

the Air Force, his many years of devoted service to our Nation deserve the highest praise. Chief Murray's numerous tours and operations clearly demonstrate his drive and determination to protect our country and ensure our freedoms.

Chief Murray answered the call to protect our country and to serve with valor, class and integrity; and he represented Western North Carolina and America well. He deserves the highest phrase; and we are happy to have you home, Chief Murray.

DEEP OCEAN ENERGY RESOURCES ACT

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, this Congress enacted a protection, in a bipartisan, bicoastal way, protection for our coasts, recognizing that we have a Federal responsibility for our deep water oceans and the treasures that they hold in store for all Americans.

Today before us we will have a bill to undo these 25 years of bipartisan, bicoastal protection with a bill that is both unnecessary, environmentally damaging and fiscally irresponsible. It is a real budget buster, creating a new entitlement program for a few States and draining the resources to the rest of the States that will be left high and dry.

Don't be fooled by the bill's temptation because of a cost that is well below what eventually will end up into the tens of billions of dollars. The Bush administration says that over the next 60 years, it is a \$600 billion giveaway. And this is something that happens at a time when we need to look for reducing consumption, more fuel efficiency and investing in alternatives.

Vote "no" on the Pombo bill.

□ 1015

AMERICAN VALUES AGENDA

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week House, Republicans unveiled the American Values Agenda to defend the commonsense principles upon which our country was founded.

Unfortunately, it seems that activist judges have made it their mission to ban freedoms of religious expression, to deny the basic right to life, to strip law-abiding citizens of their second amendment rights, and to denounce the sanctity of marriage.

My Republican colleagues and I are committed to restoring these values and others by passing a positive legislative agenda which would protect the pledge from being ruled unconstitutional by activist judges, protect the

right to display the American flag on residential property, protect the right of communities to make public references to God and faith, protect traditional marriage as a union between one man and one woman, require those that perform late-term abortions to inform the mother that her unborn child will feel pain, prohibit human cloning, apply gambling laws to the Internet, and make tax relief permanent for American families.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support these very important initiatives.

HAMAS AND SYRIA

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, this House passed a bill cutting off aid to the terrorist group Hamas. Now we see Hamas, with their terrorism, once again capturing an Israeli soldier.

Hamas and Syria are in complicity. As the author of the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act, I call on President Bush to implement the rest of the sanctions in the act, which was signed into law, by Syria.

Syria is harboring the head of Hamas, Khaled Meshal, who, it is reported, gave the orders for the capture of the Israeli soldier. Hamas is a terrorist group that is shunned by the rest of the world, and should be shunned by the rest of the world, and all monies cut off until it does three things: renounce terrorism, recognize Israel's right to exist, and abide by all previously signed documents and signed agreements with Israel.

Mr. Speaker, terrorism can never be allowed to rear its ugly head. This shows again the terrorist conspiracy between Hamas and Syria. We ought to take action. It ought to stop.

GOP STALL TACTICS COULD UNDERMINE BORDER SECURITY

(Mr. TANNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Republican majority has no interest in securing our borders before the November election. After months of debate in Congress, and several speeches by the President, including one in prime time, it now appears the Republican majority would rather talk about the issue than actually solve the problem.

President Bush has spent a lot of time recently talking about the need for a comprehensive immigration bill. If he really feels strongly about the issue, he should call congressional leaders from both the House and the Senate to the White House and hammer out a compromise. Otherwise, it

seems House Republicans are willing to stall until the fall, which we all know would make it impossible to pass a bill before the November election.

Mr. Speaker, it is time the majority take border security seriously. Since September 11, the Bush administration and Republican Congress have severely underfunded border security, breaking their promises to fund new Border Patrol agents, additional detention beds, and additional immigration investigators. Because of these funding failures, our borders are not secure.

It is time that House Republicans stop their stalling and actually come to the negotiating table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 5672, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 890 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5672.

□ 1020

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5672) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 28, 2006, the amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 110, line 8.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, no further amendments to the bill may be offered except those specified in the previous order of the House of that day, which is at the desk.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman from Virginia, and I wish to engage in a colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, there are many areas throughout the country that have extremely high tourism rates. The local

law enforcement agencies of these areas have the difficult task of providing services to these tourists on the top of their responsibility to the base population that they represent.

For example, the community of southern Nevada has about 1.8 million people, although we have visitors of over 40 million tourists a year into our community. Local law enforcement is responsible with the safety of these visitors, which places a huge financial strain on the various public safety departments.

The Judiciary Committee has agreed to consider tourism as a factor for law enforcement grants that they authorize and for which your committee provides funding.

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, I understand the gentleman's concerns, and I am glad the Judiciary Committee has agreed to work with him on this matter. The subcommittee will keep his concerns in mind.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this and look forward to working with you and the authorizing committee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY Mr. ANDREWS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the revision to Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 made on May 29, 2003.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to take a policy that promotes the idea of fair competition and make that policy actually happen in practice.

The A-76 Circular policy ensures that in instances where a Federal Department wishes to contract out a certain function, that there is a fair competition that would ensue between the Federal employees who believe they should continue to serve that function and those who would wish to have the function contracted out. There is a process by which the various costs and benefits are reviewed, there is a process where the consequences are reviewed, and then a decision is made.

The problem with the present process is this: when the contractor wins the competition, the employees do not have a right of appeal if they wish to dispute the finding. On the other hand, if the employees win the competition, the contractor does have the right of

appeal. We think that this is an unfair and unfortunate policy.

The purpose of our amendment is to suspend the A-76 process in the Departments covered by this bill until there can be reform and improvement of that process. I wanted to especially thank and commend my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), who is the cosponsor of this amendment and who has worked very diligently and very intensely on this matter. He has a scheduling conflict at this moment, but has worked very hard on this; and I want to be sure that due credit is given for his efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge adoption of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee accepts the amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the chairman and again thank my coauthor, Mr. JONES, and once again urge adoption of the amendment.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 5672, the Science, State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2007, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES). This amendment would prevent expenditure of funds in Fiscal Year 2007 for the implementation of a key revision to OMB Circular A-76 that was made on May 29, 2003.

I join many of my colleagues in expressing deep concern over the A-76 process. Adoption of this amendment would encourage conferees for this bill to establish balance in the A-76 process. Federal employees subjected to the A-76 process should be afforded the ability to appeal to the Government Accountability Office a decision to contract-out their position. Private contractors are already afforded a similar-appeal right, under the current process. This is a clear cut issue of fairness.

