

that Bill Clinton's offense was no big deal. And the hypocrisy doesn't end there. Where was the liberal outrage when Sandy Berger was caught destroying classified documents and received a slap on the wrist? What about sweetheart land deals or refrigerated cash?

Madam Speaker, the American ideal is equal justice under the law. Let's enforce the law, and let's do so equally, regardless of politics.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 720, WATER QUALITY FINANCING ACT OF 2007

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 229 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 229

*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. 720) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, 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 except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. 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 Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each further 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 further amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. 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. The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 0915

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 229 provides for the consideration of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides that the substitute reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, modified by the manager's amendment in the Rules Committee report, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended.

The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part B of the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. The amendments 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 the amendments, except for clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI, are waived. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

And I am pleased to point out, Madam Speaker, that under this structured rule, the six amendments made in order are split equally, three Republican and three Democratic.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 720 reauthorizes an important part of the landmark Clean Water Act. The Clean Water Act protects our neighborhoods and water bodies from water pollution. Clean water is vital to the health of our citizens and to our country.

The bill before us today reauthorizes the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund by providing \$14 billion over the next 5 years to local agencies to fight water pollution.

We have come a long way in this country. We have the technology and the engineering experience to prevent

water pollution. The Environmental Protection Agency estimates a huge shortfall in funds available for wastewater improvements across the country. This shortfall is significant because, without considerable improvements to the wastewater treatment infrastructure, much of the progress made in cleaning up the Nation's rivers, creeks and streams and bays since the passage of the Clean Water Act is at risk.

Clean water is a top priority for the families in my district and throughout the Nation. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership over the past few Congresses has failed to support this part of the Clean Water Act. Although legislation was introduced in the Congress then, it never made it to the House floor.

President Bush and the White House also proposed slashing this Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund in his latest budget proposal. But, nevertheless, we are hopeful today that a bipartisan vote in support of this measure will send a signal to the White House that clean and healthy water is absolutely vital to our communities. In fact, in my hometown of Tampa, Florida, the Clean Water Act Loan Funds for wastewater improvements have vastly improved the water quality of Tampa Bay. The expansion in wastewater treatment significantly improved the quality of water running into beautiful Tampa Bay.

In past years, Tampa received over \$54 million for wastewater treatment plant expansion and thereby improved water quality. It has also played a role in significantly improving the water in our rivers, bays, creeks and streams as we are able to control the pollutants that run off into these vital water bodies.

This is the same story across the country for the improved health of our communities, on the Chesapeake Bay, the Great Lakes and other water bodies throughout our country. Check with your local governments and your neighbors who live around and who are mindful of the quality of the water in our lakes, rivers and bays in your hometown.

Appearing before our Rules Committee, House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman JIM OBERSTAR said it best: "This is not just a good bill. It is a necessary one. The good health of our communities depends upon it."

And as a former county commissioner, I can tell you that the vast majority of costs in cleaning our water falls upon our local communities. And if we don't act now, we will be shifting a greater cost to future generations.

So I urge the Congress, Madam Speaker, to enact this rule and this important legislation to keep our communities, rivers, lakes and bays clean and, most importantly, to improve the health of our children, seniors, and all citizens.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this modified closed rule and to the underlying legislation. I also rise, regrettably, to report to the American people that, for the second week in a row, the Democrat leadership is bringing legislation to the House floor that benefits big labor bosses at someone else's expense.

Last week, American workers were the losers in the Democrat-controlled House when the majority leadership forced through legislation that would provide for unprecedented intimidation of employees by union bosses under a fundamentally anti-democratic process known as card check.

This week, the Democrat leadership has set its sights on one of their favorite targets, the American taxpayer. But the other losers in this bargain are far more shocking. They include local communities across the United States, small and minority-owned businesses, and the environment.

H.R. 720 would provide for an unprecedented expansion of the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provision of the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund or SRF. When the SRF was established, it applied Davis-Bacon only to the Federal portion of a Clean Water project. But today, in order to help big labor bosses pad their dwindling ranks, they would apply these same provisions to all non-Federal funds, such as loan repayments, State bond revenues, interest and State-matching funds.

Since the SRF program expired in 1995, no SRF project has been subject to Davis-Bacon. But today the Democrat Party wants to change that and to stack the deck in favor of big labor bosses whose ranks have dwindled to 12 percent in 2006 from their high of 35 percent in the 1950s.

I insert into the RECORD a letter from my colleague from Florida, JOHN MICA, to Rules Committee Chairwoman SLAUGHTER and Ranking Member DREIER detailing the specifics of this unprecedented expansion.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, March 8, 2007.

