almost 2½ times larger, the ocean economy, than the agriculture economy in terms of the output, and employed 1.5 times the number of people. It encompasses huge activities. NOAA activities touch almost a third

of our Nation's gross domestic product, and our oceans and coasts contribute more than \$117 billion to American prosperity each year.

So the issue here is really that we have to put more effort into this, because if we do not, we are just stabbing ourselves in the foot. The oxygen that we breathe comes from the oceans, the future, the unexplored. It is frankly more important that we explore the oceans on this planet than we explore Mars, yet we are putting more and more money into that effort than we do into our own planet.

So I am thanking the committee for job well done and hoping that next year we can get a better mark on this.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 2862, the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act 2006, but I also strongly encourage both the administration and the House to invest more in the programs that protect, maintain, and restore the health of our oceans in subsequent years. The conferees did a good job with this bill given the allocation, and I especially appreciate the hard work of Subcommittee Chairman WOLF, Ranking Member MOLLOHAN, and their highly competent and helpful staff.

The Pew Oceans Commission and the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy both released landmark reports within the past 2½ years reviewing the state of our oceans and the policies we use to govern them. This was the first comprehensive review in over 30 years. Both reports came to the same conclusion: Our oceans and coasts are in a state of crises and we are losing important goods and services that they provide. At the top of the list of problems causing this crisis is an under investment in the programs we use to manage the oceans and coasts.

From our oceans, Americans draw inspiration from the animals in its waters, make a living on its sometimes turbulent surface, put food on their tables, play on its beaches, and benefit from the microscopic plants that provide the majority of oxygen we breathe. For many of these reasons and others, our oceans are a critical, albeit often overlooked, economic engine. The U.S. ocean economy in 2000 was almost 2½ times larger than the agricultural economy in terms of output and employed 1½ times as many people. Ocean sector employment is larger than every manufacturing industry. NOAA activities touch almost a third of the Nation's gross domestic product, and oceans and coasts contribute more than \$117 billion to American prosperity each year.

If we are going to continue to obtain these important benefits from our coasts and oceans, we will need to implement the recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy to invest more in our oceans. I call on the administration to propose a more robust budget next year so that Americans will continue to benefit from the goods and services our oceans provide. I also ask my colleagues here in the House to push for a budget resolution next year that authorizes adequate money to the Science, State, Justice, and Commerce accounts so that Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN will be able to put together a bill that adequately supports programs that protect, maintain and restore the health of our oceans.

Unfortunately because of the tight allocation, conferees were forced to cut many important ocean programs, such as the National Marine Sanctuary Program, which is receiving a 30-percent cut from fiscal year 2005 funding levels. In 1972, exactly 100 years after the first national park was created, the Nation made a similar commitment to preserving its marine treasures by establishing the National Marine Sanctuary Program. The Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary plays a critical role protecting the ecologically and culturally important areas off my district in California while promoting sustainable use and educating the public about the marine environment.

The National Sea Grant College Program is being cut by 10 percent from fiscal year 2005 funding levels to \$55.5 million, a cut of \$5 million from the House bill and \$11.2 million from the Senate bill. From this cut, the U.S. will lose major projects that assist coastal communities, including promoting coastal economic growth, improving the quality of marine environments, educating students in marine sciences, and solving critical marine and Great Lakes resource programs. The U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy called for increasing the National Sea Grant College Program by \$20 million, and the President's Ocean Action Plan called for expanding the program.

The National Marine Protected Areas Center is being cut by 50 percent from fiscal year 2005 funding levels after the House bill called for nearly level funding and the Senate bill called for a slight increase. This center helps protect the significant natural and cultural resources within the marine environment for the benefit of present and future generations by strengthening and expanding the Nation's system of marine protected areas. An expanded and strengthened comprehensive system of marine protected areas throughout the marine environment would enhance the conservation of our Nation's natural and cultural marine heritage and the ecologically and economically sustainable use of the marine environment for future generations.

The programs I highlighted today as well as several other ocean programs are being cut when they need to be expanded. This is putting the well-being of many Americans at risk by jeopardizing the goods and services provided by healthy oceans that drive our vast ocean economic engine.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, I thank the Gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank him and the Chairman of the Committee for their long labors on what is a \$57.8 billion bill.

My concern is with what many might view as a mere footnote to this bill, the budget of a tiny federal agency that gets not billions, but only \$5.3 million, with an "m," out of this huge budget. But the budget of that tiny federal agency and a whim of nature are all that stand between tens of thousands of Texans along the southern tip of our country and disaster.

These are hard-working people along the Lower Rio Grande River Valley in one of the economically poorest parts

of this country. But the threat of disaster to them is every bit as real as what we saw played out on our screens in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans.

This bill fails to deal adequately with that problem. I believe that the Committee recognized the Valley's need in the language that it added to the report that accompanies this bill. I cannot fault the Committee, though I do not agree with the result. This report includes the same dollar amount that the House had already approved and the Senate had already approved, which is 100 cents on the dollar of what President Bush requested. But the amount of money requested is not an adequate amount to protect people from a very real danger.