The A-76 studies conducted and piloted on Guam by the Department of Defense during the late 1990s offer telling examples of the flaws inherent in A-76 implementation. The process on Guam was carried out in a manner which resulted in the depletion of important inherently governmental functions previously performed by federal employees. And in some instances these decisions are proving to have cost the Federal Government precious resources and human capital.

I support reforming the A-76 process to afford public and private parties comparable treatment under this process. This amendment would give federal employees working for agencies funded by this bill the same appeal right currently enjoyed by contractors for those agencies. This is just one piece of the effort to institute some more fairness in the A-76 process.

I urge my colleagues' support for this amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY Mr. POE

Mr. POE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 18 offered by Mr. POE:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title), the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary of State to implement a plan under section 7209 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (8 U.S.C. 1185 note) that permits travel into the United States from foreign countries using any document other than a passport to denote citizenship and identity.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer today strengthens security at our borders. This amendment will require a universal document, a passport, to enter the United States.

Now, people from Mexico, Canada, and the Caribbean islands can enter the United States with a host of documents, including baptismal certificates or no identification at all.

The Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 acted on the 9/11 Commission recommendations and mandated that all travelers entering the United States present a passport or some other type of identification and citizenship documents when entering the United States beginning January 1, 2008, thus eliminating the current Western Hemisphere passport exception loophole that allows U.S. citizens and nationals of other countries in the Western Hemisphere to present little or no documentation of their identity and citizenship when they cross into our country.

Implementing this simple statutory requirement has been difficult. Over the last couple of years, the State Department has spent a lot of time and a lot of taxpayer money to come up with documents that are alternatives to passports to comply with the law under their Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative. The question is: Why are they going to other documents?

They are doing so because of pressure from outside groups who say passports cost too much, or that they will stifle commerce, which, of course, is not true. This efficient document is a universal document and will actually streamline the crossing of people from Mexico and Canada into the United States. To date, there has been no agreement between State and these groups on the type of alternative documents that will be accepted, and it is unlikely they will come up with some type of alternative document before the deadline.

Essentially, these outside groups have been successful in persuading Congress to consider delaying any changes until they get these types of documents; threatening to kill implementation of the Terrorist Prevention Act and leaving America wide open for maybe another terrorist attack. An example of this has already been found in section 135 of the recently passed Senate immigration bill, which postpones the deadline for compliance until alternative documents have been issued.

Why other types of identification? Why set up a new bureaucracy to issue them? We should use the passport.

Mr. Chairman, we already have a document that denotes citizenship and identity to comply with the law, and it can be used to meet the deadline. It is called the passport. Why do we have to reinvent the wheel of identification? The State Department should be using its resources to reduce costs and expand the issuance of passports and abandon efforts that will ultimately lead to making our borders less safe.

Let me give an example of why this amendment is necessary. The Government Accountability Office, back in 2003, did an investigation to see how vulnerable we are with this Western Hemisphere exception to passports. Here is what their lead investigator said:

"We created counterfeit identification documents in order to establish fictitious identities and entered the United States from Jamaica, Barbados, Mexico, and Canada. The Bureau of Customs and Border Protection staff never questioned the authenticity of these counterfeit documents and our agents entered with absolutely no difficulty entering the United States."

With the recent terrorist arrests in Canada this month, Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to wait any longer to secure our borders. If we are forced to wait longer, the next group of people using fictitious documents won't be GAO investigators; they could very well be terrorists.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage the adoption of this commonsense amendment to require passports to enter the United States.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand and appreciate my friend from Texas's interest in making sure that people are identified at the border. But, quite honestly, this amendment is far, far too restrictive.

I cannot imagine what the impact of this amendment would be on commerce between Canada and the United States. The 49th parallel is the longest undefended border in the world. The trade that goes on between Canada and the United States is amongst the freest in the world.

I would point out that my home State of New Hampshire trades almost \$2 billion a year with Canada. The State of Texas trades over \$17 billion a year, and 370,000 jobs in the State of Texas are supported by Canadian industry.

I can't imagine, Mr. Chairman, what would happen in Michigan or in the Detroit area with the auto manufacturers if all these people that go back and forth between Windsor, Ontario, and Detroit had to get passports.

Now, the government has worked, with the support of the Judiciary Committee here, on a plan to provide a pass that would be cheap, it would be counterfeit proof, and the Federal Government will issue it.

□ 1030

It will be somewhat like a driver's license. I understand my friend's concern about the fact that driver's license and other forms of ID are not universal and are easy to counterfeit, but we are working on a plan that will provide this kind of identification without having to go through the cumbersome expense and time required to get a U.S. passport.

The passage of this amendment would have serious implications for our relationship with Canada. I appreciate the gentleman's concern with Mexico to the south, but this amendment, in its restrictive nature, will really limit the economy. It would be devastating to the United States. It would be devastating to the lifestyles of people who are used to going back and forth over the border. It would be devastating to the tourism industry along the Canadian border. It would be devastating to trade. I urge that this amendment not be accepted.

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

Mr. POE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the right to close.

The CHAIRMAN. No, the gentleman from Texas has the right to close.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, as I said a moment ago, this amendment is far too restrictive. We have all sorts of different programs that are under development right now, the NEXUS card, the SENTRI system and the PASS card, as I mentioned a minute or two ago. If this amendment were to pass, all those programs would be for naught.

The passport is indeed as secure a document as you can get, but time has passed since passports were developed in their present form, some 40 or 50 years ago. There is modern technology that can provide American workers and tourists and citizens the proper identification at a much lower cost and make it possible for them to get back and forth across the border more quickly

than they would and less expensively than they would with a passport.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, because the impact of it would be devastating for the economy of the United States. It would be devastating for the relations that we have with our neighbor to the north, which are amongst the best in the world.

I met with seven members of the Canadian Parliament yesterday, and they brought up this very issue, that they were concerned about the restrictions that might be placed upon American travel to the north. So I hope this amendment is not successful, despite the fact that I respect my friend from Texas' good intentions.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I also rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple solution to a complicated problem that is being worked on at a number of different levels. I know that the authorizers, which you just heard from in the authorizing committee, they are very supportive of the implementation of the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative and they are working hard on that. Because it is a complicated problem, we have experts not only in the House of Representatives and the United States Senate in the legislative branch but also in the executive branch; and they are working to accommodate this problem to all of the real needs out there.