Hon. LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER, Chairwoman, Committee on Rules, Washington, DC.

Hon. DAVID DREIER, Ranking Republican Member, Committee on Rules, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN SLAUGHTER and RANKING MEMBER DREIER: I appreciated the opportunity to appear before the Committee on Rules today concerning H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007. I am writing to clarify the point I made during the hearing this afternoon that this bill includes an unprecedented expansion of the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provision of the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund (SRF).

When the Clean Water SRF was established it applied Davis-Bacon to amounts equal to the federal capitalization grant, also commonly referred to as the "first round". As such, states were not required to apply Davis-Bacon to all other available funding

sources states used for such projects. Non-federal money, such as loan repayments, state bond revenues, interest, and the state match, were therefore exempt from 1987 to 1995 when the SRF program expired. Since that time, no SRF project has been subject to Davis-Bacon.

H.R. 720 proposes to expand Davis-Bacon beyond federal capitalization grants to all non-federal money, and represents an unprecedented expansion of Davis-Bacon application to the SRF for water and sewer projects. Chairman Oberstar correctly stated that State Infrastructure Banks program, reauthorized under SAFETEA-LU, contains a similar expanded version of Davis Bacon as that in H.R. 720. As I stated earlier today, the expansion of Davis-Bacon is unprecedented for the SRF program.

Again, this unnecessary and wasteful provision requiring the application of prevailing wage rates to SRF projects will only slow the construction and limit the number of projects for much needed wastewater treatment plants in communities large and small across America.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,

Ranking Republican Member.

The practical effect of attempting to apply this Depression Era wage subsidy law and determining the prevailing wages for Federal construction projects is startling. The National School Boards Association found that more than 60 percent of its respondents confirmed that Davis-Bacon laws were responsible for increasing the cost of construction projects by over 20 percent.

This claim is backed up by Congress's own Congressional Budget Office, which issued a report in 2001 stating that repealing Davis-Bacon or raising the threshold for projects it covers "would allow appropriators to reduce funds spent on Federal construction."

The CBO has also estimated that if Congress were to repeal Davis-Bacon outright, it would save the Federal Government \$9.5 billion over the period between 2002 and 2011.

This Davis-Bacon expansion also tramples all over the rights of 18 States that have chosen not to have a State prevailing wage law because its associated inflated construction costs mean that limited State and local budgets cannot meet the priorities of their taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I will repeat that. Because its associated inflation constructions cost mean that limited State and local budgets cannot meet the priorities of their taxpayers.

These States ought not to be saddled with this outdated Federal law against the will of their voters, which serves as an unfunded mandate by siphoning off scarce resources that would otherwise be spent on schools, hospitals, prisons, roads and other vital projects.

In the Rules Committee yesterday evening, we heard testimony from a number of our colleagues, particularly Dr. CHARLES BOUSTANY and RICHARD BAKER of Louisiana, who explained the practical impact of this legislation on their State, and might I add, a State that is in need of a lot of Federal money as a result of Katrina that occurred several years ago.

Quite simply, both Mr. BAKER and Mr. BOUSTANY made it very clear to the committee that today's legislation would have devastating effects on their State's ability to rebuild its clean water efforts and provide for much-needed environmental cleanup after the extremely costly devastation caused by Hurricanes Rita and Katrina.

Mr. Speaker, after last week, I am really not surprised by the lengths to which the Democrat leadership is willing to go to satisfy labor bosses. I am disappointed, however, by the targets that they are ready and willing to harm in accomplishing this narrow objective.

I ask every Member of this House to join with me in opposing this rule and the underlying legislation. The choice that we are being asked to make is very, very simple: If you support fiscal responsibility, small business, States' rights, rural communities, women- and minority-owned businesses, and the environment, you will join with me in opposing this rule.

If, however, instead, you support environmental harm, market distortion, wasteful Federal spending, and stacking the deck in favor of labor bosses, I wholeheartedly encourage you to vote for this legislation.

I do understand that the minority party may not be able to stop this rule from going forward, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to thank the Democrat leadership for putting this legislation and the crystal clear choice that it represents on the floor today so that voters are able to see what every single Member of this body supports.

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

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

I thank my colleague and I note that my colleague, unable to criticize the heart of this legislation, which is reauthorization of an important part of the Clean Water Act, instead reverts to attacking a portion of this legislation that is vital to workers across America, the Davis-Bacon provisions.

The Davis-Bacon Act prevents lower-cost out-of-State contractors from having an unfair ability to compete for local publicly funded construction, which protects local interests and construction workers.

