

saying is if you're going to ask the American taxpayers to pay for your financial assistance, that you should be proficient enough in the language of this country to fill out the application. Now, you don't have to be a rocket scientist to figure that out. And we can throw all these other little things in there about the people that won't get to apply and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. It doesn't matter.

All this amendment says is if you're going to ask the Federal Government to help with financial aid for your college education that we hope you succeed in, and that we want you to excel in, that you can at least speak the language of this country. That's all we're saying.

This is a very simple amendment. There's been so much rhetoric over there. I guess, you know, evidently, they're taking this for something that it's not. Very simple, Mr. Chairman. Very, very simple. Do we want to make sure that our taxpayers' dollars go to students who are legal citizens of this country, who have a GED or a high school education, that are applying for financial aid to go to a college in this country to be proficient enough in English to fill the application out in English? It's very simple.

I won't belabor this. And I know the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is trying to get as many of these amendments out of the way as you can. But I certainly hope that my colleagues, and especially all the colleagues who are interested in protecting the hard taxpayers' dollars of this country, and who are interested in getting as many students financial aid that need it, that have the best opportunity to go forward and succeed in their college education and spend the money wisely, that they would support this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. LYNCH). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WELCH of Vermont) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF GEORGIA

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

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

TITLE VI

ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to take any action to finalize (or otherwise implement) provisions contained in the proposed rule published on May 3, 2007, on pages 24680 through 25135 of volume 72, Federal Register, insofar as such provisions propose—

(1) to alter payments for services under the hospital inpatient prospective payment system under section 1886(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)) based on use of a Medicare severity diagnosis related group (MS-DRG) system; or

(2) to implement a prospective behavioral offset in response to the implementation of such a Medicare Severity Diagnosis Related Group (MS-DRG) system for purposes of such hospital inpatient prospective payment system.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleagues and friends, PETER WELCH of Vermont and JERRY WELLER from Illinois, for joining me in offering this important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, hospitals need more than just 2 months to change their coding system. It's too much too soon. CMS needs to give them the time they need. In addition, we must not allow CMS to implement this behavior offset.

I've talked to hospitals in my district. They're doing everything right when it comes to coding and charging Medicare. This cut will punish the hospital before they've done anything wrong. 269 Members of the House feel the same way.

Mr. WELLER and I sent a letter to CMS on June 12, along with 267 of our colleagues and 63 Senators urging CMS not to make this \$24 billion cut. Hospitals do not deserve a \$24 billion cut. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment and help our hospitals.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. And first let me thank my colleagues, JOHN LEWIS, PETER WELCH, for

the opportunity to join in bipartisan sponsorship of this amendment.

This amendment prevents the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services from cutting \$24 billion in funding for our local hospitals, funding that's used to provide care to seniors disabled under Medicare. In my district alone this would mean a loss of \$60 million in reimbursement for my local hospitals, having a devastating effect on the quality of care.

A key misstep in the proposed rule is the 2.4 percent so-called behavior offset payment cut. CMS proposed this cut to eliminate what the agency has inaccurately claimed will be the effect of greater use of coding as hospitals move to a new system. These extreme cuts in reimbursements, based on speculation rather than fact, will impose an added burden on all hospitals.

Earlier this year my friend and colleague JOHN LEWIS and I circulated a letter in opposition to these Draconian cuts. The response was overwhelming, with 269 Members of this House going on the record against this devastating cut to our local hospitals. This is overwhelming bipartisan opposition to this bad policy proposed by CMS.

Mr. Chairman, I will include this letter in the RECORD in support of this amendment.

The amendment also prohibits CMS from prospectively applying any behavioral offset in fiscal year 2008, ensuring that any adjustments made for coding changes will be based on the actual experiences of the hospital, not mere conjecture.

I ask my colleagues to join us in bipartisan support of this effort to prohibit the use of any funds to implement these Draconian provisions of the IPPS rule that will place hospitals under undue financial burden, compromising the quality of care our constituents deserve.

In order to prevent these local hospitals and protect our constituents, I ask my colleagues to vote in a bipartisan "yes."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, June 12, 2007.

Re CMS Proposed Inpatient Prospective Payment Rule

Ms. LESLIE V. NORWALK, Esquire,
Acting Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. NORWALK: We write to express our strong opposition to two provisions in the proposed Inpatient Prospective Payment System (IPPS) regulation. We respectfully request that these provisions be excluded from the final regulation.

The first provision would impose a 2.4 percent cut to all operating and capital payments for inpatient hospital services for Medicare patients based on the misguided premise of a so-called "behavioral offset." This unwarranted proposal would result in payment reductions for hospital services in both FY08 and FY09, cutting \$24 billion dollars in operating and capital payments over the next five years.

The second proposal would reduce payments to hospitals in urban areas for capital-related costs for inpatient hospital services, cutting payments by nearly \$1 billion over the next five years. We urge you to eliminate

both provisions when the final regulation is published.

Please allow us to further explain our strong objection to these changes:

1. Cuts due to a "Behavioral Offset." The suggestion to cut hospital operating and capital payments is based on the suggested adoption of a classification system called Medicare Severity Diagnosis-Related Groups (MS-DRGs). This change is grounded on the belief that with the implementation of the MS-DRGs, hospitals would change coding practices, resulting in higher payments. Not even in the initial years of the IPPS was coding change found to be of the magnitude of CMS's proposed FY08 and FY09 cuts. MS-DRGs are simply a refinement of a classification system that hospitals have been using for 23 years. Hospitals are already experts in coding for payment; they have little ability to change their classification and coding practices.

The rationale for the reduction is also based on the transition of hospitals in Maryland to a completely new type coding system called All Patient Refined DRGs (APR-DRGs). We have concerns with the methodology of reaching this conclusion. Maryland's hospitals are paid under a state rate-setting system where an incentive to code accurately did not significantly affect what a hospital was paid. The classification system recently adopted by Maryland is much more complicated than what CMS is proposing and changed the coding incentives for Maryland hospitals. Generalizing the Maryland experience to the rest of the nation's hospitals is an "apples-to-oranges" comparison.

CMS is not mandated by law to impose a behavioral offset in the IPPS regulation, yet has chosen to do so. There is no precedent in other payment systems for making a prospective adjustment of this magnitude—without any empirical evidence of actual and measurable changes in coding. While CMS has, on occasion, made adjustments for coding in implementing new payment systems, these changes generally have been made based on actual experience. When implementing a new physician fee schedule payment system in 1992, CMS (then the Health Care Financing Administration) imposed a behavioral offset on physician services, primarily to offset predicted increases in the volume of services. We later learned that the offset was much higher than was necessary, and the reduction was never returned to the physicians adversely affected by those cuts.

2. Cuts to Capital-Related Payments. For years, the Medicare program has paid for its share of the capital-related costs of inpatient hospital services. The proposed rule would freeze capital payments for all hospitals in urban areas and would eliminate additional capital payments made to large hospitals in urban areas. Taken together, these cuts would amount to nearly \$1 billion over the next five years.

These changes in capital payments would make it much more difficult for hospitals to purchase advanced technology and equipment and could have the effect of slowing clinical innovation in the hospitals most likely to conduct cutting edge research. Additionally, such a reduction could slow the adoption of much needed health information technology. Hospitals make long-term commitments to capital acquisitions. This proposal amounts to pulling the rug out from under their financial obligations to maintain and improve their physical facilities for patients.

Congress recently opposed a component of the administration's fiscal year 2008 budget proposal that would have significantly reduced hospital payments. As you know, both the FY08 House and Senate budget resolu-

tions reinforced this sentiment by rejecting those cuts. The administration's attempt to achieve payment reductions of this magnitude through the regulatory process is equally unacceptable. We believe this action circumvents Congress' intent that hospital services for Medicare patients not be reduced.

In closing, we would like to reiterate our belief that CMS's decision could serve to jeopardize hospitals' ability to continue to care for patients. CMS's behavioral offset is unnecessary, and will result in devastating cuts to hospital services for our constituents.

CMS's proposal to cut capital-related payments would create significant financial difficulties for many of our most innovative hospitals. We strongly support the elimination of these provisions from your final regulation.

Both CMS and Members of Congress share the goal of serving the American public and helping those most in need. We hope that you will give strong consideration to the bipartisan concerns outlined in this letter.

Sincerely,

Signed by 269 Members of the House of Representatives.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COSIGNERS OF THE CMS PROPOSED INPATIENT PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT RULE LETTER

Member	State
1. John Lewis	(GA)
2. Jerry Weller	(IL)
3. Neil Abercrombie	(HI)
4. Gary L. Ackerman	(NY)
5. Robert Aderholt	(AL)
6. Rodney Alexander	(LA)
7. Tom Allen	(ME)
8. Jason Altmire	(PA)
9. Robert E. Andrews	(NJ)
10. Michael Arcuri	(NY)
11. Joe Baca	(CA)
12. Spencer Bachus	(AL)
13. Tammy Baldwin	(WI)
14. John Barrow	(GA)
15. Shelley Berkley	(NV)
16. Marion Berry	(AR)
17. Judy Biggert	(IL)
18. Brian P. Bilbray	(CA)
19. Sanford Bishop	(GA)
20. Timothy H. Bishop	(NY)
21. Rob Bishop	(UT)
22. Marsha Blackburn	(TN)
23. Earl Blumenauer	(OR)
24. Jo Bonner	(AL)
25. Mary Bono	(CA)
26. John Boozman	(AR)
27. Leonard Boswell	(IA)
28. Rick Boucher	(VA)
29. Charles Boustany, Jr.	(LA)
30. Nancy Bayda	(KS)
31. Robert A. Brady	(PA)
32. Kevin Brady	(TX)
33. Bruce Braley	(IA)
34. G.K. Butterfield	(NC)
35. Steve Buyer	(IN)
36. Michael Capuano	(MA)
37. Dennis Cardoza	(CA)
38. Russ Carnahan	(MO)
39. Christopher Carney	(PA)
40. Julia Carson	(IN)
41. John Carter	(TX)
42. Mike Castle	(DE)
43. Ben Chandler	(KY)
44. Carolyn Cheeks Kilpatrick	(MI)
45. Yvette Clarke	(NY)
46. Howard Coble	(NC)
47. Steve Cohen	(TN)
48. John Conyers	(MI)
49. Jerry F. Costello	(IL)
50. Joe Courtney	(CT)
51. Joe Crowley	(NY)
52. Henry Cuellar	(TX)
53. Elijah Cummings	(MD)
54. Susan Davis	(CA)
55. Geoff Davis	(KY)
56. Lincoln Davis	(TN)
57. Danny Davis	(IL)
58. David Davis	(TN)
59. William D. Delahunt	(MA)
60. Rosa DeLauro	(CT)
61. Charles W. Dent	(PA)
62. Norman D. Dicks	(WA)
63. Lloyd Doggett	(TX)
64. Joe Donnelly	(IN)
65. Michael Doyle	(PA)
66. John J. Duncan, Jr.	(TN)
67. Chet Edwards	(TX)
68. Vernon J. Ehlers	(MI)
69. Keith Ellison	(MN)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COSIGNERS OF THE CMS PROPOSED INPATIENT PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT RULE LETTER—Continued