The U.S. military, Federal agencies, travelling, they are working on identification processes. This amendment, for example, would preclude the use of secure identification issued by the U.S. military and Federal agencies that would not be accepted under this amendment.

It would be extremely unfortunate as all this work has been done in order to ensure that we can have quick access across the border and perfectly adequate, secure identification and do it in a way that accommodates all of the needs.

Finally, I would like to say, this is an authorizing issue and really not an issue appropriately considered here on this appropriation bill. It is complicated, as the gentleman has mentioned. It is too simple a solution and not appropriately considered in this forum.

Mr. POE. How much time do I have, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides a universal document. Every country in the world requires passports to enter their nation. A passport is a secure document. Why are we trying to invent another type of identification, or multiple types of identification, so that we can have people from Canada and Mexico come up with those documents to enter the United States?

That is part of the problem we have now. There is no identification. There is some identification like baptismal certificates or marriage licenses to prove identity. Use the universal document like a passport. Then we can record who comes into the United States and who leaves the United States. We don't even do that now.

With a universal passport that everybody has, provided by their government, it will streamline the process. It will make it quicker and easier for Canadians to come into the United States, for Americans to travel back and forth across our common borders.

I urge adoption of this amendment, this commonsense amendment to require a passport to enter the United States.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POE. I will.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. The gentleman really answers the question why should we even consider it here. You say, why should we not use this?

That is exactly why this ought to be considered by the authorizing committee. We ought to have testimony taken by the authorizing committee to explore the questions why we should not jump to this simple solution to a very complicated problem. The gentleman's question, I think, is proof in and of itself of why we shouldn't be considering this question here on the floor today.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I understand the frustrations with the Mexican border that drove my good friend, Representative TED POE, to offer this amendment. But this amendment is a sledgehammer to kill a gnat.

The Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative (WHTI) applies to all air, sea, and land entries into the United States by January 1, 2008. There is a vast difference between the Mexican and Canadian land borders. As Chairman of the Canadian-U.S. Interparliamentary Group, I know that requiring everyone crossing the U.S.-Canadian border to have a passport is unrealistic, would devastate our economy, and would divert precious limited resources away from prosecuting true threats to our national security. Just yesterday, I met with a group of Canadian Members of Parliament from Alberta visiting Washington, DC who once again raised this issue as the top irritant in our bilateral relations.

Only 40 percent of Canadians and 20 percent of Americans have passports. I am not a fan of WHTI. But at least it attempts to solve the conundrum of improving border crossing documents without requiring everyone to spend \$97 to purchase a passport that takes six to eight weeks to get delivered. Already, the rumors that a passport is required for Canadians to drive into the United States have cost our economy over half a billion dollars. It also obviously affects the Canadian economy. One planned multi-million dollar resort complex in British Columbia was scrubbed based on the threat of a passport requirement.

Yes, it's true that the Canadians are more liberal with their immigration and asylum policies than we are. But I am satisfied that the Canadians are addressing border security in a responsible fashion. With the new Conserv-

ative government in power in Canada, I am more confident that they will continue to fix the problems in this area left undone by the previous Liberal government.

Finally, it's important to remember that no 9/11 terrorist came from Canada. In the only documented case from Canada—the Millennium bomber—the terrorist was caught by our border officials not because of documentation problems but because of human intuition. Some assert that Canada has at least 50 terror groups present and strongly infer Canada's alleged incompetence for not rounding up these individuals. Yet, they fail to recognize that if these individuals do nothing illegal, you can't arrest or deport people indiscriminately. U.S. authorities believe that there are somewhere between 50 and 100 Hamas and Hezbollah operatives in America and that al-Qaida sleeper cells are believed to be operating in 40 states, awaiting orders and funding for new attacks on U.S. soil. Yet, we haven't arrested these people. Why should Canada be held to a different standard?

When there is evidence of terrorist activity, the Canadians act. Earlier this month, the Royal Mounted Police captured the latest terrorist cell inside Canada, thanks in part to good cooperation with U.S. law enforcement officials, and have acted forcefully and effectively in intercepting these and other terrorists before they can enter into the United States. This is where our efforts should be directed, not in forcing U.S. schoolchildren to obtain a passport simply to play in a Pee-Wee hockey tournament in Thunder Bay. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the Poe amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read in its entirety.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act for "OFFICE OF JUSTICE PRO-

GRAMS—JUSTICE ASSISTANCE" may be used to fund State or local anti-drug task forces that do not collect, and make publicly available, data as to the racial distribution of convictions as result of their operation.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to share with Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. WOLF that, as we proceeded through the bill, we recognize the challenges that you face as appropriators and the difficulties of this legislative process in the appropriations process. I want it to be known that I have legislation on this Tulia example that this example or amendment tries to track.

Tulia, Texas, is a community that experienced abuse of power. We always want to celebrate good law enforcement, and they have a tough job. I meet with my local law enforcement. I try to find more resources for them to do their jobs, as I am attempting to do in Houston, Texas, as we work together to provide more funding for some of the challenges we have in the criminal justice system.

But in Tulia, Texas, more than 100 persons in that community were eventually tried and convicted in false drug charges; and it was on the testimony of one single law enforcement officer who ultimately, of course, was removed and himself indicted for perjury.

The Jackson-Lee amendment seeks to restore justice into justice systems by making the operation of federally funded State and local anti-drug task forces more transparent in order to prevent civil rights abuses such as those that occurred in Tulia, Texas, and more recently in Hearne, Texas. Grants for the local State and anti-drug task forces come from the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs.

I am an ardent proponent of initiatives that strengthen and support our law enforcement agencies. Furthermore, as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security and the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, I make it a goal whenever possible to advocate for increased funding facilities, better facilities, training and equipment, and for improved interruptible communications for first responders and law enforcement officials.

However, with this amendment, I seek a simple concept, something that is not an extra added burden. The data is already there. I seek to restore the integrity, the honesty, the even-handedness and even judiciousness of our law enforcement agencies by asking them to collect and make publicly available data as to the racial distribution of convictions they garnered as a result of their operations.

The question is whether one population over another is targeted.

By asking for the collection and publication of such data, the Jackson-Lee amendment holds State and local recipients accountable for the manner in which they conduct their anti-drug programs and deter law enforcement agencies or individual rogue cops from engaging in racial profiling if they seek to receive Federal funds under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say this is not a labeling of our law enforcement on the front line. This is just simply asking for reporting that is prescribed under the amendment that is authorized in law as filed in 42 U.S.C. 3782, 42 U.S.C. 3759 and 42 U.S.C. 3789(e), the Byrne program, as well as 42 U.S.C. 3751 and 3753.

