

which Israel continues to be attacked at the U.N., and the reluctance of many member states to defend Israel or to accord it the same treatment as other member states, suggests that there is considerable anti-Semitic components behind the policies pursued in the U.N. forums.

I believe that in the Henry Hyde United Nations Reform Act this week we will make sure that everyone will be on record to say that it is unacceptable that Israel, the only true democracy in the Middle East, should remain ostracized by the community of nations, and I urge my colleagues to pass the Henry Hyde U.N. Reform Act this week.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2862, SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 314 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 314

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 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 first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except for section 607. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 314 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2862, the Science, State, Justice, Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for 2006.

The rule allows for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. It waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

The rule provides that under the rules of the House, the bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph. It waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill.

Except as specified in the resolution, the rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Finally, it provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2862 funds our Nation's priorities without swelling our Federal budget. It is a bill of fiscal restraint, yet one that increases funding to some of our most important weapons in the fight on terror and crime, including the FBI, the DEA, and State and local law enforcement agencies.

As we continue to reassess our security and law enforcement priorities to meet threats abroad and at home, we must provide funding for programs that protect our communities. This bill accomplishes that goal.

Under H.R. 2862, funding for the Department of Justice will increase to almost \$57.5 billion, with much of that additional money going to the agencies that are helping us fight the war on terror, the war on drugs and the war against gang violence.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation will see an increase of \$542 million above the fiscal year 2005 level. The additional funding will go toward enhanced agent training and the hiring of additional analysts and translators to keep the FBI on the cutting edge of the war on terror. Increased funding means greater information technology, better counterintelligence capabilities and improved efforts to fight white-collar and gang crime.

The United States Marshals will see an increased funding of \$41 million over last year, while the DEA, the Drug Enforcement Agency, will have \$67 million additional to assist State and local law enforcement officials.

□ 1030

H.R. 2862 also funds important prevention programs for violence against women, gang crime, and juvenile delinquency. All of this adds up to better protection for our communities. This is the kind of fundamental support that Americans rely on Congress to pass. These are true national priorities, not frivolous programs tailored to special interests. This is legislation that deserves our support.

H.R. 2862 also funds our science agencies and provides for a vision of space exploration that has fascinated minds, both young and old, for generations, and provided many breakthrough technologies.

Mr. Speaker, I personally hope we will continue to prioritize science funding to ensure that our Nation remains at the forefront of scientific research and development into the future.

Through State Department funding, we have earmarked \$1.5 billion to continue worldwide security improvements and the replacement of vulnerable United States embassies around the world.

Finally, and this is a very important point, H.R. 2862 provides \$590 million for the Small Business Administration, and it supports a record level of business loans to help entrepreneurs across our great Nation access capital to start a small business. So much of our U.S. economy, of course, is driven, as we know, by small businesses.

As we begin the debate on this rule and the underlying appropriations bill, let us keep two things in mind: one, we must hold fast to our spending limits. To quote President Bush, "The American people deserve to have their tax dollars spent wisely or not at all."

Second, we must commit wholly and without reserve to funding our Nation's security and law enforcement priorities. Protecting our citizens from harm is the utmost duty of this Congress and our government. This protection stems from Federal agencies that stop gang violence, crack down on drug trafficking, and give counterterrorism and counterintelligence efforts the full support that they deserve.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last night, the Committee on Rules considered H.R. 2862, the Science, State, Justice, Commerce and Related Agencies' appropriations bill for FY 2006. And while I am pleased that the committee reported an open rule, as is customary with appropriations bills, we all know the amendment process for these bills is very restrictive. This makes it easy for the majority to allow an open rule and still maintain tight control over what is debated and deliberated on the floor through the waiver process.

If we want to foster democracy in this body, we should take the time and thoughtfulness to debate all major legislation under an open rule, not just appropriations bills, which are already restricted. An open process should be the norm and not the exception.

That being said, I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), for working together to create a bill that seems to be

a fair and responsible piece of legislation.