Unfortunately, it has become all too familiar from the other side of the aisle to attack workers across America. They blocked the minimum wage until this new Congress was elected. We have a White House that has favored outsourcing of jobs over time.

But now, through this legislation, we are able to reaffirm again that it is our policy, in fact, it is Congress's long-standing continuing tradition of applying prevailing wage requirements to federally funded construction projects. Studies have shown that by attracting more experienced, better-trained workers, that wage requirements lead to higher productivity and they reduce overall costs, which offset any higher wages.

□ 0930

The Davis-Bacon Act protects communities by ensuring that wage determination also for individual counties is based solely on the local workforce costs. Oftentimes, this means that projects come in under budget and on time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her words, except I would like to let her know, I know she was not in the body last year, but this body did pass a minimum wage bill last year. It should be noted that the bill included exactly what the Democrat leadership wanted, and we took their bill exactly as it was for minimum wage. The problem that the Democrat leadership had was that it was a balanced approach, and that is the reason why it did not move forward in the other body and why the President never got it.

Mr. Speaker, what the Republicans did was to take the Democrat bill on minimum wage and add to that a balanced provision which would help small businesses who are bearing the burden of most of the brunt of the minimum wage and allow them the opportunity to offset those changes so that we can continue growing the free market economy. Small business is the engine of our economy.

It is also worth noting, since the gentlewoman brought it up, that this body this year did pass a minimum wage without those equalizing factors or benefits to small business, and that is why it got stuck in the other body and why this body is having to come back to correct it to make it a more balanced view, the same kind of balanced view that the Republicans took last year in order to pass the minimum wage.

I know the gentlewoman was not here last year, but those are the facts of the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. He has been very eloquent on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I rise in opposition to this rule. I am deeply disappointed in the Rules Committee and its actions yesterday by limiting the number of amendments that we could have taken to the floor.

We all recognize that there is a gap, or a shortfall, in the funding that exists to help deal with our water infrastructure, and this is most pointedly affecting our small rural and disadvantaged communities; but I have to say the actions of the Rules Committee and the majority on the Rules Committee really disappoint me, because what we have seen now is politics trumping practical policy.

Sure, we don't agree on Davis-Bacon, and having an up-and-down vote is fine,

but that is a political vote. We are all frozen in our positions. But we could have taken a chance to protect our small and disadvantaged communities by creating some exemptions.

I had hoped to offer two amendments to this bill yesterday, and they were not ruled in order for the bill. One would have exempted small, disadvantaged communities as defined by law from Davis-Bacon big labor provisions in the bill. This would have given our small communities a chance to access these funds. What good are the funds if the communities can't get to them?

The gentlelady across the aisle here says, talk to local leaders. I can tell you, I have spoken to local leaders, Democrat and Republican alike, those who favor labor and those who don't, in my communities across my district, which is largely rural; and they have uniformly told me that these Davis-Bacon provisions and this State revolving loan fund will really put a burden on our small communities. It will inflate the costs by 20 to 25 percent.

So on the one hand we are saying, yes, let's create the revolving loan fund; let's fund it. On the other hand, we are telling our small communities, no, you can't have the money, because you can't afford it. You can't afford the match. You can't afford to access this money.

Our small and rural communities are the ones that are most often in need of adequate waste water infrastructure. I have visited every community in my district.

Mr. Speaker, this is a huge need, and I want to support this underlying bill; but we could have acted responsibly. We could have created exemptions that help our small and rural and disadvantaged communities. But, no, we have chosen to play politics instead of dealing with good, practical policy.

My amendments would have put the power back in the hands of local leaders. But, no, the Federal Government, the Federal Government is the one that has to dictate and mandate all. Once again, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have chosen to empower Big Labor at the expense of small disadvantaged communities and local leaders.

I have to say I am deeply disappointed. There is plenty of evidence. The CBO, as my colleague mentioned earlier, has noted that repealing Davis-Bacon, raising the threshold for projects it covers, would allow appropriators to reduce Federal funds and therefore we could get more bang for the buck. The Department of Labor, after nearly 50 years, has not developed an effective program to issue and maintain current and accurate wage determinations. It may be impractical to ever do so. There are many problems with this. We could have acted responsibly, but, no, we have chosen to play politics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule. We could have done better by the American public in put-

ting together a bill that would create the State revolving loan funds and allow our communities to access them. But, no, we have chosen to play politics.

I urge defeat of this rule and defeat of the underlying bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Rules Committee we had an opportunity to receive a number of amendments and have feedback from Members who were talking about these important water projects, and I found one amendment yesterday that was presented very interesting. It was rejected by the Democrats, but it says this:

"This amendment quadruples the current penalty for dumping sewage into the Great Lakes to \$100,000 per violation per day. The amendment also establishes a Great Lakes Clean-Up Fund within the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, and directs the sewage dumping penalties into this new fund to be spent on wastewater treatment options." Here is the interesting part: "These provisions would become effective January 1, 2027."