Member	State
70. Jo Ann Emerson	(MO)
71. Eliot Engel	(NY)
72. Phil English	(PA)
73. Bob Etheridge	(NC)
74. Terry Everett	(AL)
75. Mary Fallin	(OK)
76. Sam Farr	(CA)
77. Chaka Fattah	(PA)
78. Mike Ferguson	(NJ)
79. Bob Filner	(CA)
80. Randy Forbes	(VA)
81. Luis Fortuno	(PR)
82. Vito Fossella	(NY)
83. Barney Frank	(MA)
84. Rodney Frelinghuysen	(NJ)
85. Scott Garrett	(NJ)
86. Jim Gerlach	(PA)
87. Gabrielle Giffords	(AZ)
88. Kristen Gillibrand	(NY)
89. Paul E. Gillmor	(OH)
90. Phil Gingrey	(GA)
91. Charles Gonzalez	(TX)
92. Virgil Goode	(VA)
93. Bart Gordon	(TN)
94. Sam Graves	(MO)
95. Gene Green	(TX)
96. Al Green	(TX)
97. Raul Grijalva	(AZ)
98. John Hall	(NY)
99. Phil Hare	(IL)
100. Robin Hayes	(NC)
101. Dean Heller	(NV)
102. Stephanie Herseth Sandlin	(SD)
103. Brian Higgins	(NY)
104. Baron Hill	(IN)
105. Maurice Hinchey	(NY)
106. Mazie Hirono	(HI)
107. David Hobson	(OH)
108. Paul Hodes	(NH)
109. Tim Holden	(PA)
110. Eleanor Holmes Norton	(DC)
111. Rush Holt	(NJ)
112. Michael M. Honda	(CA)
113. Darlene Hooley	(OR)
114. Jay Inslee	(WA)
115. Steve Israel	(NY)
116. Darrell Issa	(CA)
117. Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.	(IL)
118. Sheila Jackson-Lee	(TX)
119. William Jefferson	(LA)
120. Bobby Jindal	(LA)
121. Henry C. "Hank" Johnson	(GA)
122. Timothy V. Johnson	(IL)
123. Eddie Bernice Johnson	(TX)
124. Walter Jones	(NC)
125. Steve Kagen	(WI)
126. Paul E. Kanjorski	(PA)
127. Marcy Kaptur	(OH)
128. Dale E. Kildee	(MI)
129. Peter King	(NY)
130. Ron Klein	(FL)
131. John Kline	(MN)
132. Dennis Kucinich	(OH)
133. John R. Kuhl	(IL)
134. Ray LaHood	(NY)
135. James R. Langevin	(RI)
136. Rick Larsen	(WA)
137. John Larson	(CT)
138. Tom Latham	(IA)
139. Barbara Lee	(CA)
140. Sander Levin	(MI)
141. Ron Lewis	(KY)
142. Frank LoBiondo	(NJ)
143. Dave Loebsack	(CA)
144. Zoe Lofgren	(CA)
145. Nita Lowey	(NY)
146. Frank Lucas	(OK)
147. Stephen Lynch	(MA)
148. Tim Mahoney	(FL)
149. Carolyn B. Maloney	(NY)
150. Donald A. Manzullo	(IL)
151. Edward J. Markey	(MA)
152. Jim Marshall	(GA)
153. Jim Matheson	(UT)
154. Doris Matsui	(CA)
155. Carolyn McCarthy	(NY)
156. Michael McCaul	(TX)
157. Betty McCollum	(MN)
158. Thaddeus McCotter	(MI)
159. Jim McDermott	(WA)
160. Jim McGovern	(MA)
161. John M. McHugh	(NY)
162. Mike McIntyre	(NC)
163. Cathy McMorris Rodgers	(WA)
164. Jerry F. McMorris	(CA)
165. Michael McNulty	(NY)
166. Gregory W. Meeks	(NY)
167. Charlie Melancon	(LA)
168. Michael Michaud	(ME)
169. Brad Miller	(NC)
170. Harry Mitchell	(AZ)
171. Alan Mollohan	(WV)
172. Dennis Moore	(KS)
173. Gwen Moore	(WI)
174. Shelley Moore Capito	(WV)
175. James Moran	(VA)
176. Christopher Murphy	(CT)
177. Patrick Murphy	(PA)
178. Tim Murphy	(PA)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COSIGNERS OF THE CMS
PROPOSED INPATIENT PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT RULE
LETTER—Continued

Member	State
179. John P. Murtha	(PA)
180. Jerrold Nadler	(NY)
181. Grace Napolitano	(CA)
182. Richard Neal	(MA)
183. James Oberstar	(MN)
184. John W. Oliver	(MA)
185. Solomon P. Ortiz	(TX)
186. Bill Pascrell	(NJ)
187. Ed Pastor	(AZ)
188. Ron Paul	(TX)
189. Donald Payne	(NJ)
190. Steve Pearce	(NM)
191. Ed Perlmutter	(CO)
192. Collin Peterson	(MN)
193. John Peterson	(PA)
194. Thomas Petri	(WI)
195. Joseph Pitts	(PA)
196. Todd Russell Platts	(PA)
197. Ted Poe	(TX)
198. Jon Porter	(NV)
199. Tom Price	(GA)
200. David Price	(NC)
201. Deborah Pryce	(OH)
202. George Radanovich	(CA)
203. Nick J. Rahall, III	(WV)
204. Jim Ramstad	(MN)
205. Denny Rehberg	(MT)
206. Dave Reichert	(WA)
207. Rick Renzi	(AZ)
208. Silvestre Reyes	(TX)
209. Tom Reynolds	(NV)
210. Ciro Rodriguez	(TX)
211. Mike Rogers	(AL)
212. Harold Rogers	(KY)
213. Dana Rohrabacher	(CA)
214. Peter Roskam	(IL)
215. Mike Ross	(AR)
216. Steve Rothman	(NY)
217. Lucille Roybal-Allard	(CA)
218. Bobby Rush	(IL)
219. Tim Ryan	(OH)
220. John T. Salazar	(CO)
221. Bill Sali	(ID)
222. Loretta Sanchez	(CA)
223. Jim Saxton	(NJ)
224. Adam Schiff	(CA)
225. Allyson Schwartz	(PA)
226. David Scott	(GA)
227. Robert C. Scott	(VA)
228. Jose Serrano	(NY)
229. Pete Sessions	(TX)
230. Joe Sestak	(PA)
231. Christopher Shays	(CT)
232. Carol Shea-Porter	(NH)
233. Bill Shuster	(PA)
234. Mike Simpson	(ID)
235. Albio Sires	(NJ)
236. Louise M. Slaughter	(NY)
237. Chris Smith	(NJ)
238. Vic Snyder	(AR)
239. Mark Souder	(IN)
240. Zachary Space	(OH)
241. Cliff Stearns	(FL)
242. Bart Stupak	(MI)
243. Betty Sutton	(OH)
244. John Tanner	(TN)
245. Ellen Tauscher	(CA)
246. Gene Taylor	(MS)
247. Lee Terry	(NE)
248. John F. Tierney	(MA)
249. Edolphus Towns	(NY)
250. Stephanie Tubbs Jones	(OH)
251. Michael R. Turner	(OH)
252. Mark Udall	(CO)
253. Tom Udall	(NM)
254. Fred Upton	(MI)
255. Chris Van Hollen	(MD)
256. Nydia Velázquez	(NY)
257. James T. Walsh	(NY)
258. Tim Walz	(MN)
259. Zach Wamp	(TN)
260. Debbie Wasserman Schultz	(FL)
261. Maxine Waters	(CA)
262. Diane E. Watson	(CA)
263. Anthony Weiner	(NY)
264. Peter Welch	(VT)
265. Ed Whitfield	(KY)
266. Heather Wilson	(NM)
267. Lynn Woolsey	(CA)
268. David Wu	(OR)
269. John Yarmuth	(KY)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I speak to paragraph 1 of the amendment. This is another proposed CMS rule. Bottom line is this: Our American hospitals and health care delivery system has to provide health care to our citizens. CMS plays a major role in helping us to do that and to contain costs.

But CMS, the government representative, has to be a partner of our deliverers, the hospitals, not an adversary. And that requires that they give more than 2 months notice, they give a heads up to the hospitals when they're going to change a rule that has the direct and immediate impact of changing revenue streams for our hospitals.

This amendment, paragraph 1, like paragraph 2, simply delays the implementation so that there will be a heads up, a time to respond, a time to study it and a time to implement it.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, 269 Members of this body are on record in their support of this bipartisan amendment. It is simply wrong to punish the hospital before they have done anything wrong. So I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, on this side of the aisle we'd be happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I agree. I am one of the signatories on the letter. I support it. It will help our hospitals.

□ 1215

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF
WISCONSIN

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 26 offered by Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

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

SEC. _____. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out the Entertainment Education Program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(b) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Ombudsman Program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(c) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to provide additional rotating pastel lights, zero-gravity chairs, or dry-heat saunas for its fitness center.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I wonder if I could ask the gentleman a question. In the interest of saving time helping Members get to their planes, would the gentleman be willing to forgo extended comment if we accept the comment?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Yes. I will just explain the amendment and then I would be happy to yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) is recognized.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I appreciate the Chair's indulgence and I will just take a moment to explain what this amendment does, and then I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, there is a recent troubling report entitled "CDC Off Center," which was produced under the direction of Senator COBURN with a report in the Senate Government Affairs Committee. Instead of using its resources to fight life-threatening diseases like HIV/AIDS and cancer, the CDC has instead spent money on needless luxury items and nongovernment functions.

For example, the CDC's Office of Health and Safety recently provided its employees with a new, extravagant fitness center that includes such items as rotating pastel "mood" lights, zero-gravity chairs, and \$30,000 dry-heat saunas. The CDC has also spent over \$1.7 million on a "Hollywood liaison" to advise TV shows like "E.R." and "House" on medical information included in their programming, clearly an expense that should have been covered by the successful for-profit television shows, not by our hard-earned tax dollars. They also further squandered taxpayer dollars in an office intended to help improve employee morale. This program, which currently costs \$250,000 per year, has yielded just 98 complaints since it was created last year. At this rate it is costing taxpayers about \$3,000 per complaint. Despite the program's lack of use, the CDC is planning to spend at least \$1 million more to expand it.

In a time when we are facing increasing risk of bioterrorism and disease, these are hardly the best use of taxpayer dollars.

My amendment simply would ensure that the CDC would not be able to spend any more Federal funding on these three boondoggles described above. And it is my hope that we can get the CDC focused on doing its job, which is very important and they do a good job on that, and not on these kinds of boondoggles. This report shows dozen of examples of these abuses.

And I appreciate the Chair for his indulgence and the acceptance of the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UPTON:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to purchase light bulbs unless the light bulbs have the "ENERGY STAR" designation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, because we are trying to get Members out of here for their planes, I would be happy to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. UPTON. No problem.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

Page 125, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 522. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 employees from a Federal department or agency at any single conference occurring outside the United States.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment. We are not sure which amendment this is.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order. And I would simply ask the gentleman, in the interest of time, would the gentleman be willing to shorten his remarks and we would be happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I appreciate that. I will shorten my remarks to approximately 30 seconds to say, I thank the chairman for accepting the amendment. I thank the previous subcommittee chairmen as well for accepting similar which we have done in the past, which simply says to

set priorities. When we have Federal agencies send Federal employees overseas for conferences, we should put a realistic limitation on it, and this one, I think, does, at 50 employees of any Federal Department or agency for any single conference occurring outside the United States.

Again, I appreciate the chairman's acceptance of the amendment.

While this is an amendment that I have proposed to other appropriations bills, I believe it is especially important that it be included on this bill.

Since 2000, HHS has spent over \$435 million on conferences and spent \$88 million just last year. Government-wide spending in those same years was over \$1.5 billion.

In 2002 HHS spent \$3.6 million to send 236 persons to the AIDS conference in Barcelona.

In 2004 HHS spent \$500,000 to send 140 persons to the AIDS conference in Bangkok.

In 2005 HHS sent 300 employees to a dioxin conference in Toronto.

Last year the agency sent delegations of 200 or more to 54 separate conferences.

Many of these conferences are now covered online, allowing interested parties to attend without expensive plane tickets, meals, and hotel rooms.

An identical amendment was included in the House-passed version of the FY05 appropriations bill but removed in conference. I cannot help but think of the possibly tens of millions of taxpayer money that could have been saved in the past few years had this language become standard.

I trust that the new chairman will work to include the amendment in the conference agreement—we must inject some sense into HHS. This amendment will only limit international conferences, just a small step in reigning in an agency that seems to think its job is to talk about problems instead of working to solve them.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

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

TITLE VI

ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for the "Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Services", by increasing the amount made available for the "National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute", and by increasing the amount made available for the "National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke" by \$49,000,000, \$10,000,000, and \$10,000,000, respectively.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I will yield.

Mr. OBEY. Again, the same deal, if we accept the amendment. We are trying to help get Members out of here.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I will. I will just extend that 30 seconds to approximately 1 minute, though, because I just want to make a point on this amendment.

I very much appreciate the chairman for accepting this amendment. What this amendment does, as we have said all along, is it sets priorities, and it does on two areas that are extremely important to the Fifth Congressional District and the State of New Jersey and the entire Nation as well. And that is that we set priorities by increasing funding in two very important areas.

One is to the National Cancer Institute for additional cancer research by \$10 million. And another area of extreme importance to the State of New Jersey for the rising number of children being born with autism, to direct an additional \$10 million for research in that area as well.

I will just give a couple of statistics: one in 150 children, and it used to be one in around 10,000, is now diagnosed with autism. Every day 67 children are diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder, which translates into a new case almost every 20 minutes. Autism is becoming the fastest-growing serious developmental disability in the United States. That was the purpose for putting that in these amendments, and I thank the chairman for agreeing with us to the importance and seeing that additional funds go to these very worthy causes.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment that would take \$49 million from an account that was zeroed out in the President's budget request, and transfer it to two Institutes at the National Institutes of Health that I believe need additional funding—one working to fight cancer, and one working to fight autism.