I have always said that budgets are moral documents. Where and how we decide to spend the taxpayers' money says more about our values as a society than any speech or political rhetoric possibly could. If any of my fellow Americans really want to know who and what each party cares about in this country, look at where the money goes and the truth will be what follows. That is exactly what an appropriations bill such as this does. It gives us a road map to see what is important to our elected leadership.

That is why I want to congratulate my friends across the aisle for having the courage to essentially reject the White House's inadequate budget request for this bill. Clearly, many Republican Members in this body do not share the same values as the President, and I congratulate you for having the courage to demonstrate this rare moment of independence and moderation to the American people. The bill clearly rebuffs the White House's agenda on spending issues, such as funding for the National Science Foundation, which is still inadequate, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Department of Justice, and the Drug Enforcement Agency by providing adequate, if not ideal, funding.

Also, I am pleased that Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN saw fit to prohibit the use of funds in this measure to support or justify the use of torture by the United States Government. Unfortunately, this language is both necessary and appropriate.

We also have language included today that will prohibit the White House from blocking the importation of discount prescription drugs through trade agreements. That means this body is acting to ensure that the White House does not try to subvert our authority and take further steps to prevent the American people from having access to life-saving, affordable prescription drugs. I strongly believe that access to affordable medication and health care should be a right in this country and not the fodder of a political power struggle.

Mr. Speaker, just when I saw the rays of hope sprinkled throughout the bill that this typically extreme leadership has finally begun to place the needs of everyday, hardworking Americans before their agenda, I was offered a reality check last night in the Committee on Rules. The moderation I had seen had merely been an illusion.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, brought to the Committee on Rules a necessary, important, and reasonable amendment to this bill. The amendment would have increased funding by \$410 million for local law enforcement agencies and for COPS grants, which is the most successful crime prevention program in our Nation's history; and we have deci-

mated it. It would have put more police on the streets in America's neighborhoods.

Additionally, it would have increased funding for EDA grants by \$53 million, which spur the public and private investment in order to create new jobs in our struggling communities.

The cost of his amendment would have been offset through a less than 1.5 percent reduction in tax benefits for only the wealthiest Americans, those with annual incomes in excess of \$1 million, and would have meant about a \$2,000 decrease in their refund. But the Republican majority opposed it on a party-line vote, choosing the rich over safer neighborhoods.

This issue, I believe, gives us a clear picture of exactly the difference between the Republicans and the Democrats in the House. If anyone had a doubt who was fighting for everyday Americans, they should not any more. If there was a question over which party is the champion for the middle class, the safe neighborhoods, and for job creation, that question has been answered because the majority was willing to sacrifice placing police officers on the streets in our neighborhoods in order to protect a small tax cut for only the richest Americans.

Since 2001, our police have been asked to do more with a billion dollars less in Federal funding so that the millionaires can keep their extra \$2,053. Today, we will have another opportunity to stand with the vast majority of everyday Americans and families instead of millionaires, and I will be asking Members on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on the previous question so we can try once again to allow the Obey amendment to be considered on the floor today.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to point out that this bill does provide \$2.6 billion for assistance to State and local law enforcement for crime-fighting initiatives, and that is actually \$1 billion above the President's request, in response to the gentlewoman's remarks about the Obey amendment.

Unfortunately, the Committee on Rules could not waive points of order against the gentleman's amendment. While the intent of his amendment is admirable, the means of his amendment does not comply with the rules of the House. The amendment would seek to offset an increase in funding for States and local law enforcement through a tax increase; and such changes in tax policy, as we know, are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Therefore, the amendment, as written, was not germane to H.R. 2862 and subject to a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying bill; but I have some deep concerns with this bill, and I will probably support a number of amendments today. I want to lay out a little of my concerns about this bill.

This bill has to be taken in the context of a number of appropriation requests that the administration made in their budget. I chair the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources in the Committee on Government Reform, as well as co-chair of the Speaker's Task Force; and I have been appalled at the President's approach to drug policy.