As the conferees noted in the report, and I quote: "The conferees recommend that the Commission increase funding for the Lower Rio Grande Valley Flood Control Project above the \$2,200,000 contained in the President's budget request. Studies by the U.S. Section of the IBWC conclude that the Rio Grande Valley levees are deficient in height, geologically flawed, and structurally unsound. The conferees expect the administration in the upcoming budget cycle to request sufficient funds to address these needs."

And while that language is important, it does not provide the dollars necessary to fix this problem. It is language similar to that adopted by the Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council, composed of all the governments in the three counties at the very tip of the United States where it borders Mexico.

In asking for \$10 million in construction moneys every year, they said, "Without necessary improvements, the levee system could be overtopped or fail structurally at various locations, leaving thousands homeless and creating extensive property and environmental damage to the region."

After a period of cronyism at the IBWC, well-documented by the General Accountability Office, President Bush replaced his first failed appointee with an acting appointee. We had the USIBWC's Acting Commissioner down in the Rio Grande Valley last month. He said in a meeting there that he needed \$10 million a year, not for the agency, but for construction, and a total of \$125 million over 10 or 11 years in order to solve this problem. Madam Speaker, \$2.2 million is about a fifth of what is needed in construction every year for the next 10 years if we are going to resolve this problem.

Earlier this year, we had Hurricane Emily. It hit about 35, 50 miles south of the area that I am talking about. It was a mere Category 1, yet it caused extensive flooding along some of these levees. As all of America knows, we have had so many hurricanes this year, we have run out of names, and it is forecast to only get worse this year and the year after that as we go through this cycle in the Gulf of one hurricane after another.

If we have even a category 3 hurricane, we will overtop these levees along 38 miles. If we have a Hurricane 5 like Katrina, it will be 102 miles that are overwhelmed. This is just one small section along the Rio Grande.

But I just want it clear that this administration and this Congress has in living color the recommendations of their own agency showing where the levees will be topped up to 9 feet over the existing levees; 6, 5, 4, 3 feet, whatever it is, it is an amount of water pouring over these levees. While we can talk about categories of hurricanes and whether it is a 5 or a 4 or a 3 and follow the tracking on television, what we have had from this Administration since Katrina for the poor people of the Rio Grande Valley is a "Category 0" effort, and it is that effort that has to be changed either in the supplemental appropriation they currently have under consideration, or in next year's appropriations bill, because every day we wait, exposes tens of thousands of people to considerable danger.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member and the chairman. I offer my gratitude to both of them for the hard work they have done in, once again, trying to fit many programs into a very small package.

There is a mystery buried deep in this bill. This bill marks the end, the official end, of the COPS program. We know that the chairman and ranking member were not the ones that led to its demise. In fact, over the last several years, there has been an effort to, despite the fact that it has not been reauthorized, keep it going.

Now, we know that the COPS program ends in this bill, but the question is why. Let us try to figure out what the motive is.

Well, could it be that it is not distributed evenly, the police officers, the over 120,000 police officers hired in the bill? This is an example of just some of the cities that have had officers hired under the COPS program. This is perhaps the most democratic, with a small "d", bill you can imagine, COPS in small police departments in rural areas and large big cities.

Perhaps it was that the COPS program was eliminated because it was not working. Well, that certainly was not the case. Crime has been reduced every year since the COPS program was put into place. The GAO did a study looking at the correlation between COPS hiring and the reduction in crimes and concluded that over a quarter of a million indexed crimes were not committed because of the COPS program.

Maybe it is because the program is no longer needed. Well, the former head of the Department of Homeland Security, Tom Ridge, once famously said that homeland security starts in our hometown. Everyone is saying we

need more and more first responders, not fewer.

So the COPS program in this bill meets its demise, a successful program. We do not quite know why it is ending. We are grateful to the chairman and ranking member for having it go on this long.

But we do have a chance to resuscitate it. The House has passed the reauthorization of the Justice Department bill. We are awaiting action in the Senate. In that bill we authorized the COPS program to live to see another day. We have bipartisan support from Chairman SENSENBRENNER, Democrats and Republicans joining together to try to make the COPS program come back to life.

I would urge my colleagues to think about whether or not at this time of heightened national security concern, we want the COPS program to end.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I see the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), and if he would not leave the floor, I just wanted to comment on what he was commenting on, so I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In the report on that Commission, and Mr. DOGGETT spoke to me about it, what you said did not kind of jibe completely with regard to our conversation. But the statement accompanying the conference report says, "Within the amount for the water quality program, the conferees recommend that the Commission increase funding for the Lower Rio Grande Flood Control Project above the \$2.2 million contained in the budget request." So we did ask for them to go above the request.