Mr. Speaker, a colleague brought forth an amendment as a result of a discussion with a major mayor of a city on the Great Lakes. I have heard all sorts of conversations about how important clean water is. Yet the Great Lakes, which is an area of about 20 million people that need this clean water, wake up today to find out that someone was willing to come forward with an idea which, even if enacted, doesn't take place until January 1, 2027.

No, we are not going to do that in the Rules Committee.

So on one side the Democrat majority talks about how great they are for all this clean water. But when it really comes down to it, still 20 million people are being denied this opportunity to start this clean water revolving fund and direct that sewage dumped into the Great Lakes would be cleaned up and have higher penalties. Utterly incredible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Texas for his leadership in this area and for yielding me some time to talk about this rule and a little more expansive subject.

I think what we are seeing today really demonstrates the difference between our side and our approach, the Republican approach to fiscal challenges, financial challenges, financial responsibility that we face in this Nation, and our friends on the majority side, on the Democrat side.

We have had some important bills this week that we have dealt with. We have also had an opportunity to be financially responsible, fiscally responsible and accountable to the American people. Our side has chosen to propose those measures of accountability. The

other side, the majority side, has chosen to ignore that. This is another example today.

I live outside of Atlanta. My district is the Sixth District of Georgia. It has remarkable challenges in the area of water and water quality. I appreciate the importance of assisting State and local governments in the area of clean water.

This is an important bill. It ought to be a priority of our Nation. What the majority party says, however, is that this may be a priority, but we are not going to treat it as a priority from a financial standpoint. We are going to throw money at it from a governmental standpoint and we are going to enact the kind of PAYGO proposal that the majority party loves so much, which is raise taxes and go on with the program. That is what this bill does.

This is an important bill. It authorizes \$16 billion in discretionary spending. It creates two new programs and continues other existing programs. There is \$375 million for the creation of new Federal grant programs at EPA and \$1.5 billion for State grant pollution control programs. It reauthorizes \$20 million annually for some expired pilot programs to provide technical assistance in the area of water works treatment projects, and it authorizes \$14 billion to provide grants to States to pay for the construction of clean water projects. These are important, important programs.

How do we pay for it? How do we pay for it? Well, the majority Democrat Party proposes that we pay for it by increased taxes, which is their "TAXGO" policy that they have for their financial programs. TAXGO: they raise taxes, and they raise taxes because they somehow believe that when you raise taxes on businesses that it never reaches the American people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as you and I both know, corporations don't pay taxes. What they do is they cover that by charging more for their product. The American people pay corporate taxes. The American people's taxes, the American people's costs are increased when corporate taxes are increased. It is just like the other side, the majority side, believes that the money that comes to the Federal Government is the government's money. It is not the people's money; it is the government's money. And that is this clear definition that we have seen this week.

So I offered an amendment to this bill that said this ought to be a priority of our Nation. But we ought to state that it is a priority by saying that there are other measures in the Federal Government program that we ought not cover because this ought to take that priority. A true PAYGO, a true pay-as-you-go proposal.

The Rules Committee decided no, they didn't want to do it that way. They wanted to raise taxes on the American people. So their TAXGO policy is in full place right here with this rule that doesn't even allow, doesn't

even allow the Members of the House of Representatives to even make a statement on whether they think we ought to cover this with current money.

So the TAXGO policy is in place by our good friends on the majority side, on the Democrat side. This rule proves it. What has happened this week on the floor of the House proves it, as they have voted down real pay-as-you-go amendments to two of the previous bills.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I think this really points out the clear and distinct difference from a financial standpoint in this House of Representatives. I am told, as you know, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee doesn't even allow for a recorded vote anymore on these, so you can't even tell who is supportive of the rule and who isn't supportive of the rule. But as I understand it by those who were there, every single Democrat opposed my amendment, which means that every single Democrat, including the new Democrats on the Rules Committee, support a tax-and-go policy, a tax-and-spend policy.

This rule is a demonstration of that. This rule approves that. This rule proves that the majority party is not interested in financial responsibility and financial accountability, because they were given the opportunity to say, yes, we believe that we ought to identify priorities and pay for them at the Federal level by making certain that we are not increasing taxes and increasing the amount of money that hardworking Americans have to send to the Federal Government.

□ 0945

So, Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this rule. This is another evidence of the undemocratic side of the majority party that says, no, we ought not have a full and open debate which was promised to the American people. We ought not have a full and open debate on how we are going to pay for government programs.