OMB did uninformed meddling in this budget process. There was lack of leadership out of the drug czar's office, and benign neglect out of the White House. There is no other simple way to say it. They proposed zeroing out Byrne grants, which would devastate all the drug task forces across the United States. They proposed zeroing out a number of other local law enforcement programs that are critical, including meth hot spots programs. In another appropriations bill, they proposed knocking out 60 percent of all State and local participation in HIDTAs and transferring it under Federal control and cutting the program immensely. They proposed changing the CPOT program, which gives aid to State and local law enforcement to fight methamphetamines and other issues, that and Safe and Drug Free Schools, which will be coming in another appropriations bill, they propose zeroing out the State and local funding for drug prevention.

The question is: Where is the anti-drug strategy of this administration? Many of us on this side of the aisle took to the floor to criticize the last administration when in the first parts of their term they abandoned the national narcotics strategy and did misguided efforts. What should be good for one party should be good for the other. We should have a consistent antidrug strategy.

And this is particularly appalling in the area of methamphetamines that are sweeping across every State and are moving increasingly from the rural areas into the suburbs and then into our major cities. If they hit our major cities and major suburbs, this will be an epidemic like we have never seen. The reaction out of the Federal Government is nothing. It is not in the national ad campaign. The Partnership For a Drug Free America is addressing it some, but it is not in our national ad campaign. It is not in our drug-free prevention programs.

They are proposing to zero out the meth hot spots programs, they propose to zero out the Byrne grant programs, they propose to knock out the meth hot spots, or the meth program that the last HIDTA is in, which is in Missouri. It was a meth program, and they said they did not want the new HIDTA programs.

Now, there will be a number of amendments today, we may have a few more this year, but these will be the only votes we will have that will enable us to address the meth question. Chairman WOLF, to his credit, in a very tight budget, recognized the failure of the administration's policies and put many of these dollars back. Unfortunately, in many of the categories, meth hot spots got more funding even than last year, even though the administration tried to zero it out. He put much of the Byrne grant money back in, much of the State and local funding back in, but the fact is we are still looking at merely a 50 percent whacking in some categories of these task forces.

There are likely to be a number of amendments today to try to address the Byrne grants, to try to address meth in particular, and a number of other subjects. I support Chairman WOLF and his efforts in every way; but at some point we have to stand up as a Congress and say, if this administration is not going to come up with a meth strategy, then this is the way it gets done on the House floor, amendment by amendment, in a fairly chaotic way.

It is time this administration faced up to the fact that gangs are not our number one problem in America, meth is our number one growing problem in America; and it is closely related to the gang problem. We need a coordinated methamphetamine strategy out of this administration. And quite frankly, the same thing is happening over in the United States Senate. And if administration does not address the meth question, then it will be addressed by the House and the Senate in the force of law, unfortunately often chaotically through the appropriations process or random little pieces of bills.

So while I plan to vote for this rule and I plan to vote for the underlying bill, even if these amendments do not pass, I strongly urge Members to realize what is happening here. We are going to have a meth epidemic in America unless we increasingly address it with some of the amendments that will be offered today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia a question. In his opening statement, he indicated how many times, or how many waivers had been provided. In the gentleman's statement he indicated the number of waivers that this rule provided.

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

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

Mr. GINGREY. In response to the gentleman's question, I do not know the exact number of waivers that were granted.

Mr. OBEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thought I heard the gentleman say something like 40.

Mr. GINGREY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, that was not part of my opening statement. You may be correct, but I am not sure of that number.

Mr. OBEY. But the committee has provided a number of waivers?

Mr. GINGREY. The committee has provided a number of waivers. I am just not sure what that number is.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GINGREY. Certainly.

Mr. OBEY. Let me just say, then, Mr. Speaker, that is why I intend to oppose the previous question and the rule on this bill, because the Committee on Rules did some picking and choosing. They provided waivers to the rules when they wanted to, and they did not when they did not want to.