Since President Nixon unofficially declared war on cancer in his State of the Union Address of 1971, much progress has been made in the area of cancer research. Over the past three and one-half decades, science has continued to break down barriers in the fight against this disease. Today, cancer is no longer the mystery disease that it once was, and researchers know infinitely more about the prevention, detection, and treatment of the disease than ever before.

All this research is beginning to bear fruit. Fewer people died from cancer in 2004 than in 2003 and the American public is witnessing declining rates for most major cancer types, including breast cancer, prostate cancer, and colorectal cancer. But there's much more work to be done.

I thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for increasing the budget of the

National Cancer Institute in this year's bill. I just think that we can do a little more. And this is an obviously higher priority with far broader application to the American people.

We can also do a little more to fund research for a serious problem facing the country: autism.

According to Autism Now, the largest autism foundation in the country: 1 in 150 children is diagnosed with autism; every day 67 children are diagnosed with an autism spectrum disorder, which translates into a new case almost every 20 minutes; and autism is the fastest-growing serious developmental disability in the United States.

According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, in my home State of New Jersey, the rate of new autism spectrum disorder cases is the highest in the country. One in sixty boys in New Jersey is affected.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would also increase the budget of the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke by \$10 million. This Institute, part of the National Institutes of Health, is the organization within the Federal Government that is primarily responsible for organizing the research into autism.

The account that this amendment would take from was proposed to be eliminated entirely by the administration, as it has demonstrated to be duplicative and ineffective. My amendment retains some funding in that account, but reduces it. If these appropriations bills are about priorities, I ask that we make research on cancer and autism a priority, above duplicative and ineffective programs.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 61 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is this strikes an earmark, \$200,000, for the Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Let me explain, Mr. Chairman. I know that the gentlewoman from Nevada, who is here, and I believe the gentleman from Nevada also are supportive of this. What this amendment is not about is about the merits of this particular academy, as I understand it is a charter school, or whether it is a good school or not.

I received a call yesterday from the director of the Andre Agassi Foundation, who has provided a lot of the funding for this school, inviting me to come to the school in August and to see what they are doing and take a tour. And that is very nice and very flattering, but that actually isn't the point. I am sure it is a very fine school. I am sure it is doing lots of great work. But my understanding is that this school is at least half, if not more than that, funded by charitable donations, including from Mr. Agassi and from one of the Las Vegas casinos and lots of other people.

What I raise this about is whether we should be using earmarks to give out like this to what are essentially charitable works. Now, I am sure there are many other good schools in Nevada. There are many in my area. I am sure there are fine museums. I am sure there are fine research facilities. I am sure there are all kinds of different things that we can spend Federal money on.

But I don't think that when the taxpayers pay their taxes that they intend that part of it is a repository for us, as Members of Congress, any of us as Members of Congress, to delve into that money and go out and say this is a charitable organization which I find worthy in my district and here is the taxpayers' money for that from me. Because it is not from me. It is not from the Member of Congress. It is the taxpayers' money. And I think we are better off leaving the taxpayers with their own money so they can give it to whatever charitable organizations, schools, museums, historical developments, research, that they feel they should. And I just don't feel that it is our right, as Members of Congress, to hand this money out, no matter how beneficial or how worthy the cause is, to hand this out to various charities in our districts, because it is not our money, and act as though it is something that we did.

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in the strongest possible opposition to this amendment.

In his misguided zeal to identify a high-profile example of wasteful Federal spending, the author of this amendment has instead provided me with an opportunity to sing the praises of a member of my community who has used his personal and professional success to help those that are less fortunate.

In 2001 Andre Agassi opened a charter school in Las Vegas, the Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy. It is in one of the most disadvantaged areas in my congressional district. Agassi Prep currently serves students in grades K-

10, with grades 11 and 12 being added in the next 2 years, for a total of 630 students when enrollment is complete. The first class will graduate in 2009. The student body is 96 percent minority.

This earmark, which I thank the gentleman for highlighting, would go to the Andre Agassi Prep's Technology and Multimedia Initiative and will increase the use of computer technology in math, science, reading, and language instructions.

□ 1230

This is exactly the type of environment we should be encouraging for all of our students in all of our schools.

Andre Agassi has been a tireless advocate for this academy and for numerous other philanthropic endeavors, including the Boys and Girls Clubs in Las Vegas, raising more than \$60 million and contributing a substantial amount of his own money to improve the lives of children, youth at risk in my community. There is nobody that has done more for people in this community, my community, than Andre Agassi.

The only reason we're talking about this project on the floor today is because a famous name is attached to it. But whereas my colleague on the other side hopes to find a celebrity asking for Federal handouts rather than digging into his own pocket, he has instead highlighted a model citizen and a leader who has tried to make a difference and convince others to do the same.

It is one of the fastest growing areas. This is a very important earmark. I am proud to take this earmark. I will defend it with all my strength and ability.

At this time, I would like to yield whatever time is remaining to my colleague from Nevada, JON PORTER.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate many Members of this body that are looking for ways to eliminate waste, fraud and abuse, but I'm extremely disappointed that they've chosen this project.

I must say that I'm afraid some of my colleagues haven't really done their homework. And I appreciate my friend and colleague from Nevada, Congresswoman BERKLEY, for stating some of the obvious.

This particular program is what we need in America. And there is even a Web page today that shows this as an example of what's wrong with America. I want to stand here today and say this is what's right with America. We need to encourage public/private partnerships. Here is an individual that has adopted a charter school, a strong platform with the Republican Party, charter schools. It is a public charter school that he has adopted and writes a check for close to \$3 million a year to keep it operating.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I'm embarrassed. This is what's right about America, not what's wrong about America. This particular school is serving a population that needs our help

and assistance. We admit here day after day that we're not funding special needs kids enough, and we are not. This is another example of how we can help this very important population.

And again, as my colleague said from Nevada, this is an example of an individual that is giving of his time, of his life to support our community, close to \$60 million a year. He is giving to the community \$3 million of his own money into this school.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment. And I personally am very disappointed. This is an example of what's right about America. Mr. Agassi has done everything he can to help kids. He helps needy kids at our child welfare program, Boys and Girls Clubs across the community. He's not standing there with his hand out, he's standing there with support.

So Mr. Chairman, I ask this body to oppose this amendment, and I am extremely embarrassed.

Ms. BERKLEY. Reclaiming my time, let me sum up.

I'm going to urge defeat of this amendment. And before I yield back the balance of my time, I want to reiterate that I represent one of the faster growing areas in the country. If we are forced to rely strictly on formula funding for Federal assistance, we will always be behind the eight ball. We depend and rely on these earmarks in order to keep up with the latest technology and importance of providing for the people that I represent. I'm sorry that I had to even come down here to defend this earmark. I'm proud of it.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, you know, I don't disagree, and I'm not in a position to disagree with anything about this school said by either the lady from Nevada or the gentleman from Nevada. Again, let me reiterate, that is not my point.

My point is that there are probably many other schools that are worthy. There are probably all kinds of health considerations that are worthy. There are probably museums that are worthy. There are all kinds of things that are worthy. But the Federal Government does not traditionally fund charter schools. Schools are inherently local and State, and I think should be, and hopefully will continue to be. It's not a Federal school. And so I just don't think that it is right or appropriate that any of us pick something and essentially say this is where we're going to use the taxpayers' funds in a charitable endeavor.

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

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to my colleague's comments about charter schools.

Having been the co-author of charter school legislation in Nevada in the late 1990s, it truly is a Federal program. We do have funds available through grant processes that help charter schools. Unfortunately, we needed help immediately and this was the way to do it. As a matter of fact, this earmark isn't even in my district, it's adjacent to my district in Nevada. But it is traditional, it is what we do as a Congress. Another example of why I think Members understand their districts better than this full body, which is why we are here today in opposition to this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 62 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service, City College of New York, NY.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would eliminate a \$2 million earmark for the Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service at the City College of New York, New York.

Currently, Mr. Chairman, the City College of New York does not have a Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service. The Web site shows there are 16 centers of study, none of which bear Mr. RANGEL's name. So ostensibly this \$2 million is going to be creating the Charles B. Rangel Center for Public Service.

Currently, according to the Web site, it appears that most everything dealing with public service careers at the City College of New York currently goes through the Colin Powell Center for Policy Studies, which was founded by a charitable grant in 1997.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. RANGEL provided to me yesterday a brochure here on the Center for Public Service in New York. And this has a lot of stuff in it, admittedly, it mentions many things. But there are a few things in it I thought were troubling, because amongst the things that it says this center will have are, quote, "a well-fur-

nished office for Congressman Rangel." Second, "the Rangel Library to house its Rangel archives." And it goes on to say, quote, "The Rangel archivist librarian will organize, index and preserve for posterity all documents, photographs and memorabilia relating to Congressman Rangel's career."

House rules, and House rule XXI, clause 6 says, and I quote, "It shall not be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report that provides for the designation or redesignation of a public work in honor of an individual then serving as a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner or Senator." In other words, the rule says that we don't name public works after ourselves while we are in Congress.

Now, it's my understanding from the Parliamentarian that this amendment does not violate the letter of that rule. I would argue, and argue to my friends in the majority, that it would violate the spirit. I really do not think this is a road we want to go down, where we, as Members, have the ability to create and name things after ourselves using public funds while we are in office. If you think about that, there are five colleges or universities in my district. I'm sure if I went to one of them, any of them, with \$2 million and said, Let's have the John Campbell School of Fiscal Responsibility, I'm sure they would at least listen to that. But I don't think that would be right and I don't think that would be good and I don't think that would be proper. And I don't believe that this earmark is either.

So, I would request that my friends on the majority side and on the minority side consider, before you knee-jerk oppose this amendment, consider what this is opening up for this House. And do you really want to open up that we're going to have earmarks to name things after ourselves?

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition because I'm supporting the spirit and the rule.

Let me make some things abundantly clear that this would not only not violate the spirit in which we are doing this, but 60 years ago Charles Rangel was a high school dropout on the streets of Lenox Avenue, and the only thing that brings him to this Congress is the G.I. Bill. And in my community, where only four out of 10 kids manage to finish high school, I've devoted my entire life in working with the public and private sector in trying to keep our kids in school, and giving them the opportunity to get an education.

The days that we think that education is a local issue are over. As we move toward globalization, it is going to be far more important for every

young person, every person in this country to be exposed, to get the education, and to compete.

This is not a question of Federal funds being used to start anything. The City University came and asked would I start a drive to raise the money, which they already raised \$25 million, in order to do this. And all the office things that you're talking about, when you talk about archives, it means after I leave here. And I do hope that there would be an office there, as we bring people in to encourage people to get an education, to go into public service. I cannot think of anything that I am more proud of. I wish we had more of this type of thing.

And so it just seems to me, as you have seen fit to apply for an earmark here, that you understand what it is. I've been in office for 38 years, I don't need any accolades. My community has given me that. My predecessor served for 26 years before me. So I do hope that when you start talking about we understand that you can do this, but we're anxious to make certain that people don't want this, anybody that has given 38 of their years to the Congress, anybody that was able to go back to high school under the G.I. Bill when they were 23, anybody that spends his time inspiring kids to go to school, to stay in school, to get an education, to get married, make contributions in anybody's community, and the city college that stood on a hill, where I had no idea that it was a college when I was a kid since nobody in my family had gone to college, anybody that can get this Congress to support something like that, I would laud not only the success in getting it done, but the spirit in which it's being done.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. You said that this is not starting this, but it does not exist today; is that correct, sir?

Mr. RANGEL. We have corporation people making contributions. The school does not exist. It will be announced in October. And I hope my Federal Government is a part of that, as I know my city and State are going to be a part of it, not because my name is on it. I would feel just as strongly about this if it wasn't. But somehow they feel, as some people do, that my name on it will drive and be able to raise the private funds, and so far \$25 million has been raised. And I want my government to be a part of that effort.

The brochure is what is being sold to encourage people, including you, to understand what we're trying to do and what we're going to do.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. And so, you don't agree with me, or see any problem with us, as Members, sending taxpayer funds in the creation of things named after ourselves while we're still here?

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. CAMPBELL, I would like to answer you. I would have a

problem if you did it because I don't think that you've been around long enough that having your name on something to inspire a building like this in a school—it might be that it would be in order for you to get publicity and to get reelected. But since I've been here 38 years and have not really had any opposition from the other side, it doesn't serve any function for me, except to try to encourage people to participate with government, local government, teachers, in order to keep our kids in school.