Section 3782 lays out the parameters of the establishment of rules, regulations and procedures that are necessary for exercise of agency functions in carrying out the provisions of Byrne. Specifically, it authorizes a promulgation of rules and regulations that ensure that the entire program has a high probability of improving the criminal justice system and is likely to contribute to the improvement of the criminal justice system and a reduction and prevention of crime.

More importantly, Mr. Chairman, however, the rules and regulations promulgated must help the reporting agencies determine the program's impact on communities and participants. The very negative results of the program that we saw in Tulia and Hearne, Texas, clearly and unequivocally contravene these provisions. The Jackson-Lee amendment seeks to correct this problem.

Mr. Chairman, lives were interrupted. Mothers lost sons and daughters to jail time. I would ask for those who are unfamiliar with this case to just look on the Web site. You will find this is a unique case, when more than 100 people were sent to the judicial system, incarcerated, tried, convicted, and they were innocent. There were people who were not even around that this officer, through funding, testified against.

I would simply ask that this amendment be accepted by my colleagues, because what it does is ask for justice, and it asks for the facts. If you have done the crime, you do the time. We understand that.

But what we want to say is that 15 percent of the African American population of Tulia was arrested, prosecuted, sentenced to decades in prison based on uncorroborated testimony of a federally funded undercover officer who had a record of racial impropriety in the course of enforcing the law. Let us not have this happen again.

I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 5672, which states that none of the funds made available in this Act under the heading "Office of Justice Programs—Justice Assistance" may be used to fund State or local anti-drug task forces that do not collect,

and make publicly available, data as to the racial distribution of convictions as a result of their operation.

The Jackson-Lee amendment seeks to restore "justice" into the justice system by making the operation of federally funded state and local anti-drug task forces more transparent in order to prevent civil rights abuses such as those that occurred in Tulia, Texas, and more recently in Hearne, Texas.

Grants to fund state and local anti-drug task forces come from the "Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs (Byrne Program)," in Title 42 U.S.C., Subchapter V. I am an ardent proponent of initiatives that strengthen and support our law enforcement agencies. Furthermore, as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security and the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, I make it a goal whenever possible to advocate for increased funding, better facilities, training, and equipment, and for improved interoperable communications for first responders and law enforcement officials.

However, with this amendment, I seek to restore the integrity, honesty, evenhandedness, and judiciousness of our law enforcement agencies by compelling them to collect and make publicly available data as to the racial distribution of convictions they garnered as a result of their operations. By compelling the collection and publication of such data, the Jackson-Lee amendment holds state and local grant recipients accountable for the manner in which they conduct their anti-drug programs and deters law enforcement agencies from engaging in racial profiling if they seek to receive federal funds under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the type of reporting that is prescribed under my amendment is authorized in law as found in 42 U.S.C. 3782, 42 U.S.C. 3759, and 42 U.S.C. 3789e, the Byrne Program as well as 42 U.S.C. 3751 and 3753.

Section 3782 lays out the parameters of the establishment of rules, regulations, and "procedures that are necessary to the exercise" of agency functions in carrying out the provisions of Byrne. Specifically, it authorizes the promulgation of rules and regulations that ensure that the entire program has a "high probability of improving the criminal justice system" and is "likely to contribute to the improvement of the criminal justice system and the reduction and prevention of crime." More importantly, however, the rules and regulations promulgated must help the reporting agencies determine the program's "impact on communities and participants." The very negative results of the program that we saw in Tulia and Hearne, Texas, clearly and unequivocally contravene these provisions, and the Jackson Lee amendment seeks to correct this problem.

Section 3789e contains a report to the President and to Congress that relates to the nature of the activities conducted under this program. The Jackson-Lee amendment seeks to ensure that unethical and dishonest application of anti-drug task forces funded under this program do not slip through the cracks. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is vital to protecting the integrity and the evenhandedness of the activities funded under this program. Many years of Civil Rights jurisprudence and law have been ignored and thrown out the window when America permitted situations such as that in Tulia and Hearne to take place with impunity.

In recent years, it has become clear that programs funded by the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program have borne opportunities for the abuse of the penal system, racially disparate treatment, corruption and tainting of law enforcement agencies, and the commission of civil rights abuses across the country. This is especially the case when it comes to the program's funding of hundreds of regional narcotics task forces. Operation of anti-drug task forces around the country, which has lacked state or federal oversight, has been riddled with corruption and is the root of some of America's most horrific law enforcement-related scandals.

One of the better known federally-funded anti-drug task force scandals occurred in Tulia, Texas, several years ago. Fifteen percent of the African American population of Tulia was arrested, prosecuted, and sentenced to decades in prison based on the uncorroborated testimony of a federally-funded undercover officer who had a record of racial impropriety in the course of enforcing the law. The Tulia defendants have since been pardoned, but these kinds of scandals continue to plague the Byrne grant program.

More recently, on May 11, 2005, the District Attorney of Robertson County in Hearne, Texas, and the South Central Texas Narcotics Task Force, in a case filed by the American Civil Liberties Union on behalf of 28 African Americans, offered to settle their case after 5 years of litigation. This case arose from the arrest of 28 individuals—out of 4,500 other residents of Hearne in November 2000 on charges of possession or distribution of crack cocaine. During litigation, the presiding judge was asked to dismiss the charges because they were based on evidence from an unreliable informant, as reported to the Houston Chronicle.

These scandals are not the result of a few "bad apples" in law enforcement; they are the result of a fundamentally and systemically flawed bureaucracy that is prone to corruption by its very structure. Byrne-funded regional anti-drug task forces are federally funded, state managed, and locally staffed, which means they do not really have to answer to anyone. In fact, their ability to perpetuate themselves through asset forfeiture and federal funding makes them unaccountable to local taxpayers and governing bodies.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to ensure that state and local law enforcement agencies are held accountable and discouraged from engaging in racial profiling.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill. It, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part, "an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law." The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I know that procedurally,

even though I cite a number of sections which I believe would comply with removing the point of order, might I say that, in the course of the gentleman's response, I would just simply say to him that, because this is such a repetitive incident, such as the one that occurred in Hearne, Texas, and a South Central Texas narcotics case and a case filed by the American Civil Liberties on behalf of 28 African-Americans, that the case was offered to settlement, this case arose from the arrests of 28 individuals out of 4,500 other residents of Hearne in November, 2000, on charges of possession or distribution of crack cocaine.