As a result, they have tried to block my ability to offer the amendment that was our number one priority on the minority side of the aisle, which is to restore the funding for the local law enforcement grants and to restore the cuts in EPA that were made by simply reducing the size of the tax cut that persons making \$1 million a year or more will get in this country by \$2,000.

□ 1045

That would mean instead of getting \$140,000 tax cut this year, a millionaire would have to settle for \$138,000. I know there are many Members on the majority side of the aisle who get irritated when I keep bringing up this trade-off, but the fact is that the wealthiest one-thousandth of 1 percent of our citizens have seen their share of the national income double since 1980. The bottom 90 percent of earners in this economy have seen their share of income fall. The 400 most well-off taxpayers in this country make at least \$87 million a year. Those earning \$10 million per year pay a smaller share of their income in taxes than those making \$100,000 a year. Meanwhile, while the upper crust is having a high old time, the folks in the middle are struggling. They struggle to pay unexpected bills. It is harder for them to send their kids to college. It is harder for local communities to provide needed services. Law enforcement services are being cut back.

The previous speaker mentioned what is happening to our antimeth programs around the country. I think it is important for the House to understand that, for instance, this bill has a substantial increase, over a billion dollars, for deep space programs, and yet since fiscal year 2001, local law enforcement programs have been cut by a billion dollars, and Economic Development Administration programs which are principally targeted to help small communities such as those I represent, that program has been cut by 50 percent since 2001.

I do not think that reflects the priorities of the American people. It cer-

tainly does not reflect the priorities of most people on this side of the aisle. So I am going to be voting against the previous question on the rule and the rule itself if there is a rollcall to protest the fact while the Committee on Rules has been magnanimous in providing many waivers, it has not provided a waiver for the key amendment that would enable us to restore needed funding for local law enforcement.

I do not believe the priorities represented by this committee's judgment represent the priorities of the American people. When the time comes, I will be offering whatever amendments I am allowed to offer under the rules to try to change those priorities.

The subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), is a very able Member, but he cannot perform a miracle without resources, and the allocation he was given are totally inadequate to the task at hand. The quality of America's law enforcement at the local level will suffer because of it.

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

Mr. Speaker, of course we represent that the President's request for State and local law enforcement was not sufficient. That is why the committee took the necessary steps to restore funding in a responsible manner. As an example, the gentleman from Indiana was just talking about some of that restoration. The committee restored approximately a billion of the \$1.4 billion reduction that the President requested.

This bill provides \$2.6 billion for crime-fighting initiatives, including the following restorations in funding: \$355 million to reimburse States for criminal alien detention; \$334 million for juvenile delinquency prevention and accountability programs; \$387 million for violence against women and prosecution programs; \$348 million for the Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grants Program; \$520 million for Community Oriented Policing Service, the COPS Program; and yes, \$60 million for meth hot spots.

I would suggest to the gentleman in regard to his question about the point of order, the gentleman's amendment would not be subject to a point of order if the gentleman would alter his amendment to include offsets for his increase from within the programs under the jurisdiction of SSJC Appropriations Act. The amendment would then comply with the rules of the House and could be considered and voted upon by Congress.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a member of the Committee on Rules.

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, of late there has been much discussion on protecting Americans and what Congress can do to fund programs which prove effective and yield results. Yet here we are today cutting a program that our law enforcement officials rely upon to ensure the safety and security of our communities, the COPS Program. They are our first line of defense, and the COPS programs help States and localities put more police on our streets to keep our families safe.

My hometown of Sacramento has seen the practical benefits of this program. The COPS Program has put an additional 569 law enforcement officers on the streets of Sacramento in the past decade. Without this program, I do not know that this would have been possible.

I realize the cuts to the COPS Program could have been much more sizable. Congress did not go as far as President Bush recommended in downsizing this program. I am pleased at that, but I am truly disappointed that again for the fourth year in a row funding for this much-needed program is on the chopping block.