So, I am proud of the fact that they're using my name in order to create this. And it's going to be created. As I said, if you had gone to the Web site, you would have gotten a number, you could have gotten in touch with President Williams, he would have told you we've collected \$25 million, and that would be it.

So, not only do I not see anything wrong, but I wish more public servants that have the ability to do this would get involved in this type of thing. I think it's very important.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. If the gentleman would yield, is there, then, a number of years in which someone can have been in Congress in which you are then allowed to name something after yourself?

Mr. RANGEL. No. But I'm convinced that after you're here a while that you would find out it's the quality of service and what you have produced for your constituents rather than how long you've been here.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I just think that putting our constituents first is what this place should be all about, and putting our country first.

The gentleman from New York is a distinguished combat veteran, with 38 years service in this House. But we have seen people leave this House to great glory, and to even be elected President or ambassador, captains of industry. And other of our colleagues have gone straight from this Chamber to jail. And the decision is best made by history. The collective wisdom of our rules is that, in general, we don't name things after ourselves when we are great and powerful, but no independent judgment could be leveled.

□ 1245

I support this project. I think this project is a good one. But I would just ask would the gentleman entertain a unanimous consent request simply to remove his name to advance this project, but to delete the current ego from this?

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. I tried to make it clear, and I wish I had been better at it, that as flattered as I am that they are using my name, I am thoroughly convinced that the only reason they are using my name is the ability to attract funds to get this thing going. So for me to be able to remove my name from it, I would say that the \$25 million that they raised was in bad faith, and the money that they intend to raise, that I would not lend my name to, they would never have done this unless I agreed.

Mr. KIRK. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is a very powerful chairman. If he supports this project, they will come. But I worry about setting the precedent of everyone else naming things after themselves.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In conclusion, it includes an office, et cetera. I just don't believe that we should use the power and authority we have while in office to use taxpayer funds to create monuments to ourselves or to participate in the creation of a monument to ourselves. That is just not something that I believe we should be doing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I just want to commend the Democrats. We always said that names should be placed next to the earmarks. This earmark is going beyond the spirit of the law. The name is on the earmark.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. OBEY. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Garrett amendment pertaining to the Department of Labor and the National Institutes of Health, which was previously adopted by a voice vote and accepted by the committee, I would like to clarify that the amendment does not specify which Department of Labor programs would be impacted.

Adoption of that amendment does not create any legislative intent that

would require the Department of Labor to reduce funding for the migrant and seasonal farm worker program.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the American Jazz Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, for exhibits, education programs, and an archival project.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for “Institute of Museum and Library Services—Office of Museum and Library Services: Grants and Administration” is hereby reduced by \$200,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair.

Before talking about this amendment, there wasn't time for me to speak on the last one, I just want to say that I don't think it is the road that we want to go down to start naming facilities or programs after ourselves. I think that the rules may be a bit vague, but they seem clear enough that we shouldn't do that. The dialogue that I heard was, Are you worthy to have something named after you if you have just been here a few years? Does it take 38 years? What does it take?

Frankly, I think it would take a lot more than \$2 million to get any college or university in my district to name something the “Flake Center,” for a myriad of reasons. But, having said that, I just don't think it is a road that we should go down. So that is why I supported the gentleman's amendment. I hope others as they come to the floor will, as well.

This amendment would prohibit \$200,000 in Federal funds from being used for the American Jazz Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, for exhibits, education programs, and for an archival project. It reduces the cost of the bill by a consistent amount. I couldn't think of any jazzy line here, but I will just say that earmarks like this probably give taxpayers all over the blues.

This earmark would come out of the Institute of Museum and Library Services account, or the IMLS. The IMLS administers a competitive grant program for museums, libraries and zoos. This committee has recommended this program be funded with nearly \$18 million.

Here is part of the problem, I think, with earmarks, particularly in this bill. We are often earmarking funds that are in programs at the agencies

that are already designated to be awarded on a competitively bid process. This jazz museum, I am sure, has submitted applications. Perhaps they have won grants over the years. But maybe this year they didn't. So what earmarks typically do are circumvent the process that we have mandated to be established with these agencies.

We often complain about Federal agencies not listening to us and going out and spending willy-nilly. That is often the case, certainly. It is our job, then, to call them in and say, we want to change your program. We want to have you competitively bid projects.

I should point out that much of what we criticize the agencies for we are doing here in spades. Earmarks are, by their very definition, no-bid contracts. We are saying to people out there, if you can't get your grant through the competitively bid process, come to us anyway, and we will earmark those funds for you. So there is no concept, no discussion of merit.

Try as they might, I am sure the Appropriations Committee is not in a position to adequately scrub and vet all of these earmark requests. That is simply not their role and shouldn't be their role. We shouldn't put that burden on the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLEAVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me first of all say that on the positive side, I do have respect for the gentleman from Arizona. He is consistent. He is not mean-spirited with his opposition. There is a lot of mean-spirited conversation that goes on here.

I should say to him, however, that this Member of Congress placed all 120 requested earmarks on my Web site in March, not at the request of anyone. I did it. I am proud of my earmarks. I want everybody to see them. I don't think there is enough money going, though, to this particular project.

When I was mayor of Kansas City, Missouri, we built the American Jazz Museum. It is the only museum on the planet dedicated to the preservation of America's only art form. Jazz is the only art form created in the United States of America. We have what is called the John Baker Collection. If students at the University of Arizona want to study the industry of jazz, the art form of jazz, and they would like to see the soundies, the only place they can see the John Baker Collection, the largest collection of old black and white soundies, is the American Jazz Museum in Kansas City.

People from across this Nation, actually from across the world, come into Kansas City. The city put money into it. Of course, as a former mayor, I know that we send unfunded mandates

down to the city. So the city, particularly, since I left office, reduces the funding each year. Since people are using this museum from all over this Nation, I'll bet there are people in Arizona, I hope they are watching, who are using the American Jazz Museum.

So, I believe, first of all, that I have been as transparent as anybody could be. The comments we received from people in our district, Republicans and Democrats, is thank you for being transparent. I don't hide any of it. I want everybody to look at it, examine it. It gives me an opportunity to stand here, and hopefully people in my district are watching me now to stand here and not only defend the earmark, but to promote the American Jazz Museum.

This is the home of Charlie “YardBird” Parker, who was born and raised right there and went to school around the street from the museum. This is the place where Count Basie organized his band. This is the place where Jay McShan organized his band. Every major jazz artist in the world wanted to play 18th and Vine.

Now, there is some debate about whether Kansas City or New Orleans is the Mother of Jazz. Of course, New Orleans is wrong, and I try to help them when I can. But the point here is that we need, Mr. Chairman, to have people who are going to put up earmarks to be in a position to feel good about them and to express it. So I don't see this so much as a defense, but as an opportunity to promote what I think is one of the legitimate projects for funding from the United States Congress because it serves the people of this Nation.

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman whose earmark this is. I believe he knows that. I commend him for earlier than just about anybody putting his earmarks on his Web site. Certainly, this has been a good reform. I have been complimentary, and I remain so, of the majority party's willingness in January to go down this road and actually require this much. It follows some of what we did in the fall as Republicans. Frankly, in some areas, I think it did better than we did.

This isn't a case of something looks untoward in this earmark, or somebody is trying to get some private gain. It doesn't seem to me to be that at all. It is simply a question of, is this a proper priority? Should Members of Congress be able to designate money like this, particularly in this case, when we have a Federal agency with a program to award grants and an account with \$16 million that we appropriate every year to award grants under this program? That is my question here.

I think that certainly, as mentioned, jazz is uniquely American. I can't imagine them submitting a proposal that would not be granted. It seems like a great place. It seems to be appropriate. What is at question here is,

should the Congress be doing this? That is where I am.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. OBEY. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1300

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to get a few things off my chest with regard to this earmarking issue.

I know that policy questions are complicated, and I know that budget questions are complicated. I recognize, therefore, that substantial members of the press and some Members of the Congress as well in both bodies seek to find other more simple issues which are small enough to get their mind around. And so we have spent a good amount of time the last 3 weeks talking about earmarks. I want to put some things in perspective about earmarks.

In the Financial Services bill, out of all of the money provided in that bill, 1.5 percent was devoted to earmarks.

In Interior, 0.43 percent of all the money appropriated was provided for earmarks.

In Transportation, 1.4 percent of the entire bill was allocated through earmarks.

And in this bill, it is slightly less than 0.20. That is a very tiny portion of the overall bill.

The executive branch allocates or directs spending at least 10 times as great as does the Congress and I don't see or hear much squawking about that.

I just want to suggest this: I don't happen to be comfortable with the earmarking system because it is a pain in the neck to me, it takes an incredible amount of time, and I would much rather spend that time on policy. But the fact is that it is a constitutional prerogative of the Congress to do so. And I would submit it creates a much more fair system. An example, when Speaker HASTERT ran this place last year, here he is the Speaker of the House, and yet if the Congress earmarked no money, all the dollars would go back to Illinois and they would be directed by a Democratic Governor. So Speaker HASTERT would be part of the body that raised the money at the Federal level and sent the money back to States and local governments; and yet without the earmarking process, the most powerful and influential man in Congress would have nothing to say about how that money was allocated in his own State. I submit that is not right.

Or take myself. I chair the Appropriations Committee. I think I spend more time and, frankly, I think I know at least as much about the Federal budget as anybody in this institution, not because I am so plugged in but because of my job and the fact that I have been here a long time, and even an idiot ought to be able to pick up a fair amount of information as long as I have been here.

So I would simply ask the question why should I serve in this body, try to help my district, and then discover that for 16 straight years we had a Republican Governor, I had absolutely nothing to say about funds that were distributed in my State without the earmarking process.

The earmarking process, if it is used correctly, allows individual Members to target things in their own district that they think will contribute the most to improving the living conditions or the educational conditions or the cultural conditions in that district. I don't think there is anything wrong with that.

But I find it incredibly amazing and amusing that we are talking about 0.19 percent of all of the funds in this bill. How much time have we spent talking about basic education philosophy? How much time have we spent talking about which of these education programs really work? How much time have we spent in this debate talking about the programs? The answer is zip because some people prefer to deal with small things.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind my colleagues of some important facts as we deliberate on these earmarks. I think it is very important to understand that we have reduced the dollar value of earmarks in this bill by 50 percent from the levels that the Republicans had when they were running this House of Representatives. A 50 percent reduction. We have cut 41 wasteful programs from the budget in this appropriations bill. We have saved over \$1 billion over last year.

So instead of getting involved in the intricacies of one earmark after another, let's keep focused on the facts that count. And the fact that counts is that we reduced this budget and slashed those earmarks in half.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make two final points. The first is the people in the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri, Harry Truman's district, will have the opportunity to judge whether or not I should have placed these projects before Congress for earmarks next November. I am measured by my representation in that district. I would suggest that they are going to be very pleased with what I have done.

The other issue is that we are talking about a \$200,000 earmark, and I had hoped for significantly more than that. We are spending \$285 million a day, \$11 million a hour in Iraq. If you subtract \$200,000, that would reduce the number of Coca-Colas in Iraq by about four cases based on the price they have been gouging.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio:

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

SEC. _____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 4.6 percent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, one of the previous speakers from the majority party talked about how this legislation in front of us has reduced the number of earmarks. I believe his quote was there are 41 programs that have been eliminated from last year's appropriation bill. Nevertheless, this bill increases spending \$10.8 billion more than the President requested, 7.7 percent more than the President requested. It is \$7 billion, or a 4.6 percent, increase over last year's appropriation.

So my amendment is real straightforward. It says we are not going to go back to the President, we are not going to cut it, using the term "cut" to the President's requested level, we are going to go back to last year's funding level, a level funding amendment, a hold-the-line amendment, whatever you want to call it. It is certainly not a cut, although that has typically been the argument made by the other side of the aisle.

This is the sixth amendment I have offered in the appropriations process. Each one has been the same, to hold the line on spending. I don't do it to be a pain in the rear to the committee or to the ranking member. I appreciate the work of the committee and our ranking member and those involved on this committee in bringing this bill forward.

I do it because we have a spending problem. We have a spending problem in this Congress and in this government, and there is going to come a day

when we are going to have to deal with it. There is no better time to start than now, and no better place to start than to say let's just hold the line because here is what happens every single time government continues to spend and spend and spend. It inevitably leads to higher taxes, higher taxes that hurt our economy, higher taxes that hurt our standing in the international marketplace. But most importantly, higher taxes that hurt families out there trying to do the things for their kids and their grandkids so they can experience the American dream.