I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be responsible, to be financially responsible, to allow for the appropriate discussion, debate and voting on measures so the American people know who their friends are from a taxing standpoint. I believe it is the Republican side of the aisle. I would hope my Democrat friends would join us in that endeavor, and urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and bring an appropriate rule, bring a rule that allows us to debate the issues in an open and honest way and then have the vote.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to notify the gentlewoman I will now yield myself the balance of my time, and then yield back my time and allow the gentlewoman to close.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the statement of the administration policy on this bill.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, March 8, 2007.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 720—WATER QUALITY FINANCING ACT OF 2007  
(REP. OBERSTAR (D) MN AND 32 OTHERS)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 720, which authorizes excessive Federal funding for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) and mandates the application of Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements "to the construction of treatment works carried out in whole or in part" with SRF funding. For the reasons described below, if H.R. 720 were presented to the President in its current form his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

The bill would expand Davis-Bacon Act coverage to a program that has not been subject to any Davis-Bacon requirements since 1994—first by reinstating coverage for Federally-funded clean water state revolving fund projects, and second by expanding Davis-Bacon Act coverage to non-Federal clean water projects, including for the first time ever, projects financed by funds contributed solely by States and moneys repaid to the state revolving fund. This provision will increase project costs and impose new administrative burdens on States. Furthermore, it is contrary to the Administration's long-standing policy of opposing any statutory attempt to expand or contract the applicability of Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements.

In addition, the bill's total authorization of \$14 billion for the SRF during fiscal years 2008–2011 represents on average a more than 250 percent increase over recent appropriation levels and is unrealistic in the current fiscal environment. This excessive authorization will distort market signals by discouraging utilities and their consumers from moving toward full-cost pricing, as they have elsewhere. Instead, this bill may encourage municipalities to delay undertaking needed infrastructure projects to wait for Federal subsidies, potentially diminishing reliability and increasing the eventual costs to the public.

To provide additional opportunities to communities for financing needed wastewater infrastructure, Congress should enact the Administration's Water Enterprise Bond proposal, which would provide an exception to the unified annual State volume cap on tax-exempt qualified private activity bonds for wastewater and drinking water projects. To ensure the long-term financial health and solvency of these drinking water and wastewater systems, communities using these bonds must have demonstrated a process that will move toward full-cost pricing for services within five years of issuing the Private Activity Bonds. Consequently, this proposal will attract more private capital to meet the infrastructure needs of these sectors, help water and wastewater systems become self-financing, and minimize the need for future subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, part of what the President has said very clearly to Congress today is two things: number one, that this Davis-Bacon expansion will cost an incredible amount of money to local water districts that seek bonds and funding that go to the marketplace to get that money to match the Federal money; and that the President believes that by expanding Davis-Bacon arbitrarily, it will mean that the cost of all these projects will go up exponentially and make it far more difficult for local communities to get the funding they

need because it is more money than what should be paid reasonably for the projects to be done.

Secondly, the President makes a point which I think is very true, and that is by almost doubling the amount of money that is in this fund, America is now going to start looking to Washington to take care of these projects. Over my years in this body, we have seen over and over again the requests from the Democrats to let's go build more schools in this country—with Federal money. Oh, yes, with Davis-Bacon; but more importantly, it is a message to people back home, let's let Washington build our schools.

Republicans have said, the day we start doing that, there will be no more schools built by local people. Everybody will look to Washington.

The President is saying today, by this bill, people back home are going to start looking to Washington to take care of their water system needs. That is dangerous, and I think that is a problem.

Mr. Speaker, the choice that we are being asked to make is very clear. If you support fiscal responsibility, small business, States' right, rural communities, women- and minority-owned businesses and the environment, then you would want to oppose this rule and the underlying legislation.

However, I admit that the Democrats are going to win today, and we are going to lose; but instead, what that is going to mean is it is going to be environmental harm, market distortion, wasteful Federal spending and stacking the deck in favor of labor bosses. That is who is going to win today.

I include for the RECORD a letter to Speaker PELOSI and to the Republican leadership, JOHN BOEHNER, signed by the National Association of Minority Contractors, the National Association of Women in Construction, the National Alliance for Working and Employee Rights, and the Women Construction Owners and Executives who make very clear their opposition for the reasons why we have talked about today: Excessive overspending and far-reaching expansion of Davis-Bacon that will mean that many of these communities who need the money the most will find that on up to 20 percent of their projects, the needs of their people cannot be met because of bloated spending that is contained within this bill. We want to make it very clear that we oppose this legislation.