That, again, was an example where this individual, using Federal monies, had given misinformation to the judicial system. These scandals point out the bad apples. I think this is sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentlewoman must confine her remarks to the point of order.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will.

I wish there were a waiver of the point of order, but on the basis of the gentleman's point that was made, I hope that we have made our point.

At this point, I will concede the point of order, looking forward for my legislation to pass, and ask to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. HEFLEY:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. Total appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced by \$598,390,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

□ 1045

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise again today to offer an amendment to cut the level of funding in this appropriations bill by 1 percent. This amount equals more than \$598 million, which is one penny off of every dollar appropriated in this bill.

As you know, I have offered these kinds of amendments for most of the appropriation bills that we have considered so far this year, and if they had all been accepted, one penny off a dollar, we would have saved \$2.2 billion.

The appropriations made in this particular bill represent an increase of ap-

proximately \$140 million more than the administration's request for 2007. In addition, this bill also reflects an increase of more than \$2.6 billion over last year's appropriations bill, an increase that I think is just unacceptable in light of our deficit.

Mr. Chairman, I would encourage support of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment to cut \$598 million from the bill. As the gentleman can see from the debate, and the other amendments offered on the bill, many Members feel the funding for a whole host of programs in this bill is already inadequate. The budget resolution passed by the Congress has imposed upon us a very restrictive spending climate. This amendment constitutes attempts to reopen the decisions we have already made in the budget resolution.

The bill we are considering today stays within the budget resolution framework and represents a lot of hard work and hard decisions to match limited funds to competing national priorities. A number of accounts in the bill are funded very close to the bone. A reduction of 1 percent, many salaries and expenses would have a fairly dramatic and highly negative impact.

I would ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Knowing your history, Mr. Chairman, and many of these important efforts, particularly in the State funding, I just wanted to mention that any 1 percent cut would impact child survival and health programs, global funds to fight AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, the Development Assistance Fund, the International Disaster and Famine Assistance. These are varied programs that simply cannot afford any more of a cut.

We are obviously fighting international poverty. The U.S. Global Leadership Campaign has been on the Hill this past week. Secretary of State Powell and Secretary Albright have begged us to maintain our investment in these areas. And I can't imagine what a 1 percent cut would do to this very, very small part of the budget, which is 1.2 percent. And I would hope that our colleagues would see the necessity of having a better face or a continuing face to fight against issues dealing with children, HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria.

I hope that we can oppose this amendment for the devastation it would do to many programs that put the face of America to the world.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out to the gentlewoman from Texas that these amendments are

couched in such a way that they are not 1 percent across the board in every program in any of these bills. It is 1 percent total out of the bottom line or the top line, whichever way you want to say it, in the bill. And that means that the administration, the Department, can look at it and decide what is really needed and what is not. And if you will notice from some of the amendments we have had in the last day or two, this bill is riddled with earmarks for special little projects across the country in various districts. And, frankly, I don't know why the people of Colorado should have to pay for things in other districts that are strictly for those other districts like we had in some of the Flake amendments yesterday.

So we are not talking about a 1 percent. You can always mention, in every bill there is lot of good stuff. I have great respect for the chairman and the ranking member here. They have worked hard on this. There is much that is very, very good that I too would not want cut in this bill. But if we can't find one cent out of every dollar, then I think there is something very wrong.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I just want to thank the Chair for presiding very, very fairly and for correcting me on mistakes that I made without people knowing that I made the mistakes. But I think it was always very good to look up there and see your fair face, and you were very, very fair, I think, on both sides. I personally want to thank you very, very much on this bill but on many others that I have watched, but seeing you all day yesterday. So thank you.

Also thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for the great job that they have done and the Members, and again, Congressman HASTINGS, I thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

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

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

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

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 18 by Mr. POE of Texas.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. POE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 90, noes 318, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

AYES—90

Aderholt	Doolittle	Moran (KS)
Akin	Duncan	Musgrave
Barrett (SC)	Everett	Myrick
Bartlett (MD)	Foley	Neugebauer
Barton (TX)	Fox	Ney
Bean	Gibbons	Norwood
Beauprez	Gingrey	Otter
Berry	Goode	Paul
Bilbray	Gordon	Platts
Bilirakis	Graves	Poe
Blackburn	Hall	Price (GA)
Bonner	Harris	Radanovich
Bono	Hayworth	Rogers (AL)
Boozman	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Boren	Istook	Ross
Burgess	Jenkins	Royce
Buyer	Jindal	Saxton
Campbell (CA)	Jones (NC)	Sessions
Cantor	Kelly	Shays
Capito	King (IA)	Shuster
Capuano	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Chandler	Linder	Sullivan
Chocola	LoBiondo	Tancredo
Cramer	Lynch	Taylor (MS)
Davis (KY)	Marchant	Taylor (NC)
Davis (TN)	Matheson	Wamp
Davis, Jo Ann	McCaul (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Deal (GA)	McHenry	Wu
DeFazio	McIntyre	Young (FL)
Dent	Miller, Gary	

NOES—318

Ackerman	Cardin	Ehlers
Alexander	Cardoza	Emanuel
Allen	Carnahan	Emerson
Andrews	Carson	Engel
Baca	Carter	English (PA)
Bachus	Case	Eshoo
Baird	Castle	Etheridge
Baker	Chabot	Farr
Baldwin	Clay	Fattah
Barrow	Cleaver	Feeney
Bass	Clyburn	Ferguson
Becerra	Coble	Filner
Berkley	Cole (OK)	Flake
Berman	Conaway	Forbes
Biggart	Conyers	Fortenberry
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Fossella
Bishop (NY)	Costa	Frank (MA)
Blumenauer	Costello	Franks (AZ)
Blunt	Crenshaw	Frelinghuysen
Boehlert	Crowley	Gallely
Boehner	Cubin	Garrett (NJ)
Bonilla	Cuellar	Gilchrest
Boswell	Cummings	Gillmor
Boucher	Davis (AL)	Gohmert
Boustany	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez
Boyd	Davis (FL)	Goodlatte
Bradley (NH)	Davis (IL)	Granger
Brady (PA)	Davis, Tom	Green (WI)
Brady (TX)	DeGette	Green, Al
Brown (OH)	DeLahunt	Green, Gene
Brown (SC)	DeLauro	Grijalva
Brown, Corrine	Diaz-Balart, M.	Gutierrez
Brown-Waite,	Dicks	Gutknecht
Ginny	Dingell	Harman
Burton (IN)	Doggett	Hart
Butterfield	Doyle	Hastings (FL)
Calvert	Drake	Hastings (WA)
Camp (MI)	Dreier	Hefley
Capps	Edwards	Hensarling