If you don't believe me that spending is going to lead to higher taxes, all you have to do is look at yesterday's Roll Call where there is a story. In fact, we just had the distinguished chairman from the Ways and Means Committee down here defending an earmark in his district, but he is talked about and the article talks about the tobacco tax that they are looking to put on the American people to fund increased spending.

The old line, it's tax and spend, tax and spend politicians; it's actually the opposite, it's spend and tax, spend and tax. Spending drives the equation, and that is why we need to begin to get a handle on spending. That's what this amendment does.

In the course of offering these amendments over the last several weeks, we have consistently heard two arguments from the majority party. The first is the old devastating cut argument, that somehow if we just spend what we spent last year, that will somehow be terrible and the sky will fall and the world will end and everything will go to chaos. I find that hard to believe in light of the fact that countless number of American families have to do that all the time, live on last year's budget. But somehow, government never seems to be able to do that.

The other line that we have heard, and I find this one somewhat amazing, but the line is how dare Republicans talk about holding the line on spending because you increased spending over the last several years as well. I am fascinated by that argument because the argument, when you boil it down, is this: Because Republicans spent too much, we are going to spend more.

So I fail to see the logic in those two arguments. What I do understand is this, Mr. Chairman. Government spends too much. Families know how to budget. We should be able to do the same thing. Families don't just get an automatic 4.6 percent increase in their budget. We should look to hold the line on spending. That is what this amendment does. It will help set us on the path of fiscal discipline so we can begin to deal with the big problems that I referenced earlier that are going to be out there with entitlement spending, and begin to get a handle on our budget so that our economy can continue to grow and prosper.

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to make a couple of short observations. We are told by this gentleman, and we have been told, and we have been told, and we have been told and we have been told for 3 days that somehow it is this bill which is responsible for the outrageous fiscal mess facing the country. I just want to say one thing: Yes, this bill spends \$10 billion more on our kids, on our workers, on our obligation to provide access to health care to people who don't have it, than the President does. I plead fully double guilty. I would do twice as much if I could. I would do three times as much if I could because the country needs it.

This is the bill that makes the investments that will make our country stronger economically, educationally and socially not just today but for the next 10 years. That's what this bill is about.

We have got a 2 percent difference between us and the President in terms of what we are trying to spend in this bill versus what he thinks we ought to spend. I have just told you where we have put it in the right places. Where does the President want to put money? The President wants to spend five times as much as the difference that we have with him on this bill, he wants to spend five times as much giving tax cuts to people who make more than a million bucks a year. He is going to give 57 billion bucks to people in this country who make over a million bucks a year. We think that money, a portion of it, is better spent on kids who need it and on sick people who need it. And we make no apology for it.

The other thing I would simply say is that the other place that the President wants to spend it, he wants to spend 60 times as much as that \$10 billion on that stupid war in Iraq, the worst foreign policy blunder in the history of the Republic.

So we plead fully guilty to having a meaningful 2 percent difference between the President and us. We plead fully guilty, and I wish it were more.

□ 1315

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the Republican leader, friend and gentleman from Ohio, for 1 minute.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my colleague for yielding, and I rise today to support the gentleman's amendment.

The bill before us spends some \$10 billion more than the President requested, \$7 billion more than what this bill spent last year. And what the gentleman seeks to do is reduce the overall amount of spending in this bill to the level we spent last year.

Now, our job as Members of Congress is to make decisions, decisions about spending, and when we keep increasing spending and increasing spending, guess what? There's no reason to make a decision. We don't have to make the tough choices because we just keep spending more.

Now, this bill is some \$7 billion more than we spent last year. This will be on top of the bills that we've already spent this year, spending some 10 to \$12 billion more than the President asked for and above last year's levels.

On top of that, there's \$6 billion of additional spending that was in the continuing resolution in February; \$17 billion more in the supplemental spending bill for Iraq and Katrina, over and above what was needed in those theaters. And the appropriation process is not finished yet.

What's happening here is we're continuing to spend more. We've got the largest tax increase in American history coming, and I thought we were here to ensure that our kids and their kids had a better chance in life than what we had. I mean, every generation of Americans has been proud of the fact that they left the country and left opportunities for our children and their children that were better than what we had. And I think it's our obligation to make sure that our kids have a better chance at the American Dream than what we had.

But we're not doing that. We're mortgaging our children's future by continuing to raise taxes and increase spending. We've done it all year, and we're not even to the end of the year yet. Now we're only in July and we've got numbers that will add up to close to \$100 billion of additional spending. How much is enough? How much is enough?

I think that the gentleman's amendment is a good amendment, just to bring the spending level in this bill down to last year's level, and let's make the tough choices that the American people sent us here to make.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman.

They say on the other side, and the gentleman has said, that we have a spending problem and that they left the country in better shape. Our friends on the other side are talking about leaving the country in better shape. I think we need, Mr. Chairman, to remind them of the history here.

What we're talking about is just 6 short years ago President Clinton left office with a budget surplus of \$5.6 trillion, and a lot of us at that time were talking about how we were going to invest in education and health care and the important things that our country needs and that make our country stronger.

And in 6 short years, 6 short years, our Republican friends have driven this country into a deficit situation. We're

talking projected now on a 10-year basis \$3 trillion or more in deficit.

So I don't see how our friends on the other side of the aisle can claim the mantle of fiscal responsibility. I don't see how they can claim in any way that they have left the country in better shape. I don't see how they can claim that they're fighting spending. I mean, this was, under them, borrow and spend, borrow and spend. That was the message. And what we're trying to do here in this particular piece of legislation is get under control a situation where we invest again in the things that the American people really care about: invest in education, investing in our workers so that we can have a competitive workforce, investing in Pell Grants to help students get the very best education.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask how much time both sides have left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Each side has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, before yielding to my friend and gentleman from Arizona, let me just respond to one thing real quickly.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee talked earlier about all the new spending, and the other side has a definition for success for them is more spending. Our side actually believes the definition of success should be success.

And I always look at education. I came from the general assembly in Ohio, and one of the things you focus on so much in the general assembly budget process is primary and secondary education. And if you look at what's happened, and this is for every State, but I can just give you the numbers on Ohio.

We have 612 public schools in Ohio. In 1977 we had 2 million K-12 kids. Today we have 1.8 million. So we've had 200,000 less kids in K-12 public school, 612 districts in our State. Over that 30 years, 200,000 less kids. Dollars spent per pupil, dollars spent per aggregate, dollars spent for facilities, dollars spent any way you want to define dollars spent adjusted for inflation is a tremendous increase.

So you have got 200,000 less kids. So you've got the graph going this way. The economists have always got these graphs. Graph coming down on number of students, graph going up adjusted for inflation, and what are the results? It's a straight line. So you spent a boatload more money on 200,000 less kids to get the exact same result. So more money may mean more learning in some places, but to make the blanket statement more money means more education, more money means more learning is simply not true, and the facts are on our side.

So we define success as actually being success, not giving more money and hoping that good things are going to happen, and if they don't, you know what we're going to do, give them more money next time. We don't define it

that way. We say if kids are really learning, that should be success, not the fact that we've given them more money.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It was brought up before that we're not talking about what the Federal agencies do. We talk a lot about what Congress does with earmarking, but there's an area of complaint I've heard about what the Federal agencies are doing. Well, this is the time to have that discussion. Right now.

We're looking to reduce the amount spent, the amount that we appropriate to the Federal agencies. Yes, they waste money, a tremendous amount of money. They waste money in my own district. This is the time that we say, hey, hold back a little, reprioritize, don't spend as much, and yet we're not doing it.

Instead, we say, well, you're misspending money and so we're going to misspend some money with earmarking. We don't like the way you have prioritized, so we're not going to actually go in and provide oversight and say, all right, stop spending money this way or that way. We're just going to add to it with our own priorities.

Let me just give an example. It's often said we don't ever give examples of specific programs. I'll give you one. I believe it was last year or maybe the year before GAO came out with a study saying that the DARE program was a waste of money, basically, or we weren't getting the bang for the buck that we should. What did we do? We increased funding for it. Instead of saying, you know, maybe it's not run as it should be, maybe we should scale back on it, force them to change it or scrap it altogether, but instead we increased funding for it.

That goes on across the board. GAO studies that we often commission are always followed by, well, they must need more money. Not the money's being misspent. They just need more of it.

That's what this amendment is all about to say, hey, Federal agencies you're misspending money; you're spending too much; it's time to scale back, and by the way, we can scale back on our own as far as earmarking as well.

So we never hear about the Federal agencies misspending. Here's one saying they do. They do in your district; they do in my district. This is the opportunity to say enough is enough. Let's cut back. Let's have some fiscal responsibility here.

So I commend the gentleman for his amendment, and I urge everyone to support it.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentleman's argument. At least his argument is con-

sistent. I appreciate the gentleman's integrity, and I appreciate the principles of his argument. But I must say, sitting here listening to some of the other Members on the other side of the aisle consistently raises issues of inconsistency.

The gentleman who's offered this amendment has said we should go back to last year. That's all we're doing is going back to last year so we can hold the line on spending. Why we would want to go back to last year? When last year was there ever an attempt to hold the line on spending?

Mr. Chairman, the other side spent and spent and spent and borrowed and borrowed and borrowed. The difference between us is we want to invest in America's families. The other side, Mr. Chairman, decided to spend to give special interest giveaways. We want to spend to make sure that kids can get Pell Grants and go to college and compete in the global economy. They wanted to spend on no-bid contracts to Halliburton. We want to spend to make sure that seniors can heat their homes in the winter because of high oil prices. They wanted to spend on \$13 billion in tax cuts for oil company executives who I don't think are eligible for LIHEAP. That's the difference between us.

We just had a debate earlier about the propriety of Members of Congress putting their names on projects that are funded by the Federal Government. I would suggest to my good friends that if there were an earmark for a facility called the Congressional Hypocrisy Treatment Foundation, there wouldn't be a plaque large enough for all of their names.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, some simple facts. The President's budget would have us spend as a share of our total national income 48 percent less on education, health care, science, job training, et cetera, than this country spent in 1980, and by 2012 he would have us spend 57 percent less than we spent in 1980.

That creates a problem because we're going to have 27 million more Americans in the next 10 years. We're going to have 12 million more seniors needing health care. We're going to have 2.7 million more kids in elementary and secondary school. We're going to have 2.2 million more students in college. And, unless we change our ways, we're going to have 11 million more Americans without health insurance.

That's why we don't want to go back to last year. We want to move ahead to try to deal with the problems coming at us. We see them; they're there. We ought not to stick our head in the ground like an ostrich. We ought to deal with them, and that's what this bill does.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, can I ask how much time is left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member from New York.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this amendment.

There were a couple of things that were said in the debate that I just want to try to get a little clarity on.

I served here in the late 1990s, and I recall that Republicans, as the majority party, passed a balanced budget in 1997. In 1998, we had our first balanced budget. Now, President Clinton was President at the time, but I believe I heard someone on the other side say President Clinton left the country with a \$5.6 trillion surplus. I think they're mistaken. I think what they meant to say is President Clinton left the United States Government with a \$5.6 trillion debt.

Now, that debt has increased, but the fact is that when we were in the majority party, for the first time since the 1940s, we produced a balanced budget. The President does not have the power of the purse; the Congress does. We created that surplus. We created the balanced budgets, and there was no surplus left at the end of the Clinton administration. We actually paid down the debt about a half trillion dollars, about \$500 billion. That was good work.

Things changed pretty dramatically in 2001 when our Nation was attacked. We went to war, we had a recession, and the dot-com bubble burst.

But we produced that surplus. We produced those balanced budgets. Not the President of the United States. The Congress. That's where the power of the purse resides.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Could I inquire, Mr. Chairman, how much time we have on our side?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has 4½ minutes.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

□ 1330

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this would almost be sad if it really wasn't so comical.

I think what a lot of folks are witnessing today is some more smoke and mirrors, another magic show that they may have seen somewhere.

We have the chairman of the Appropriations Committee who said that the President's budget would spend 48 percent less this year on education and some other things that he mentioned than 1980, but yet they talk about what kind of spending spree we are on. I can't imagine what kind of spending spree the Democratic majority must have been on in 1980.

Let me say this. We keep hearing a lot of history lessons, a lot of history in here. For some reason we don't want to talk about the future.

But we keep hearing about the \$57 billion from the people in this country that make over \$1 million. Now, I really don't know if that's true or not. I am going to assume the chairman of the Appropriations Committee knows if that's true or not.

But it's almost like he sounds mad that he can't get his hands on somebody else's money. He says, you know, we can't get that \$57 billion, and we want to spend it. I am mad about it.