MARCH 7, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
*Minority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND MINORITY LEADER BOEHNER: As the U.S. House of Representatives prepares to vote on the "Water Quality Financing Act of 2007", H.R. 720, we would like to recognize the important role of the federal government in addressing our nation's water infrastructure needs but strongly disagree with including egregious, prece-

dent-setting expansions of the federal Davis-Bacon Act to non-federal funds contained in the legislation.

In order to obtain the highest construction value for the taxpayers' dollar on these critical projects, it is imperative that this legislation not include any federal Davis-Bacon Act provisions. During past consideration of this legislation, debate has been crippled by harmful Davis-Bacon Act expansions and we implore you to let a clean bill, absent of Davis-Bacon provisions, pass through the U.S. House of Representatives in order to bring much needed water infrastructure to the American people.

We perceive any application of the Davis-Bacon Act into this legislation as expansion. Section 602(b)(6) of the Clean Water Act of 1987 clearly states that Davis-Bacon requirements on such loans were to sunset in FY 1995. Since October 1, 1994, the clean water state revolving funds have operated efficiently without Davis-Bacon requirements.

The Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO sued to impose Davis-Bacon on CWSRF after the sunset date. In a letter dated October 29, 1998, the EPA took issue with every argument made by the building trades. In fact, the EPA stated that even without section 513 in section 602(b)(6), the EPA "would reasonably have concluded that the CWA's Davis-Bacon Act provisions did not apply in the SRF program at all".

On June 22, 2000, the EPA, under the Clinton Administration, reversed its previous statements and issued a "settlement agreement" with organized labor to repeal the statutory sunset date of October 1, 1994, and expand Davis-Bacon to CWSRF for programs after July 1, 2001. Clearly, this "settlement agreement," which contradicted the earlier arguments made by the EPA itself, was a statutory violation of the Clean Water Act. If this legislation passes in current form it would undoubtedly be subject to litigation if enforced.

Given that Davis-Bacon requirements were sunset in 1995 and have not since applied, nor would such requirements apply unless expressly provided for by Congress, any re-application of Davis-Bacon to CWSRF would clearly be expansion of this flawed Act.

Lastly, a series of audits by outside agencies as well as the Department of Labor's (DOL) own Office of Inspector General (OIG) have revealed substantial inaccuracies in Davis-Bacon Act wage determinations and suggested that they are vulnerable to fraud. In addition, DOL's OIG released three reports highly critical of the wage determination program. In fact, one of the reports found one or more errors in 100 percent of the wage surveys they reviewed.

We, the undersigned organizations, are vehemently opposed to any re-application of Davis-Bacon requirements to this loan program and ask you to please vote against the "Water Quality Financing Act of 2007", H.R. 720, due to the harmful expansion of the Davis-Bacon Act contained within.

Respectfully submitted,

Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc. (ABC); Chuck Muth, President, Citizen Outreach Project; Council for Citizens Against Government Waste; Grover Norquist, Americans for Tax Reform (ATR); Independent Electrical Contractors, Inc. (IEC); Miller & Long Concrete Construction; National Association of Minority Contractors; National Association of Women in Construction; Tim Phillips, President, Americans for Prosperity; Ryan Ellis, Alliance for Worker Freedom; United States Chamber of Commerce; Will Fine, Executive Director, National Alliance for Worker and Employer Rights; Women Construction Owners and Executives.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman from Texas if he wouldn't mind, prior to my closing, that we allow the distinguished gentleman from the Rules Committee to speak. He arrived as we were completing our dialogue, and I would like to yield him 2 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. CASTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. I do recognize that from time to time as we do these rules that people do come down. The gentleman who is asking to speak is a member of the Rules Committee, and based upon that request, I consent and agree, and I welcome the gentleman.

Ms. CASTOR. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for his courtesy and also thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her leadership on the Rules Committee and for her spectacular handling of this rule today before us. I appreciate all of her insights and advocacy on behalf of clean water and environmental issues. I want to make clear for the record that this entire House should be grateful for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. It is a fair rule. There are three Democratic amendments and three Republican amendments. They cover the many issues brought before the Rules Committee last night.

I want to take a moment to address one issue, and that is the issue of Davis-Bacon. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) said that the Democrats are going to win and the Republicans are going to lose on this vote. Well, let me say I would recharacterize it. I think the American people and the American workers are going to win if we keep the Davis-Bacon provisions.

I know many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't like Davis-Bacon and who don't believe that people should be paid the prevailing wage, who don't believe that the workers of this country should be paid a livable wage.