The men and women in law enforcement make a real difference not only in our cities and towns, but in the bigger effort to safeguard our country from the threat of terrorists. I am frustrated because we had the opportunity to correct this funding cut for a worthwhile program.

The Committee on Rules could have made in order under this rule an amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). It would have kept funding for the COPS programs at the previous year's level; no increase, but certainly no decrease. This would have been a smart amendment to make in order.

I am pleased to note, however, that this bill makes a significant commitment to strengthen research and education through increased NASA funding. Technology developed by NASA has long served as the engine of innovation which has driven our Nation's economic growth. Advances made by this Agency in areas of science and technology have played an integral role in the defense of our Nation. And most importantly, we are educating our Nation's next generation of scientists and engineers. I applaud the committee for their long-term planning in this area.

Although I would like to see a few changes to this bill, particularly a greater increase in law enforcement funding, I do support the underlying measure. I am pleased it was reported out in a bipartisan fashion. I commend the Committee on Appropriations for their hard work under such tough budgetary constraints.

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

Mr. Speaker, I point out to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) that just recently in the homeland security funding bill that we passed last

month, we provided for \$3.7 billion for first responders. The House-passed bill included grants to high-threat areas, firefighters, and emergency management.

Since September 11, 2001, the Congress has provided \$32.4 billion to our first responders in funding their needs, such as terrorism prevention and preparedness, general law enforcement, firefighter responders, training 811,275 police, fire, and emergency medical personnel, and, yes, in this bill that we are talking about this morning, \$520 million for the COPS Program.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I will be calling for a no vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule so we can consider the Obey amendment that was rejected in the Committee on Rules last night on a party-line vote.

The Obey amendment would give additional badly needed funds for grants to State and local law enforcement assistance and to the Economic Development Administration Grant Program. Specifically, it would increase by \$410 million funding for formula grants to State and local law enforcement agencies as well as for the COPS Program, one of the most effective programs in its history.

It will also increase funding for Economic Development Assistance grants by \$53 million, and restore this assistance to State and local governments to last year's level, money they badly need to create new jobs.

I also want to assure my colleagues that the cost of this amendment will not add a single dime to the deficit. It is fully paid for by making a very slight reduction of less than 1½ percent to the tax break received by people of annual incomes of over a million dollars, tax benefits that these fortunate individuals received as a result of the 2001 and 2003 tax cut legislation and will lose only \$2,000 on their tax refunds if the Obey amendment is accepted.

I want to assure my colleagues that a no vote will not prevent us from considering the Science, State, Justice, Commerce appropriations bill under the open rule, but a no vote will allow Members to vote on the Obey amendment to help our State and local governments with law enforcement and economic development. A yes vote will cancel the consideration of this amendment. I urge a no vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise again in support of this rule and in recognition of the importance of the underlying bill in funding and providing for the necessary tools for our law enforcement that defends the American people against crime and terror from sources both foreign and domestic.

H.R. 2862 funds our law enforcement needs, and it funds them responsibly. While some on the other side have called out for more funding of this program or that program, they fail to realize the limited funds available in the Federal budget. Again, H.R. 2862 supports and provides for the operations of the Department of Justice with \$5.8 billion for the FBI, \$1.7 billion for the DEA, and \$800 million for the United States Marshal Service. Without question, this bill funds those who put their lives on the line every day to make sure the American people are secure and safe as they go about their daily activities.

Mr. Speaker, this appropriation also provides the necessary funding for the Department of Commerce to strengthen economic growth and protect the intellectual property rights so essential to technical and societal development, and because of the importance of technological strength, this bill also includes a responsible level of funding for NASA and the National Science Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2862 not only supports our law enforcement agencies here at home, but it also supports the State Department and our needs abroad. From funding to reinforce our vulnerable embassies to funding for improved training of State Department personnel, this legislation provides \$9.5 billion to strengthen our relationships overseas and wage the diplomatic war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF), the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), and I would also like to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for all of their labor and time on this bill.