Herger	McKinney	Sánchez, Linda
Herse	McMorris	T.
Higgins	McNulty	Sanchez, Loretta
Hinche	Meehan	Sanders
Hinojosa	Meek (FL)	Schakowsky
Hobson	Meeks (NY)	Schiff
Hoekstra	Melancon	Schmidt
Honda	Mica	Schwartz (PA)
Hoolley	Michaud	Schwarz (MI)
Hostettler	Miller (FL)	Scott (GA)
Hoyer	Miller (MI)	Scott (VA)
Hulshof	Miller (NC)	Sensenbrenner
Hyde	Miller, George	Serrano
Inglis (SC)	Mollohan	Shadegg
Inslee	Moore (KS)	Shaw
Israel	Moore (WI)	Sherman
Issa	Murphy	Shimkus
Jackson (IL)	Murtha	Simmons
Jackson-Lee	Nadler	Simpson
(TX)	Napolitano	Skelton
Jefferson	Neal (MA)	Slaughter
Johnson (CT)	Northup	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (IL)	Nunes	Smith (TX)
Johnson, E. B.	Nussle	Smith (WA)
Kaptur	Oberstar	Snyder
Keller	Obey	Sodrel
Kennedy (MN)	Ortiz	Solis
Kennedy (RI)	Osborne	Souder
Kildee	Owens	Spratt
Kilpatrick (MI)	Oxley	Stark
Kind	Pallone	Strickland
King (NY)	Pascarell	Stupak
Kingston	Pastor	Sweeney
Kirk	Payne	Tanner
Kline	Pearce	Tauscher
Knollenberg	Pelosi	Terry
Kolbe	Pence	Thomas
Kucinich	Peterson (MN)	Thompson (CA)
Kuhl (NY)	Peterson (PA)	Thompson (MS)
LaHood	Petri	Thornberry
Langevin	Pickering	Tiahrt
Lantos	Pitts	Tiberi
Larsen (WA)	Pombo	Tierney
Larson (CT)	Pomeroy	Towns
Latham	Porter	Turner
LaTourette	Price (NC)	Udall (CO)
Leach	Pryce (OH)	Udall (NM)
Lee	Putnam	Upton
Levin	Rahall	Van Hollen
Lewis (CA)	Ramstad	Velázquez
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Visclosky
Lipinski	Regula	Walden (OR)
Lofgren, Zoe	Rehberg	Walsh
Lowe	Reichert	Wasserman
Lucas	Renzi	Schultz
Lungren, Daniel	Reyes	Waters
E.	Reynolds	Watson
Mack	Rogers (KY)	Watt
Maloney	Rogers (MI)	Waxman
Markey	Ros-Lehtinen	Weiner
Matsui	Rothman	Weldon (FL)
McCarthy	Roybal-Allard	Weldon (PA)
McCollum (MN)	Ruppersberger	Weller
McCotter	Ryan (OH)	Wexler
McCrery	Ryan (WI)	Wicker
McDermott	Ryun (KS)	Wilson (NM)
McGovern	Sabo	Wolf
McHugh	Salazar	Woolsey
McKeon		Wynn

NOT VOTING—24

Abercrombie	Hayes	Millender-
Bishop (UT)	Holden	McDonald
Cannon	Holt	Moran (VA)
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Olver
Diaz-Balart, L.	Jones (OH)	Rush
Evans	Kanjorski	Sherwood
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Manzullo	Whitfield
Ford	Marshall	Young (AK)
Gerlach		

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1118

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. CARSON and Mrs. MCCARTHY and Messrs. TIERNEY, MELANCON, GUTKNECHT and MURPHY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. BEAN, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia and Mrs. BONO and Messrs. GORDON, SAXTON, ISTOOK, STEARNS, BOOZMAN, NEUGE-

BAUER, DAVIS of Tennessee, LYNCH and BOREN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 347, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 347, I was detained and was unable to get to the floor before the roll closed. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOEHNER was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to give all the Members an idea of what the schedule for the day is. After the passage of this bill, we will move to the rule on the Deep Water Recovery Act, the OCS bill, and the rule on the resolution with regard to the disclosure of the SWIFT Program. Once those two rules have been considered, there will be votes, and then we will move to the OCS bill and then finally to the resolution.

We expect to complete our week's work by 6 or 6:15 this evening. I am trying to give everyone as much notice as we can. That is the schedule as I see it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the 5-minute vote will continue.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 94, noes 316, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

AYES—94

Akin	Davis (TN)	Hefley
Bachus	Deal (GA)	Hensarling
Baker	Diaz-Balart, M.	Herger
Barrett (SC)	Duncan	Hoekstra
Bartlett (MD)	Everett	Hostettler
Bass	Feeney	Inglis (SC)
Bean	Flake	Issa
Beauprez	Foley	Jenkins
Bilbray	Fossella	Jindal
Bilirakis	Fox	Jones (NC)
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Keller
Burton (IN)	Garrett (NJ)	King (IA)
Buyer	Gibbons	Lewis (KY)
Campbell (CA)	Gohmert	Linder
Chabot	Graves	Lungren, Daniel
Chocola	Green (WI)	E.
Coble	Gutknecht	Mack
Cooper	Harris	McCotter
Davis (KY)	Hart	McHenry

McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts

Poe
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus

Shuster
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

NOES—316

Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake

Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski

LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Ehlers
Lucas
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Markley
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pomboy
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)

Sabo
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)

Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen

Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—22

Abercrombie
Bishop (UT)
Brady (TX)
Cannon
Conyers
Culberson
Evans
Fitzpatrick (PA)

Ford
Gerlach
Hayes
Holden
Holt
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski

Manzullo
Marshall
Moore (WI)
Rush
Sherwood
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).
Members are advised 2 minutes remain
in this vote.

□ 1127

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no fur-
ther amendments, the Clerk will read
the last lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Science,
State, Justice, Commerce, and Related
Agencies Appropriations Act, 2007”.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in
strong support of the United Nations.