Well, the majority in this Congress today believes the opposite. I bet many people on the gentleman's side of the aisle believe as well. Workers in this country are working longer hours and harder than ever before, and they can't make ends meet. We shouldn't have a rush to the bottom when it comes to the wages of the workers in this country. We need to stand firm and stand tall for the workers of this country to ensure that they get paid a livable wage so they can support their families, so they have health care and pension benefits. That is what this debate is about.

So, today, my colleagues who don't like Davis-Bacon will have a choice.

They have an amendment in order that can rip Davis-Bacon out of this bill. They can eliminate Davis-Bacon. They can eliminate the prevailing wage. They can eliminate a livable wage for workers. Or you can stand with the majority in this Congress for workers, for the prevailing wage, for Davis-Bacon, for a livable wage; and that is the right thing to do.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim 2 minutes of my time as a result of us yielding back our time because we did not anticipate any additional speakers.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the distinguished gentleman from the Rules Committee: Yes, it is political with regard to Davis-Bacon, strip it or leave it, but what about exemptions? Why couldn't we entertain exemptions for small, disadvantaged communities? What is the fear on your side in not allowing that to come to a floor debate?

I simply ask the question, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

It is this gentleman's opinion that what the gentleman is trying to do is to chip away at Davis-Bacon, chip away at workers' rights and chip away at the prevailing wage and chip away at making sure that workers get a livable wage, and this gentleman is very much opposed to that.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Reclaiming my time, I would say that if small, disadvantaged communities cannot access the funds to repair their infrastructure, it is going to hurt the worker, and it is going to hurt the disadvantaged small community.

I would say there is a practical way to move through this with regard to policy rather than simply playing politics.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we think we are trying to make a point here today that there were some strong reservations that should have been taken into account by the Rules Committee. We are not trying to chip away at minimum wage. We tried last year to pass a new minimum wage.

What we are trying to do is get work done that is in the best interest of not only Americans who need these projects to complete things that have been done to their communities as a result of damage but also to move forward with more efficiency.

We support spending money for clean water. We don't support bloated

projects that are against the market-based abilities that communities have.

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

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we don't delay any longer and that we take action on this rule and this legislation that reauthorizes an important part of the Clean Water Act.

I understand where some of the debate is going to occur today, and I understand that a sizable number of Members on the other side of the aisle oppose the Davis-Bacon requirements for fair wages across the country. But the Rules Committee has made in order an amendment on Davis-Bacon, and Members in this body will have an opportunity to debate and vote on that issue. It is important, however, as we enter that debate, that we recognize that Davis-Bacon ensures a higher-quality work product and ensures that the work is done right the first time as higher-paid workers are the best trained and most experienced.

I urge Members to defeat that amendment and continue in the new direction that is being charted by this new Democratic Congress where we stand up for the hard-working men and women across this great country.

It is too important to delay any longer this reauthorization of the Clean Water Act. It is imperative that Congress now pass the Water Quality Financing Act, H.R. 720, which will provide critically needed funds for clean water infrastructure. It will protect the public health, the environment and our quality of life. It will restore the viability of the Federal, State and local partnership to meet the goals of the Clean Water Act. And ultimately, if we take action today, we will protect and improve the health of our citizens across America.

I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and on the previous question.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 179, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—229

Abercrombie  
Ackerman

Aderholt  
Allen

Altmire  
Andrews

Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenuer  
Boucher  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Castor  
Chandler  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleave  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
English (PA)  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Giffords  
Gillibrand  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)

Herseth  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hinchee  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoolley  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey

Olver  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Platts  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Rohrabacher  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Wexler  
Wilson (OH)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Yarmuth

NAYS—179

Akin  
Alexander  
Bachmann  
Baker  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Biggart  
Billray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Boozman  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (SC)  
Buchanan

Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Dent

Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
Everett  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)

Gerlach	Lungren, Daniel	Rogers (MI)
Gilchrest	E.	Ros-Lehtinen
Gillmor	Mack	Roskam
Gingrey	Manzullo	Royce
Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Goode	McCaul (TX)	Sali
Goodlatte	McCotter	Saxton
Granger	McCrery	Schmidt
Graves	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Hall (TX)	McHugh	Sessions
Hastert	McKeon	Shadeegg
Hastings (WA)	McMorris	Shays
Hayes	Rodgers	Shimkus
Heller	Melancon	Shuster
Hensarling	Mica	Simpson
Herger	Miller (FL)	Smith (NE)
Hobson	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)
Hoekstra	Miller, Gary	Stearns
Hulshof	Moran (KS)	Sullivan
Inglis (SC)	Musgrave	Tancredo
Issa	Myrick	Terry
Jindal	Pence	Thornberry
Johnson, Sam	Peterson (PA)	Tiaht
Jones (NC)	Petri	Tiberi
Jordan	Pickering	Turner
Keller	Pitts	Upton
King (IA)	Poe	Walberg
King (NY)	Porter	Walden (OR)
Kingston	Price (GA)	Walsh (NY)
Kirk	Pryce (OH)	Wamp
Knollenberg	Putnam	Weldon (FL)
Kuhl (NY)	Radanovich	Weller
Lamborn	Ramstad	Westmoreland
Latham	Regula	Wicker
LaTourette	Rehberg	Wilson (NM)
Lewis (CA)	Reichert	Wilson (SC)
Lewis (KY)	Renzi	Wolf
Linder	Reynolds	Young (FL)
LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)	
Lucas	Rogers (KY)	