Secondly, we say "Studies by the U.S. section of the IBWC conclude that Rio Grande Valley levees are deficient in height, geologically flawed, and structurally unsound. The conferees expect the administration in the upcoming budget cycle to request sufficient funds to address these needs. Also, the conference directs that \$250,000 be made available for the Rio Grande Canal Project." This is an increase over the construction amount.

Secondly, we plan on doing a letter, because the country of Mexico is involved. Texas ought to be involved, but by torching something, it does not always get it done. I think it has to kind of come together.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, the language the gentleman quotes is the same language that I quote. I applaud the committee for adding that in there.

The problem is that the total amount of money for the agency was not changed, and to get any more than \$2.2 million, they will be taking it out of existing projects that they have on the Colorado River. And the head of the agency is saying they need five times as much as the President asked for.

Mr. WOLF. Who did they say that to? Is that in writing somewhere?

Mr. DOGGETT. Yes, I think it is in writing. It is in the cost estimates or in the reports that have already been forwarded up to the State Department. But I do not think they were ever forwarded to the committee.

I applaud the committee concerns about this and the language that they added, and I am glad the gentleman will be submitting further letters and the like, because this is a small part of this budget, but a big problem for our folks. And they get out of this, even if they go from \$2.2 to \$3 million, only about a third of what the agency itself says is needed, not just this year, but each year for the next 10 years.

□ 1400

Mr. WOLF. Well, we are going to do a letter. I would urge the gentleman to get a meeting to get the commission to come up to your office. We will have a staff person come by. Also get the State of Texas, also do not forget about Mexico, to get them to come by and try to bring it to a head. I think that is a more constructive way than just saying this bill is not very good. I thought we had with this language forced them to address the issue. We will send a letter.

But if this were my congressional district, I would have them up here. I would ask the State Department to come down and walk with you. I would go to Mexico and be on the other side. I would have a letter to President Vicente Fox. I would have a letter to Secretary Rice. So there is a lot that you have to do.

Mr. DOGGETT. If the gentleman will yield, let me just assure him I have done all those things short of walking in Mexico because this only covers the cost of repairing the U.S. side of the levees. It does not concern any repairs to the Mexican side.

Mr. WOLF. What do they do? What does Mexico do?

Mr. DOGGETT. Well, Mexico, I think if they see that we are moving to raise the levees on the American side, they will be caused to take action on the Mexican side. This is simply, the cost that I have talked about is only the U.S. side of the levees. It is not the Mexican side of the levees. That is their responsibility to act on that.

Mr. WOLF. But if it goes on one side does that not impact on the other side?

Mr. DOGGETT. That is why I say, naturally, the kind of budget challenges they face in Mexico, if they say we are raising our side to meet this flood problem, we believe that they will act to raise it on their side also.

Mr. WOLF. Well, I would like to challenge the gentleman to really pull together. I will try to come to the meeting or get some staff people to come. Bring in the Mexican ambassador. Do something rather than just coming down and doing that. But do something. Get the Mexican ambassador to come on in. Have somebody from the State Department. Bring them on up. Go down there. Walk it. Do everything

you possibly can, because you certainly do not want something to happen whereby people die in a flood.

Mr. DOGGETT. I accept that challenge already having done most of that. It has not just been my request, but the request of three of us, four of us, actually, from the Rio Grande Valley to the President and to the State Department, and we have been unable to get any movement from them. And I understand we need their cooperation in order for your committee to move forward. Thank you for your interest.

Mr. WOLF. Well, we will try to help you. We will send a letter, and in the letter that we will send maybe Mr. MOLLOHAN will sign it with me. We will send you a copy of it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member, and I do thank the chairman. This is an interesting mix of a committee, the State, Justice, Commerce and related agencies; and I acknowledge that the amount is up to \$4.9 billion from the request of \$4.7 billion. Let me quickly point out some areas that I wish we had more money, but I am grateful and want to emphasize the value and this is, of course, NOAA that played a pivotal role and could play an even greater role as we begin to see climatic changes and see storm surges create the devastation of the gulf coast.

This is an important agency and the monies included certainly are welcome and arguably, I hope, we will see additional dollars. The \$1.3 billion for international peacekeeping certainly is valuable, and I hope that the emphasis is on peacekeeping. I would hope that some of those dollars could be used in transitioning our military out of Iraq and putting in peacekeeping forces that would combine with our allies over this crisis that we have.

I am grateful that NASA is funded. In times of trouble, I know that we look to agencies like this, but I am grateful for that funding and also for the National Science Foundation and, in particular, the small business.

What I do want to bring to my colleagues' attention are two points. One, I am sorry that we did not include the language that would prohibit the FBI under the PATRIOT Act from accessing library circulation records. And I hope we can fix that. I really do. After the backdrop of the national security letters, we know that the FBI, we have a great deal of respect for them and their homeland security role; but we need the protection of civil liberties as well.

I would also say to my good friend, one of the issues that I have been