□ 1100

I want to encourage all of my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION ON H. RES. 314, H.R. 2862, THE SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR FY2006

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 3 shall be in order without intervention of any point of order and before any other amendment if offered by Representative Obey of Wisconsin or a designee. The amendment is not subject to amendment

except for pro forma amendments to a demand for a division of the question in the committee of the whole or in the House.

SEC. 3 The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

Amendment to H.R. \_\_\_\_\_, as Reported (Science, State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriations, 2006)

Offered by Mr. Obey of Wisconsin

In title I, in the item relating to "Office of Justice Programs—State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance", after the first and second dollar amounts, insert the following: "(increased by \$270,000,000)".

In title I, in the item relating to "Office of Justice Programs—Community Oriented Policing Services", after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$140,000,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "Economic Development Administration—Economic Development Assistance Programs", after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$53,000,000)".

At the end of title VI, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ In the case of taxpayers with adjusted gross income in excess of \$1,000,000, for the calendar year beginning in 2006, the amount of tax reduction resulting from enactment of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (Pub. L. 107-16) and the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 (Pub. L. 108-27) shall be reduced by 1.466 percent.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 190, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

YEAS—222

Aderholt	Boustany	Cubin
Akin	Bradley (NH)	Culberson
Alexander	Brady (TX)	Cunningham
Bachus	Brown (SC)	Davis (KY)
Baker	Brown-Waite,	Davis, Jo Ann
Barrett (SC)	Ginny	Davis, Tom
Barrow	Burgess	Deal (GA)
Bartlett (MD)	Burton (IN)	DeLay
Barton (TX)	Calvert	Dent
Bass	Camp	Diaz-Balart, L.
Beauprez	Cannon	Diaz-Balart, M.
Biggart	Cantor	Doolittle
Bilirakis	Capito	Drake
Bishop (UT)	Carter	Dreier
Blackburn	Castle	Duncan
Blunt	Chabot	Ehlers
Boehrlert	Chocola	Emerson
Boehner	Coble	English (PA)
Bonilla	Cole (OK)	Feeney
Bonner	Conaway	Ferguson
Bono	Cox	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Boozman	Crenshaw	Flake

Foley	Kolbe	Ramstad	Neal (MA)	Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (CA)
Forbes	Kuhl (NY)	Regula	Obey	T.	Thompson (MS)
Fortenberry	LaHood	Rehberg	Olver	Sanchez, Loretta	Tierney
Fossella	LaHram	Reichert	Ortiz	Sanders	Towns
Fox	LaTourrette	Renzi	Pallone	Schakowsky	Udall (CO)
Franks (AZ)	Leach	Reynolds	Pastor	Schiff	Udall (NM)
Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Payne	Schwartz (PA)	Van Hollen
Galleghy	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (KY)	Pelosi	Scott (GA)	Velázquez
Garrett (NJ)	Linder	Rogers (MI)	Peterson (MN)	Scott (VA)	Visclosky
Gerlach	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher	Pomeroy	Serrano	Wasserman
Gibbons	Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen	Price (NC)	Sherman	Schultz
Gilchrest	Lungren, Daniel	Royce	Rahall	Skelton	Waters
Gillmor	E.	Ryan (WI)	Rangel	Slaughter	Watson
Gingrey	Manzullo	Ryun (KS)	Reyes	Smith (WA)	Watt
Gohmert	Marchant	Saxton	Ross	Snyder	Waxman
Goode	Marshall	Schwarz (MI)	Roybal-Allard	Solis	Weiner
Goodlatte	McCaul (TX)	Sensenbrenner	Ruppersberger	Spratt	Wexler
Granger	McCotter	Shadegg	Rush	Stupak	Woolsey
Graves	McHenry	Shaw	Ryan (OH)	Tanner	Wu
Green (WI)	McHugh	Shays	Sabo	Tauscher	Wynn
Gutknecht	McKeon	Sherwood	Salazar	Taylor (MS)	
Hall	McMorris	Shimkus			
Harris	Mica	Shuster			
Hart	Miller (FL)	Simmons			
Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)	Simpson			
Hayes	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)			
Hayworth	Moran (KS)	Smith (TX)			
Hefley	Murphy	Sodrel			
Hensarling	Musgrave	Souder			
Hergert	Myrick	Stearns			
Hobson	Neugebauer	Sullivan			
Hoekstra	Ney	Tancredo			
Hostettler	Northup	Taylor (NC)			
Hulshof	Norwood	Terry			
Hunter	Nunes	Thornberry			
Hyde	Nussle	Tiahrt			
Inglis (SC)	Osborne	Tiberi			
Issa	Otter	Turner			
Istook	Oxley	Upton			
Jenkins	Paul	Walden (OR)			
Jindal	Pearce	Walsh			
Johnson (CT)	Pence	Wamp			
Johnson (IL)	Petri	Weldon (FL)			
Johnson, Sam	Pickering	Weldon (PA)			
Jones (NC)	Pitts	Weller			
Keller	Platts	Westmoreland			
Kelly	Poe	Whitfield			
Kennedy (MN)	Pombo	Wicker			
King (IA)	Porter	Wilson (NM)			
King (NY)	Price (GA)	Wilson (SC)			
Kingston	Pryce (OH)	Wolf			
Kirk	Putnam	Young (AK)			
Klaine	Radanovich				