the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 720.

□ 1037

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 720) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes, with Ms. SOLIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself 4½ minutes and rise in strong support of H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.

It has been a long time coming to this point. We have labored within the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for at least 11 years, maybe just a few months longer than that, to bring forth a bill to replenish the State revolving loan funds so that municipalities can continue the work of aggressively expanding their capacity to handle wastewater, treat that wastewater, return it to the receiving waters in good quality.

We have been delayed over the last 6 Congresses, not by unwillingness within our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, but because of external factors within the House. Now that those external factors have been removed, we are bringing this bill to the floor with good and sustained bipartisan support. I appreciate very much the support of Speaker PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER scheduling this legislation early on in the session; and I particularly appreciate the participation and cooperation of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), our ranking member, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water Resources for the long participation that we have had and the splendid agreement and working relationship we had between our staffs on the Democratic and Republican sides, with one notable exception that will be debated at length here and which we debated extensively in subcommittee and full committee.

I especially want to express my great appreciation to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON). For years now, she has worked as our ranking member on the Water Resources Subcommittee, learned the issues, mastered the subject matter, and is now Chair of the Water Resources Subcommittee and has played a leading role in bringing this legislation to the floor.

The bill started out as \$20 billion to replenish State revolving loan funds; but due to concerns by the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office, we scaled the legislation back to a \$14 billion bill, paying for it through an additional revenue source, as within the authority of this committee. The CBO has said that municipalities in raising municipal bonds that are tax exempt will cause a loss in revenue to the Treasury, and, therefore, the revenue in this bill has to be offset by another source. We have done that in a bipartisan agreement, and this bill is at \$14 billion, fully paid for. We will not have the debate that we have had on two other bills that were extraneous to the subject matter because we have covered this issue.

Unfortunately, the administration has steadily reduced funding for the State revolving loan fund over the past several years, and in the budget request for 2008 has a \$200 million reduction, down to \$687.5 million. That is totally unacceptable.

There was a time when we were investing \$6 billion a year in Federal funds, matched by State and local dollars, to build sewage treatment facilities, raise them to tertiary treatment, removing nutrients, adding oxygen, returning clean water to the receiving waters. We are not doing that any longer. We are not keeping pace with the pressure on the Nation's water and wastewater systems nor our sewage treatment systems.

The only debate that we really have is, What shall be the wages paid to those who work on building these facilities? And I listened with great interest and concern to the debate on the rule. The manager of the rule said that cities will start looking to Washington for these projects to take care of their water system needs. That is almost the same language that Dwight Eisenhower used in 1960 to veto the Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments when he said: Pollution is a uniquely local blight. Federal involvement will only impede local efforts at cleanup.

That was wrong then, it is wrong now, it was wrong when Richard Nixon vetoed the Clean Water Act of 1972.

We have had a partnership of State and local government. They have invested billions of dollars at the local level. We need to continue that partnership into the future. This bill will do that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAKER. Madam Chair, at this time I would yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of this Committee on Transportation, Mr. MICA.

Mr. MICA. Madam Chairwoman and Members of the House, normally I would be supportive of this legislation. I have tried to work in a bipartisan manner with Mr. OBERSTAR and other members of the committee on both sides of the aisle.

NOT VOTING—25

Bachus	Eshoo	Neugebauer
Bono	Fattah	Nunes
Boren	Hunter	Ortiz
Boswell	Kline (MN)	Paul
Calvert	Larson (CT)	Pearce
Camp (MI)	Marchant	Souder
Cardoza	Millender	Whitfield
Davis, Jo Ann	McDonald	Young (AK)
Engel	Moore (WI)	

□ 1037

Mr. GRAVES changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. FRANK of Massachusetts, DELAHUNT, ADERHOLT, and TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 132, I was on a visit to Walter Reed. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007.

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

There was no objection.

WATER QUALITY FINANCING ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 229 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on