You know what? We are spending too much money on the war on terror. Well, look, I have only been here 3 years, but I know one thing. I know that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the Democratic leadership over there can stop this war today, today. They got 232 votes. They control the purse strings, they can stop it today.

The supplemental budget that we passed that our leader talked about was \$20 billion more than the President requested. The chairman of the committee said, you know what, I would spend \$10 billion more. What's stopping him? He is already spending \$11 billion more. What's stopping him from spending \$10 billion more.

Because you know why? I think they are afraid to tell you that these things that they are investing in, that's what they like to call spending taxpayers' dollars. The things that they are investing in is coming out of the American people's pocket. They are making investments for the people of this country that they don't even have any say in. It's time we wake up.

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

The gentleman just said the things that they are investing in and implying that the Democrats are making these investments. Yes, we are making these investments. They are investments in strengthening American families, making sure kids can go to college, making sure people can afford to heat their homes.

I will tell you something else, it's not just us, this bill came out of appropriations with a strong bipartisan majority. The most conservative Members of the other side voted for this bill. It's not that we are making these investments as Democrats, it's that most mainstream Members of Congress, with responsibilities to our districts, are making these investments.

Now, maybe there are some who are so far on the other side, so far on the fringe, that they would argue with their own conservative Members that an investment in college education is a bad idea. But the fact of the matter is, they are in a very, very small minority.

This bill has strong bipartisan support in the Appropriations Committee. Republicans and Democrats work together despite the opposition from such a fringe minority.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. Would the gentleman from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Sure.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I was wondering, I will ask it as you are walking, do you believe that the Federal Government has responsibility for any K-12 education programs?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I think that the Federal Government, if they want to fund K-12, it should be in block grants to the local school districts for them to be able to spend the money to the needs of their local school districts and the needs of the State.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You do believe in Federal spending on education at the local level?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I think that if the Federal Government is going to spend money on education, that they need to send it to the State as a block grant for the State Department of Education to spend in their local districts.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

I wanted to make sure, because as we had the conversation, I have heard many gentleman who were up here earlier say they didn't believe in any Federal spending for education, local education, at all.

I just want to clarify that you, at least, do believe that we do have an obligation to spend money. I appreciate you saying that.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. You know, I have listened to you many nights and I respect you, because I really believe that you are a true believer in what you are saying.

Let me just say this, that I am part of that fringe.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I know. I have been here.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. You are part of a fringe, somewhat of a fringe.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I don't think I am.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Being part of that fringe, I am proud of the fringe.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, that's twice in the past 2 days that our friend from Georgia has admitted being on the fringe. In response to the claim that I am on the fringe voting for this bill, I would just like to say I joined his colleagues, every Republican on the Labor-H subcommittee from all over, conservative Republicans, in support of this bill.

The gentleman from New York; Mr. REGULA, the gentleman from Ohio, these are balanced, fair investments.

As the gentleman from New York stated, we are not raising taxes. Check, keep your forms from last year, your tax forms, and compare them to next year. There will not be an increase in your taxes.

What we are doing is we are not spending the money on the banks, we are spending it on the kids. We are not giving it to the oil companies, we are giving it to the kids for education and health care.

It's a difference in priorities. There is not a tax increase in here, and the bottom line is we make investments into the future of our country.

I find it offensive and staggering that the minority leader can come here, along with our friends, and talk about leaving the country in better shape than they found it, or that we have that obligation. Three trillion dollars in debt under your watch, Republican House, Republican Senate, Republican White House, \$3 trillion.

The gentleman from Ohio wasn't here, but this Congress asked the Secretary of the Treasury to raise the debt limit five or six times so they could go out and borrow more money from China, more money from Japan, more money from OPEC countries. So we don't need lectures on how to leave the country better off than we found it.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, how much time is left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would just ask the gentleman, my friend from Ohio, how does increasing spending 4.6 percent over last year's bill, how does that help address the \$3 trillion debt problem that I admit, I wasn't here, I admit that's a real problem.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Would the gentleman yield so I could ask you a question?

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I would be happy to yield. I asked you a question.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You will probably remember, because we were in the State Senate together in Ohio, there was a study done by the University of Akron. It said every dollar that the State of Ohio invested in higher education, they got \$2 back in tax money. This is an investment we are going to make, and we are going to yield returns.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, I would argue that every dollar we let the American taxpayer keep gets earned and returned to the economy, and that's what ultimately allows us to deal with the \$3 trillion in debt. That's why we are offering the amendment that we bring forward.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That's been the philosophy, and it hasn't worked.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. It has too worked. The deficits are coming down right now because of the tax cuts that were put in place earlier this decade. We have seen that happen right now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We raised the debt limit six times. How can you say it worked?

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Yes, sometimes facts are a strange thing. The Federal Government does not have a revenue problem.

Revenues increased by 14.5 percent in 2005, 11.6 percent in 2006, and are projected to grow an additional \$167 billion, or 7 percent this year, because we let the American family keep more of their money, spend it on the things they want to spend it, instead of saying to them, you know what, we are going

to increase spending 4.6 percent in this bill and \$20 some billion in this appropriation process that we have done.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Two seconds, I would just say if your philosophy has worked, you would be in the majority right now.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how many speakers the other side has?

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I think our time is done.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the differences we have heard in this debate are entirely clear. We want to, with Republicans on the Appropriations Committee, who by a widespread margin supported this bill. We want to continue to invest in America's families and in their future. A very small group of Members on the other side want to continue going to the past where they were spending taxpayer dollars on special interest giveaways.

There are people, in all of our districts, who are scratching their heads trying to figure out how they are going to send their kids to college so they can compete in a global economy. The President wants to slash or eliminate college affordability programs for 1.5 million students.

Now, that's why Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee supported investments that will make additional Pell Grants available so that people who are working hard, playing by the rules, and want their kids to advance can send their kids to college. This isn't a radical idea.

This was a bipartisan consensus on the Appropriations Committee. But those who are offering these cutbacks don't agree with Republicans and Democrats who believe in making investments so that people who play by the rules and work hard can send their kids to college.

There are people in our districts who are trying to figure out how they are going to pay for their skyrocketing home heating oil costs. The President wants to cut home heating oil programs by \$379 million and take away assistance to 1.5 million people.

That's why Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee agreed that we should invest a fraction of that, \$880 million to make sure that an additional 1 million people can pay their heating oil bills. Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee, bipartisan, there are a few who say, no, no, we should continue giving tax cuts to big oil company executives rather than giving people the ability, helping people with the ability to pay their home heating oil costs.

There are people in our districts who can't figure out what to do if they get cancer, how they are going to have access to health care programs. The President wants to cut medical research at the NIH by \$480 million and

cut preventive health care services by \$220 million. That's why Democrats and Republicans join together on the Appropriations Committee to invest \$1.3 billion to improve health care access and help 1 million Americans receive treatment and increase investments in NIH.

This is about priorities, bipartisan common-sense priorities. This is about those of us on both sides of the aisle who believe that we should invest in strengthening America's families and a very small group who believe that we should continue to borrow to give away money to the special interests.

I want to conclude by reminding my colleagues how we go about making these investments, not by raising taxes. They are going to keep saying it and saying it and saying it. That's not how we do it. We cut 41 programs. We slashed earmarks in half. We saved \$1 billion.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would rather not talk about what one party did one year and what one party did another year, because I think there is substantial support in both parties for the bill that we have before us today. I want to walk through what the impact of this cut would be on this bill.

If we pass this amendment, we will be cutting \$1.2 billion from No Child Left Behind, the President's signature education set of programs. We will be cutting \$684 million from Title I grants. We will be cutting \$519 million from IDEA. That's a program which both parties have fought for the last 3 days to try to increase.

We would be cutting \$717 million from Pell Grants, reducing scholarship awards for millions of students, despite the fact that the cost of higher education has gone up by 40 percent the last 5 years. We would be cutting \$1.4 billion from the National Institutes of Health, money that we use to combat cancer, heart disease, Parkinson's and the like. We would be cutting \$100 million from community health centers, denying needed health care and dental services to almost half a million people.

We would be cutting \$53 million out of the President's request to prepare the country for a potential pandemic flu. We would be cutting \$320 million from Head Start, \$98 million from Child Care Development Block Grant. We would be cutting \$446 million from the Social Security Administration, denying the resources that agency needs to maintain and keep open its local offices and reduce backlogs of disability and SSI claims.

So people have a choice. What's more important, their own accounting sheets or these investments in the country?

The fact is, with the exception of the gang of four, virtually every Republican who has offered an amendment

has done the same thing that Democrats have tried to do. They have tried to find ways to increase programs that they think are important to the country's future.

I would submit I don't think those Republicans are out of step, and I don't think those Democrats are out of step. I think the folks who are out of step are the gang of four offering the amendments.

□ 1345

I believe that most Americans, and I think most Republicans, would rather invest the funds now to prepare our workforce to be better trained, our kids to be better educated, and our health care system to be more efficient and more and more humane. That is what this bill is all about, and I think that there is a bipartisan consensus in this House to stick with this bill. So I would urge respectfully rejection of the amendment, as I make one other point.

We have the \$1.4 billion initiative of add-ons to try to discourage women from having abortions. Instead of lectures, we provide resources to make their lives better if they decide to have those kids. This bill would cut about 40 percent of that initiative out of the bill. I happen to think that initiative is too important to sandbag, and this amendment sandbags that effort. So I would urge rejection of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

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

SEC. ____ Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$1,517,480,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues who are endeavoring to bring about some responsible spending here in Washington. I think this debate is helpful. It is helpful for the American people, because

what it demonstrates is a difference in philosophy.

Before I get to the specifics of my amendment, I want to mention, we have just heard a litany of projects that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee said would be cut with the previous amendment, and he went through: No Child Left Behind cut \$1.2 billion; title I, \$684 million; IDEA, \$519 million; Pell Grants, \$717 million cut.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, what the American people understand is that the amendment that was just proposed would keep funding level. Not cut, level, which means that there wouldn't be any decreases over this current year of spending; there would be the same amount of money. It is what Americans do every year when they have a difficult challenge financially.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we have a difficult challenge financially this year in our Nation. And, consequently, to label those things cuts just isn't so.

But I rise to offer my amendment, which is affectionately known as the Hefley amendment. Former Congressman Joel Hefley from Colorado offered this amendment on multiple occasions. It is a 1 percent reduction in the increase of this Appropriations bill.

Now, to look at the big picture, look at where we are in terms of numbers right now, this current year enacted for this portion of the Federal Appropriations covered \$144.6 billion. The President's request, the administration's request, as we all know, was less than that, \$140.9 billion. The bill that we have before us is \$151.7 billion; \$10.8 billion more than the administration's request, more than the request of those that we charge for running this portion of our Nation.

My amendment that I am offering now would, instead of having this bill be \$151.7 billion, would say let's have it be \$150.2 billion. So, a significant increase over last year but a 1 percent reduction from the increase, an increase that would be greater than the rate of inflation but a 1 percent reduction than that that comes from the committee. And the reason for that is because of the financial situation that we find ourselves in as a Nation.

If you, Mr. Chairman, or I or any of our constituents find themselves in a situation where they need to save some money, then oftentimes what they will do is say we need to cut back across the board on the kinds of things that we are spending. And this amendment simply states that, out of a 1 percent cut, we ought to be able to find one penny out of every dollar to save for our children's future. And the rationale for that is because it is not our money, Mr. Chairman, it is not Congress's money. It is the hard-earned money of the American taxpayer. And we hear a lot about priorities, and we ought to be prioritizing. And that is what budgetary bills are, that is what appropriations bills are, making priority judg-

ments for the hard-earned American taxpayer money. Our priority on this side is that hardworking American taxpayer.

So we rise to offer this amendment that we believe to be a responsible amendment. It outlines the differences between the two sides very clearly. We believe that there ought to be at least one penny out of every dollar that we ought to be able to find in terms of savings for this area for the next year, and offer it sincerely and honestly and respectfully. I would encourage my colleagues to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's plea. I will again remind my colleagues that Republicans and Democrats on a bipartisan basis came together in support of these investments in America's families. I do not recall the gentleman coming to the floor arguing for a 1 percent cutback when it was time to give rich oil company executives a \$14 billion tax cut.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment but I thank the gentleman for offering it, because it reminds us of what this debate is really about. We are debating about whether we will invest in America's future. We are debating what kind of a Nation we expect to be.

My chairman, fellow committee members of both parties, and the vast majority of people around the country believe in America's future. We believe that America's best days are ahead of us. We believe that the American people can compete and succeed in the global economy, and that the most talented, industrious, and ingenious people on Earth are the American people. And we believe that, to ensure our bright future, we must invest in the American people today.