NAYS—190

Abercrombie	Davis (TN)	Kaptur
Ackerman	DeFazio	Kennedy (RI)
Allen	DeGette	Kildee
Andrews	Delahunt	Kilpatrick (MI)
Baca	DeLauro	Kind
Baird	Dicks	Kucinich
Baldwin	Dingell	Langevin
Bean	Doggett	Lantos
Becerra	Doyle	Larsen (WA)
Berkley	Edwards	Lee
Berman	Emanuel	Levin
Berry	Engel	Lewis (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	Lipinski
Bishop (NY)	Etheridge	Lofgren, Zoe
Blumenauer	Evans	Lowey
Boren	Farr	Lynch
Boswell	Fattah	Maloney
Boyd	Filner	Markey
Brady (PA)	Ford	Matheson
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	Matsui
Brown, Corrine	Gonzalez	McCarthy
Butterfield	Gordon	McCollum (MN)
Capps	Green, Al	McDermott
Capuano	Green, Gene	McGovern
Cardin	Grijalva	McIntyre
Cardoza	Gutierrez	McKinney
Carnahan	Harman	McNulty
Carson	Hastings (FL)	Meehan
Case	Herseth	Meek (NY)
Chandler	Higgins	Meeks (FL)
Clay	Hinchev	Melancon
Cleaver	Holden	Menendez
Clyburn	Holt	Michaud
Conyers	Honda	Millender-
Cooper	Hooley	McDonald
Costa	Hoyer	Miller (NC)
Costello	Inslee	Miller, George
Cramer	Israel	Mollohan
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Moore (WI)
Cuellar	Jackson-Lee	Moran (VA)
Davis (AL)	(TX)	Murtha
Davis (CA)	Jefferson	Nadler
Davis (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano
Davis (IL)	Kanjorski	

Boucher	Larson (CT)	Rothman
Buyer	Mack	Sessions
Cummings	McCrery	Stark
Everett	Oberstar	Strickland
Hinojosa	Owens	Sweeney
Jones (OH)	Pascrell	Thomas
Knollenberg	Peterson (PA)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1125

Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mrs. CAPPS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote No. 243, a motion ordering the previous question on H. Res. 314, a rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. Had I been present I would have voted "no" on this motion.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of my resolution is as follows:

Resolution disapproving the manner in which Representative SENSENBRENNER has responded to the minority party's request under rule XI of the House of Representatives for an additional day of oversight hearings on the reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act and the manner in which such hearing was conducted.

Whereas Representative SENSENBRENNER willfully and intentionally violated the Rules of the House of Representatives by abusing and exceeding his powers as chairman;