The mission of the U.N. today is as relevant
as it was in 1945 when this global forum was
established: preserving peace through inter-
national cooperation and collective security.
Cutting U.S. funding to the U.N. not only un-
dermines the efforts of the U.N. but also re-
duces the United State's ability to influence re-
form at the U.N. Government entities by their
very own definition are not perfect institutions,
and the U.N. is no exception. But the U.N. is
actively engaged in review and assessment of
its organizations to ensure that they are effec-
tive and consistent with the core mission. The
U.N. has already taken some important steps
in much needed reform, like the creation of an
ethics office. It has created new bodies to ad-
dress the new threats of the 21st century, like
the Peacebuilding Commission that will work
to assist countries in the difficult transition
from conflict to sustainable peace. I believe
that the U.S. must be an active participant in
the U.N., and push for appropriate reforms
that make the U.N. more responsive to the
changing challenges of the 21st century. The
U.S. and Congress in particular, can support
these reform efforts by robustly funding the
U.N. and not undermining U.S. standing at the
U.N. with amendments and rhetoric that un-
necessarily criticize the U.N. without assigning
any value to the important work they do.

Now more than ever, the world needs the
United Nations to be successful.

Mr. LEVIN. I rise to point out a serious
shortcoming in the FY07 Science, State, Jus-

tice, Commerce Appropriations bill. Manufac-
turing has a proud history in this country as
the engine that created our middle class—a
source of good jobs, steady benefits, and
quality products for consumers. While I will
support the overall bill, I am concerned that it
does not provide adequate resources for the
Manufacturing Extension Partnership, or MEP.

MEP is a small, but proven program that
helps small manufacturers compete globally
by giving them access to technologies and
processes that improve their productivity and
their products.

By proposing to cut MEP by more than 50
percent, the President has again dem-
onstrated his upside-down priorities and re-
fused to acknowledge the manufacturing jobs
crisis in this country. Since 2001, manufac-
turing states like Michigan have lost a median
17 percent of their manufacturing jobs—an av-
erage of more than 75,000 jobs per state. Yet
the Bush Administration has ignored the im-
portance of preserving our manufacturing base
at every turn—refusing to enforce U.S. trading
rights here and overseas, failing to take ad-
vantage of opportunities to create new mar-
kets for American goods, and repeatedly pro-
posing funding cuts for programs that spur in-
novation and forward progress here at home.

I understand that the Subcommittee has
tried to do its best with inadequate resources,
and I appreciate that the \$92 million provided
for MEP in the bill is a significant improvement
over the President's request. But we have to
do more than turn a 50 percent cut into a 15
percent cut.

I hope that as this bill moves forward, we
will be able to restore funding for MEP to the
current level of \$106 million. The con-
sequences of not doing so are serious: 2,100
fewer manufacturers would receive MEP's val-
uable services, resulting in 5,760 fewer manu-
facturing jobs in this country. By way of com-
parison, last year in Michigan alone, MEP
helped create or retain almost 2,000 jobs and
almost \$190 million in sales.

In a word, fully restoring funding for MEP to
the current level is critical. It is critical to our
small manufacturers and to the workers and
families that rely on them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise
in support of the Science, State Justice and
Commerce Appropriations bill for Fiscal 2007
and commend the Chairmen and Ranking
Members of the full committee and the sub-
committee for producing a bill that is worthy of
support.

While there are many laudable provisions of
this bill, I would like to turn the House's at-
tention to an amendment offered in full committee
last week by the gentleman from New York,
Mr. SWEENEY.

My colleagues, many American families
have long stood vigil on behalf of their family
members who were murdered on December
21, 1988 on Pan Am 103 over Lockerbie Scot-
land. We must never forget the pain and suf-
fering of the families affected by this horrible
act and Muammar Qadhafi and others must
be held responsible.

It is our job today to ensure that America re-
quires Libya to fully honor its commitment to
the victims of Pan Am 103.

In recent years, the Libyan government has
come forward and expressed an interest in be-
coming a member of the international commu-
nity.

However, at the same time, I remain con-
cerned that Libya has yet to meet its financial

commitments to the families of the Americans killed in Pan Am Flight 103 and may be implying that all claims in this case are settled.

It is imperative that the Libyan government meet its commitments before diplomatic relations are restored. We must be resolute in the face of terrorism and we must hold Libya to their commitment to their victims' families.

As we are aware, Libya made a commitment in 2003 to pay compensation to these families in the amount of \$2.7 billion. While part of that package has been paid, \$536 million of the settlement is still outstanding.

Under the agreement reached with the families, this money was to be paid upon Libya's removal from the list of state sponsors of terror. Now that this has happened, the United States Government must stand on principle and prevent our families from being victimized again.

The Sweeney amendment has a simple purpose—to bar our Government from funding any activity related to restoring diplomatic relations with Libya until Libya honors the financial commitments it made to the families of the victims of the 1988 bombing of Pan Am flight 103.

And, even more important than the financial obligation is the need to bring those responsible for the destruction of Flight 103 to justice. Money can never compensate for the cold-blooded murders by state-sponsored acts of terror.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the amendment and the base appropriations bill.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2007 because I refuse to pretend that partially restoring the President's reckless cuts to important programs is the best we can do. We are administering death by a thousand cuts to the basic functions of government to finance tax breaks for millionaires and an open-ended war in Iraq. And we're going to borrow over \$300 billion to do it.

In this bill, I find particularly objectionable the \$563 million cut from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including a \$47 million cut from the Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund; the \$20 million cut from economic development projects in distressed areas; and the \$117 million cut for dues to the United Nations and other international organizations. The bill robs from these and other critical programs to avoid eliminating assistance to state and local law enforcement, as requested by the President, although law enforcement still suffers a \$150 million cut from last year.

I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this bill to force the Bush Administration and Republican Congress to start making responsible choices with the American people's money.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 5672, the Science-State-Justice Commerce Appropriations bill.

This legislation includes approximately \$176,000,000 for a DNA analysis and capacity enhancement program and other local, State, and Federal forensic activities. Of this funding, not less than \$151,000,000 is directed toward the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program which help to reduce and eliminate the backlog of DNA samples and increase State and local DNA laboratory capacity.

I met Debbie Smith five years ago when she came to Washington to testify at a hearing about the importance of DNA evidence. The evidence collected from her rape sat on a shelf for years waiting to be analyzed. After hearing her story, I resolved to do something about the hundreds of thousands of rape kits that were sitting on shelves, unanalyzed, because of a lack of funding. "The Debbie Smith Act" became law in 2004, and with the critical funding provided by Congress, DNA evidence will be analyzed and rapists put behind bars. I commend Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for their steadfast support for this issue.