The America we see ahead of us is one where every child has the opportunity to go to college regardless of whether their parents did and regardless of whether they are rich or poor. They receive the best job training, develop the strongest skills, are empowered to create by laws that reward innovation, and have a government that is working for them, not against them, in foreign markets.

In the America we see, every child and their parents has access to decent health care, and no one working full time, playing by the rules and contributing to the prosperity of the country, has to become impoverished because of the catastrophic illness in the family. No parent should have to mourn the loss of a child it could not provide health care for, and no child should grow up in a home without one of its parents for lack of the same access to care.

For our parents' generation, this vision of America's future resembles their own fondest hopes. Our parents and their parents struggled so that we could enjoy a higher quality of living, better schools, better hospitals, and a safer world than what they knew. And, by and large, this greatest generation was successful. America is a better, more prosperous Nation because of their struggle.

But the generations that went before us did more than struggle; they also invested. They built schools, they built hospitals, they built our Armed Forces, and they invested in America's future. If America is to enjoy the same bright future we have in mind, that investment must go on.

Fortunately, this vision of an America where our best days are still ahead of us is a bipartisan vision. It crosses every economic, political, and generational line. We all want and believe that we can bring about a more secure and more prosperous future for our children and grandchildren. And we believe we can do so, must do so, in a fiscally responsible way by paying as we go.

Sure, there are some who do not share these values or who believe that we can achieve this bright tomorrow without any investment, without any contribution or sacrifice on our part. They are the "get something for nothing" crowd, the "I got mine, you get yours" crowd. They do not believe America needs our investment. And the future? Well, the future can take care of itself.

Some of these naysayers you will hear from today, some you have heard from already. Masquerading under a banner of fiscal prudence they will say, "We cannot afford the investment." It is a masquerade. These are the same people, of course, who drove our national debt to the highest in history through a half decade of borrowing. And theirs was the worst form of borrowing; borrowing that led to no investment and, therefore, to no improvement in the Nation's foundation.

Our parents' generation had them, too, these masqueraders, the "something for nothing" crowd. But just kind of imagine what kind of an America we would live in today if our predecessors had followed their irresponsible siren song. We would still be traveling along dirt roads instead of highways, with crops rotting in the fields, long-term economic stagnation, a bleak presence, and an even bleaker future. We would, in sum, have become that Nation that Franklin Roosevelt so presciently warned against, a Nation with a substantial portion of its people ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and insecure.

It is indeed fortuitous that these voices are few now and were few then, that the overwhelming bipartisan majority of committee members and Americans recognize that we have a responsibility to our Nation's future, and that responsibility requires sound investment.

In 10 years, 2.7 million more kids will be in K-12 schools, and America will be ready for them because we insist on it. In 10 years, 2.2 million more students will be in college, and our universities will be ready for them with a state-of-the-art education because we insist on it. In 10 years, the global economy will be even more extensive and American workers will be competing and winning because we will have invested in them. And, yes, it is because we are insisting on it now.

We believe in America's future. We believe our best days are ahead of us. And we share the belief that our parents had before us that we are responsible for that bright future, and that future requires investment.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is available on both sides?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 11 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I was heartened to hear my good friend talk about the promise for the future, because that is exactly what we are talking about. We are talking about the future. It was a bit of an Orwellian speech there, because the actions of this bill don't match the wonderful sunshine that the gentleman paints, but that is all right, because that continues to be the mantra that we hear.

Americans know that when you hear the word "investment" in this Chamber that what that means is taxes, and it points out the fundamental difference between the majority party and the minority party. The majority party believes that government spends hardworking American taxpayer money better than hardworking American taxpayers. That is the fundamental difference, and that is what this discussion is about. So I am pleased that the gentleman who just spoke shed light on that, because he indeed did.

I yield 4 minutes to my good friend, the gentlelady from Oklahoma, and look forward to her comments on a fiscally responsible approach to this appropriations bill.

□ 1400

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Chairman, let me just say I appreciate the good work of the committee. And I know it takes a lot of effort to bring people together for setting the spending priorities and the policies of our Nation, and I know there have been a lot of hearings and testimony on this particular piece of legislation. And I want to commend the committee for their hard work, both Democrats and Republicans.

But I do rise to support this amendment. I think it's a reasonable amendment, to look at how we can, in this Congress, be more fiscally conservative, how we can control our spending.

I've had so many people come up to me since I've been elected as a newly

elected freshman saying, we have to do a better job in Congress of controlling our spending.

This particular amendment cuts the budget by 1 percent. The budget that has been recommended is \$10 billion over last year's. \$10 billion is more than we spend in the State of Oklahoma's whole State budget. \$10 billion is more than that. So I think it's reasonable to say that we would like to cut this amount by 1 percent. I don't know how people can argue with that.

Now, I've heard a lot of discussion here today about how this piece of legislation invests in education, health care, social systems, it's for the future of our children; and I don't think you'll find anyone up here who will argue against those things.

I've also heard some people stand up and say today that the Republicans like to spend money when it's their turn, but when we're spending money, then we're against it.

Well, when you look at the spending amounts that have occurred over the last many years in this Congress I, frankly, don't approve of that. I think we have been spending too much money in this Congress, and I'm not going to lay blame on either side, other than just to say that a 1 percent cut in this budget, to me, seems reasonable. There is an increase in spending for the important things, social programs, education, health care.

I've also heard some of the people who have spoken today talk about the future and about stupid political blunders, spending on policy like the Iraq war. Well, I guess we can have that debate, which we have had, for many, many months. But what I can say is that the money that has been spent by this Congress, and some people have asked, you know, has the money gone to wise things? I personally think that protecting our Nation, protecting our national security and spending that money is a well worth cause.

We're talking about the priorities that we're going to be having here in Congress. Some people have said well, look at the various appropriations bills that we've already had that we've been voting on. Some were \$10 billion more, some were \$7 billion more, \$12 billion more. You didn't object to all the different spending levels that there were. When you add all those things up, that adds up to a lot of money.

And I guess all that is to say that no one in my State has called me and said, please tell Congress to spend a little bit more money. Please tell them that I'm not paying enough, and I have some more.

But what I do hear my people back home say is, set the priorities. Determine what's reasonable. Be fiscally responsible in how we're spending our money.

People are concerned about the rising cost of gas, the rising cost of health care. They're concerned about education, they're concerned about taking care of those who can't take care of themselves.

I think it is reasonable for us to look at a 1 percent cut in this budget, but yet still meet the priorities of this Nation in taking care of the people that need to be taken care of in this appropriations bill.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I would just say to the gentlewoman that in fact she may not be getting calls from people saying that it's harder for their kids to afford college, or that gas prices are getting higher, or that they're worried about their health care. But many Republicans and Democrats are getting those calls, which is why there wasn't a single Republican in the Appropriations Committee who voted against this bill.

The gentlewoman also said that we've got to be fiscally responsible. Well, that's why so many Republicans joined us in supporting this bill, because in fact this bill cuts 41 programs that didn't make sense any more, and reduces by half the number the dollar value of earmarks that we had in the past.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a member of the committee.

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Chairman, this has been a very interesting debate, and one of the aspects of it with which I find myself in agreement is the assertion by my friend on the other side of the aisle that there is a display of differences of opinion and attitudes with regard to the way in which we handle our fiscal responsibilities here, and there is no question about that.

If you look at the last 6 years, while the Republican Party has controlled every aspect of this government, they managed to succeed to almost double the national debt. They now have us in a situation where we owe almost \$9 trillion, \$8.9 trillion.

They continue to spend, as a result of their initiatives, now, about \$11 billion a month on Iraq, the illegal invasion of Iraq which they perpetrated and are interested in carrying out.

What we're trying to do here in this particular bill, and in the context of our budget responsibilities, is to focus attention on the needs of the American people, what we as a Congress ought to be doing in the context of our responsibilities, serving the American people, doing what's right for them, improving the possibility, the prospects of education, making it easier for our children to get the best possible education that they can get, making it easier for people to get the health care that they need, making it easier for people to deal with housing situations and circumstances so that people have proper housing.

In other words, our objectives and our priorities are to improve the quality of life of the American people, while your obvious priorities and objectives are to decrease the quality of life of the American people, which is consistent with your objective in the context of this particular amendment.

You want to reduce the amount of money that is available for education,

reduce the amount of money that's available for health care, reduce the amount of money that's available for housing and other things that are essential to the American public, while you keep wasting more and more money in Iraq.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair, and again I appreciate the gentleman's passion. We believe that in order to improve Americans' lives you have got to let them keep more of their hard-earned money and that's what this amendment does, allows Americans to keep more of their hard-earned money.

Madam Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 4 minutes to my good friend from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. If the American people, Madam Chairman, are watching this debate, they've certainly seen a lot of name calling and a lot of shouting, and now we're having our motives questioned. I personally try to not go down that road. I assume my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I'm sure their purposes are noble. But I must admit in the 4½ years I've been here, I've certainly been called a lot of names. I think this afternoon's the first time I've been called part of the fringe. I thought fringe had more to do with curtains. But here we are as part of the fringe, I guess, because we believe that the government shouldn't grow faster than the people's ability to pay for it. And somehow that's being called a fringe opinion.

We believe that it's the people's money, and not the government's money. Yet we are being told by our Democrat colleagues that's a fringe opinion.

We happen to believe that the best housing program and the best education program is a paycheck, not a government check; but somehow our Democrat colleagues have chosen to tell us that that's a fringe opinion.

And then we hear lectures from our Democrat colleagues saying well, when you guys were in the majority you spent too much money. So Madam Chairman, their response is well, we're going to spend even more. That logic defies me.

Now, they focus a lot on their noble purposes, Madam Chairman, and they focus a lot on the benefits of all this spending that they care to do. And again, I would like to point out, this particular amendment says that this bill will grow by 3.8 percent instead of 4.8 percent. I suppose that's another fringe opinion as well.

But you know what, Madam Chairman? My friends on the other side of the aisle don't focus upon where this money is coming from, and so they talk about their investments on behalf of the American people. Well, Madam

Chairman, maybe the American people want to make their own investments.

You know, I listen to the Ward family in my district from Garland, Texas, and they write, "Dear Congressman, a tax increase in the spending is going to fuel the taxes, the largest tax increase in American history courtesy of the Democrat Party." So all this spending in this bill is fostering a tax increase on the American people. So the Ward family in Garland says, "A tax increase this year would wipe out my ability to continue my daughter's education."

Well, I've got a message for the Ward family in Garland. Don't worry. Don't worry about it. The Democrats have an investment that they're going to make on your behalf. So don't worry about the \$3,000 a year they're going to take from you.

I also heard from the Kincaid family in Garland. "In my particular case, an additional \$2,200 in taxes would cut into the finances I use to pay for my son's education."

The gentleman from Garland, Texas in my district goes on to say, "I really believe that, given more money, Congress will spend more money. That's not the answer."

Well, I guess we ought to tell the Kincaid family in Garland, Texas, don't worry about your son's college education. The Democrats are going to make an investment for you.

I heard from the Brock family in Dallas, Texas, also in my district. "Dear Congressman, with this tax increase I could not pay for a semester of college for my daughter if I had to send \$2,200 more to the government."

Well, again, we have good news for them. Don't worry about all the money that they're taking. The Democrats have an investment for you.

So, again, Madam Chairman, what our friends on the other side of the aisle don't seem to realize is that all this great government spending and all these wonderful investments they have are coming out of the pockets of the American people. In many respects, we are not having a debate over how much this Nation ought to spend on health. We're debating who's doing the spending. It ought to be the family.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, it's time for a fact check for the American people. The gentleman said, well, we may have spent a lot of money; but now you're spending more.

Fact: This bill saves \$1.1 billion over last year.

Fact: This bill slashes earmark dollar value 50 percent from last time.

Fact: This bill eliminates 41 programs that don't make sense any more. Facts count.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, we believe we do have a fringe four or five here in the Congress. And it's not, when the gentleman refers to me or the gentleman from New York or the chairman, you're talking about a

bill that passed out of the committee with unanimous support from Democrats and Republicans. You will see on the floor it will pass with Democrat and Republican votes. This is a bipartisan bill.

But we have a fringe group in the House that consistently wants to try to find out and try to figure out how to make things work. And what this bill does is it invests in our future. And the bottom line is this. We're now competing with 1.3 billion people in China, 1.2 billion people in India, competitive global economy.

And over the last few years, we've seen for the average American people, and the gentleman from Georgia said, well, we want people to keep more of their own money. So do we. But they haven't been over the past few years.