I also am pleased that this legislation contains \$21,488,000 to enhance State and local efforts to combat trafficking of persons, as authorized by legislation that I sponsored with Representative DEBORAH PRYCE (R-OH), the "End Demand for Sex Trafficking Act." This funding will also go toward conducting comprehensive research and statistical review of sex trafficking and unlawful commercial sex acts in the United States.

Approximately 600,000 to 800,000 people are trafficked across international borders each year. However, trafficking is not just a problem in other countries. Each year, men, women, and children from all over the world are brought into the United States for the sole purpose of being bought and sold by American citizens for commercial sex. And the victims are often Americans.

I have worked on the trafficking issue for many years including working to stop sex tour operators like Big Apple Oriental Tours, which is based in New York City, from sexually exploiting impoverished women and girls in developing countries.

It is important that we protect the victims of the sex trade industry, and punish the predators that exploit them. This funding is an important step in preventing the many human rights abuses inflicted on men, women, and children around the world.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5672) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 890, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 23, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]

YEAS—393

Abercrombie	Cole (OK)	Harris
Ackerman	Conaway	Hart
Aderholt	Conyers	Hastings (FL)
Akin	Costa	Hastings (WA)
Alexander	Costello	Hayworth
Allen	Cramer	Herger
Andrews	Crenshaw	Herseth
Baca	Crowley	Higgins
Bachus	Cubin	Hinchey
Baird	Cuellar	Hinojosa
Baker	Culberson	Hobson
Baldwin	Cummings	Hoekstra
Barrett (SC)	Davis (AL)	Honda
Barrow	Davis (CA)	Hooley
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (FL)	Hoyer
Barton (TX)	Davis (IL)	Hulshof
Bass	Davis (KY)	Hunter
Bean	Davis (TN)	Hyde
Beauprez	Davis, Jo Ann	Inglis (SC)
Becerra	Davis, Tom	Inslee
Berkley	Deal (GA)	Israel
Berman	DeFazio	Issa
Berry	DeGette	Istook
Biggert	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Bilbray	Dent	Jackson-Lee
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, L.	(TX)
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jefferson
Bishop (NY)	Dicks	Jenkins
Blackburn	Dingell	Jindal
Blumenauer	Doggett	Johnson (CT)
Blunt	Doolittle	Johnson (IL)
Boehlert	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Boehner	Drake	Jones (OH)
Bonilla	Dreier	Kaptur
Bonner	Edwards	Keller
Bono	Ehlers	Kelly
Boozman	Emanuel	Kennedy (MN)
Boren	Emerson	Kennedy (RI)
Boswell	Engel	Kildee
Boucher	English (PA)	Kilpatrick (MI)
Boustany	Etheridge	Kind
Boyd	Everett	King (IA)
Bradley (NH)	Farr	King (NY)
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Kingston
Brady (TX)	Feeney	Kirk
Brown (OH)	Ferguson	Kline
Brown (SC)	Filner	Knollenberg
Brown, Corrine	Foley	Kolbe
Brown-Waite,	Forbes	Kucinich
Ginny	Fortenberry	Kuhl (NY)
Burgess	Fossella	LaHood
Burton (IN)	Fox	Langevin
Butterfield	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Larsen (WA)
Calvert	Gallegly	Larson (CT)
Camp (MI)	Garrett (NJ)	Latham
Campbell (CA)	Gibbons	LaTourette
Cantor	Gilchrest	Leach
Capito	Gillmor	Lee
Capps	Gingrey	Levin
Capuano	Gohmert	Lewis (CA)
Cardin	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Cardoza	Goode	Lewis (KY)
Carnahan	Goodlatte	Linder
Carson	Gordon	Lipinski
Carter	Granger	LoBiondo
Case	Graves	Lofgren, Zoe
Castle	Green, Al	Lowey
Chabot	Green, Gene	Lucas
Chandler	Grijalva	Lungren, Daniel
Chocoma	Gutierrez	E.
Clay	Gutknecht	Lynch
Cleaver	Hall	Mack
Coble	Harman	Maloney

Marchant
Markay
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaull (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne

Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster

Simmons
Simpson
Skeltson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—23

Cooper
Delahunt
Duncan
Eshoo
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Green (WI)
Hefley

NOT VOTING—16

Bishop (UT)
Cannon
Clyburn
Evans
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Ford

□ 1146

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4761, DEEP OCEAN EN- ERGY RESOURCES ACT OF 2006

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 897 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 897

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. 4761) to provide for exploration, development, and production activities for mineral resources on the outer Continental Shelf, 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 Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. House Resolutions 162, 163, 181, 182, 393, 395, 400, 401, 468, and 620 are laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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.

The Rules Committee granted a fair rule for consideration of H.R. 4761 providing for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled between the Chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Resources.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Resources now

printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered read.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Resources.

The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution and provides that the amendments printed in the report may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report and provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

The rule provides that House Resolutions 162, 163, 181, 182, 393, 395, 400, 401, 468 and 620 are laid upon the table.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation faces an energy crisis that is impacting our constituents across the country. In my district of West Virginia, many lower and middle income citizens, especially our seniors on fixed incomes, are being impacted by the soaring prices at the pump and rising home heating costs. Not only does this blow a hole in the budgets of many families, it also has an impact on the Federal budget; and correctly, in my view, we sought to increase the funds for LIHEAP to help those in the lower and middle income range.

The crisis also impacts jobs. Energy prices make adding jobs more challenging for small business owners as their transportation and energy costs skyrocket. The impact has been felt by larger, community sustaining industries.

The Kanawha Valley in my district has long been one of the largest centers of the Nation's chemical industry. These chemical plants use natural gas as both an energy source and as a feedstock. The cost of energy is one factor that has led to job losses in this important industry and has decimated the large chemical industry in the Kanawha Valley. These jobs have gone overseas.

The American Chemistry Council estimates that since the price of natural gas began to spike the chemical industry has lost more than \$60 billion to foreign competitors because investors are wary of expensive natural gas in the United States. This has cost over 100,000 jobs nationwide in the chemical industry, about 10 percent of that total industry workforce.

Last month, hundreds of employees from West Virginia chemical plants wrote me asking that Congress pass legislation to allow drilling in the