There's been a \$3,200 increase in their energy costs, a \$1,200 increase in their health insurance, a 40 percent increase in college tuition. Wages for college grads in the last 4 or 5 years is down 5.2 percent.

Gas prices, the fastest growing part of the budget has been the interest payments on the debt. But our bill addresses middle class family wages, down \$1,669 over the past 2 years. So the American people have not been able to keep more of their own money. And so our agenda, through this bill and other bills that we have passed addressed that issue.

How do you reduce the cost of energy? You make investments in research and development, and that will yield us benefits down the line.

How do you help families send their kids to schools? You invest money into the Pell Grant. You cut student loan interest rates in half. And the difference really has been with the student loan interest rates, we're not spending any more money. What we're saying is that money is not going to go to the banks. That money is going to go to the kids and the students, and we're going to cut the student loan interest rates in half and increase the Pell Grant.

We have money in here for our community health centers, so kids can get preventative care, so they end up they can get treated for a cold, instead of ending up in the emergency room for a much higher price to the taxpayer. So we're making significant investments. And this bill will help secure a strong future for the United States of America.

We need to get more kids in college. We need to invest in foreign languages. That's what this bill does. And I'm proud of this bill, on a bipartisan basis.

And I think it's important for the people, Madam Chairman, who are listening as this goes into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. What do they want? They want an investment in their future, and that's what this bill does. It makes that investment to secure our future and make us strong and move us in a new direction.

□ 1415

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, a lot is being said, a lot of numbers are being thrown around, a lot of claims are being made, even claims that facts are facts. And I just wanted to clarify a point that my good friend from New York made, and that is that this bill saves \$1.5 billion over last year. I don't understand that statement because last year we spent \$144.7 billion in budget authority, enacted, and this year it is \$151 billion, so almost \$8 billion more than last year.

So the facts, I think, need to be checked. Let's try to be accurate. Everybody wants to thump their chest and say what a great party they have. But the facts are we are spending \$8 billion this year more than last if this bill passes.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments that I believe point clearly to what the facts are.

I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 2½ minutes.

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, I rise on behalf of the fringe in America. Madam Chairman, that would be the fringe that believes that governments ought to live within their means, ought to pay their bills, ought to balance budgets.

The gentleman from Ohio, whom I respect and admire his style as a legislator and a leader, has coined the phrase "fringe," and I want to embrace it. I want to come to this floor and say every American who believes that we ought to balance the Federal budget, who believes that we ought to come together across the political divide and reform entitlements, who believes we ought to wrestle to the ground an \$8 trillion national debt, that fringe is the fringe that I represent in America and those with which I proudly stand.

And let me say I know that number 8 trillion very well. On my way to the floor today, I passed the office of clearly a dozen of the gentleman from Ohio's colleagues' offices, Democrats all, who anyone looking on wouldn't necessarily know, who all have signs in front of their office lamenting an \$8 trillion national debt. And as the other gentleman said, I lament the role of the Republican majority in creating that, and I fought members of my own majority in years that we saw the debt go from \$5 trillion to \$8 trillion.

But I say on behalf of the fringe, the fringe of Americans who say govern-

ments ought to live within their means, they ought to balance budgets, they ought to make the tough choices in a bipartisan way to live within the fiscal values that the American people represent, I say let's deal with it. And this cut today brought by the gentleman from Georgia is a modest step to be sure. It is a 1 percent cut. It says instead of doing with a 4.8 percent increase over last year, the Federal Government will have to get by on a 3.8 percent increase over last year. And it doesn't seem to me to be too much to ask, with an \$8 trillion national debt, for us to come together and begin to trim and begin to make the hard choices. But it won't solve the real problem, and my cherished colleagues on the other side of the aisle know this. We have to get past the names; we have to get past the categories, and we have to represent the fringe of America that wants to see us balance this budget.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Well, Madam Chairman, it is refreshing to hear some candor on the other side in their admission that there is a fringe. And that is, in fact, a matter of fact because there wasn't a single Republican vote against this appropriations bill in committee.

Now, those who define themselves on the fringe would suggest that the answer to America's problems is a 1 percent solution. We can rein in our deficit that they built up with a 1 percent cutback.

I don't know where they were, and I have a very high regard for their position, but I do feel an obligation to ask where were they in offering amendments to cut \$13 billion in giveaways to the richest oil company executives making the largest profits in the history of humankind? Where was the 1 percent cut amendment then? Suddenly we could afford that, but we can't afford additional Pell Grants for the steelworker that the gentleman refers to.

Where were they with an amendment for a 1 percent cut in excessive payments to Halliburton, \$1.47 billion in payments to Halliburton that have been found by the Federal Government to be fraudulent? Where was the amendment to cut those payments by 1 percent? We could afford excessive and fraudulent payments to Halliburton, but we can't afford additional investments in cancer research and access to health care for the American people.

I would respect my colleagues if they showed more consistency. But there has not been that consistency. It is not about spending. It is about spending on the wrong things and the wrong priorities.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISRAEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. I think I may have the gentleman's answer to where was the fringe when the giveaways to the oil

companies and the Halliburtons were taking place; why wasn't there an effort to cut those giveaways by 1 percent.

Those who wanted to cut those profits and those giveaways were not part of the fringe. The fringe we are talking about here today is the fringe that says we want those obscene oil company profits. We want those obscene profits for Halliburton. But we want to cut over \$1 billion out of education, out of health care. That is the fringe we are talking about.

The overwhelming bipartisan majority of us want to balance the budget. We are working hard to do that. But we don't want to balance the budget on the backs of our kids and on the backs of those who need health care and on the backs of our workers who need training. And that, I think, is the fringe that we are talking about here today.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman.

I will conclude, Madam Chairman, by suggesting that the mainstream view, the view that has been endorsed on a bipartisan basis by mainstream Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee and the American people is that we should make investments in education. The fringe view: more oil money for oil companies.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I would like to again simply walk us through what this cut means in specific terms. This amendment would cut \$257 million from the President's No Child Left Behind education flagship program. It would cut \$144 million from title I, denying more than 40,000 students those title I services. It would cut \$113 million from Special Education. It would wipe out every single amendment but one that was passed on this floor in the last 2 days to enhance Special Education, most of those amendments coming from the Republican side of the aisle.

It would cut \$156 million from Pell Grants. It would cut \$300 million from the National Institutes of Health for medical research in cancer, heart disease, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's and the like. It would cut \$22 million from community health centers. Over 100,000 of the uninsured would not have access to those services. It would cut \$70 million from Head Start, \$21 million from the Child Care Development Block Grant. It would cut \$27 million from LIHEAP.

I want to remind you, in LIHEAP, the bill itself only restores half of the cut that was made last year by the President and the Congress.

It would cut \$97 million from the Social Security Administration. Members are climbing all over me saying, "What are we going to do to keep my local Social Security offices open? What are we going to do to eliminate the multi-

month backlog in people applying for Social Security disability?" I will tell you what they are going to do. This will add to it. It will add to the problem.

So with all due respect to the sanctimony that we hear from those who belatedly cry about the Federal deficit, I didn't hear them crying about the Federal deficit when they voted to spend \$600 billion on an ill-advised war in Iraq. I don't hear them crying about the fact that \$57 billion in tax cuts for millionaires adds \$57 billion to the Federal deficit.

So I just think we need to recognize that I believe the vast majority of Americans and I believe substantial portions of both parties in this House believe that this bill is responsible in real dollar terms. All of the domestic appropriation bills that we will produce and have produced this year amount to a 1 percent increase in real terms.

One of the gentlemen over there claimed that these were not cuts. Well, let me tell you something. If you appropriate the same amount of money this year that you appropriated last year but inflation eats away at that and so does population growth, if you don't adjust for inflation and population growth, then to each recipient of the services under this legislation there is indeed a cut to them. And that is what counts. It is the impact on their pocketbook. It is the impact on their ability to get help to send their kids to school.

It is an impact on the couple in my District who called 31 dentists to try to get some help with their kid who had to have the braces taken off his teeth. They couldn't get any of them to take them because the dentists wouldn't take Medicaid patients. They didn't have a local clinic. So the mother held the kid down while the father took the braces off with a pair of pliers.

That wouldn't happen to any child of a Member of Congress. The gentleman is smiling about that. I don't think that is anything to smile about. I met that woman.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. The conversation that I was having with my assistant to the right resulted in my glee, not to your comment.

Mr. OBEY. I understand.

But let me simply say, Madam Chairman, these cuts, these will be cuts in terms of the services that we are trying to provide to these people. It is immoral. It is unconscionable that we allow 44 million Americans to go without health insurance.

This bill will deliver health care coverage to 2 million more Americans than got it last year. It will make up in a tiny way for the indifference, the massive indifference, which has characterized this country the past few years on the issue of health coverage.

I would urge a "no" vote on the amendment and support for the underlying bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam 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 Georgia will be postponed.

□ 1430

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 23 offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

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

SEC. _____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.5 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, the amendment that I'm offering today to this appropriations bill would make a cut of just one-half of 1 percent of the overall funding of the bill.

You know, my friends on the other side of the aisle, Madam Chairman, are talking about how we are "fringe" Members of the House of Representatives. You know, when I go into my district and I talk to people, one thing that they really want Congress to do is rein in spending. We hear lots of individuals say, you know, we have to live within our family budget, how come Congress doesn't have to do that? I was proud to be in the State legislature in Colorado where we had an amendment to our Constitution forcing us to live within our means, so to speak, in the State of Colorado. We could not spend money that we didn't have.

Well, here in the Federal Government, it seems that even though as I walk down the hallways of the office buildings, the Longworth House Office Building, I see many signs on easels out in the hall talking about our \$8.8 trillion debt. We are being constantly reminded of that. And you know what? I think that is very appropriate. I think every American ought to see that placard and see what we have, \$8.8 trillion debt.

And as I think about that, I'm just offering the Members of Congress yet another opportunity to do the right thing, the right thing being exercising fiscal discipline, just a modicum of fiscal discipline, 1.5 percent. So the increase in this bill would go from 4.8 increase to 4.3. Now, some people would

miscategorize that as a cut. It is not a cut. It is still an increase in spending of 4.3 percent.

So I would ask my colleagues to identify with the American people who admire people who can live within their means, who don't spend money that they really don't have, but show the discipline to do the right thing.

And I'm asking for this cut today. How many people can visualize a \$100 bill? You give someone a \$100 bill and say I want you to spend this wisely, but let's just save 50 cents of that \$100 bill. How many people would say that that was unreasonable?

Madam Chairman, I'm saying today that this Congress needs to start on the right path. I'm asking for a .5 percent amendment to this appropriation bill.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Well, another fringe offering. Now we're down to .5 percent. The solution to America's problems is now down to .5 percent. The solution to America's problems is now down to .5 percent, less Pell Grant money so the kids can go to college, higher fuel bills in the winter for people who can't pay their fuel bills. I never saw a .5 percent reduction in funds to Halliburton. I never saw a .5 percent reduction in the \$13 billion in giveaways to Big Oil company executives, who are making the world's greatest profits. But now suddenly, when it comes to reducing people's heating bills or reducing their college costs, we want them to have another .5 percent burden because the burden they have just isn't enough.

This is déjà vu all over again. It was a bad idea on the amendment before this. It was a bad idea on the amendment before that. It's still a bad idea, it's just down to a .5 percent bad idea.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

And since my friends on the other side of the aisle have embraced their fringeness, I would like to just point out to you from the Roll Call today, around the Hill there is a festival, 11-day play, this weekend. I know many of you go home, so many of your staff may want to attend this, it's the Capitol Fringe Festival. So you may be able to attend and completely embrace the fringeness.

But again, as the gentleman has said, Madam Chair, when we first got in the majority in January, we tried to pass out of this House, in our Six in '06, provisions that we passed, campaigned on and then passed. One of the provisions was to strip \$14 billion from the oil companies. And our friends, who are now wanting to take this money from Pell Grants and investments in education, investments in health care,

voted against stripping the oil companies of \$14 billion. And this is what we're talking about.

This bipartisan committee passed out of the committee unanimously, on support of the Republicans on that committee, with the support of the Democrats on this committee, well thought-out pieces of legislation, well thought-out amendments in the committee, supported unanimously by both sides. And what we're saying is, we have to make these investments.

And there is no tax increase in this year's budget, none, zero, that's it. You can't point it out. In 2007, keep your forms, 2006, or last year's forms, and compare them to next year's, and there will be not one dime of an increase. All we did was we took that money that our friends were giving to the banks and we invested that money in the kids. The \$14 billion that was going to the oil companies at their times of highest profits is going into health care and education now and alternative energy.

As I said earlier, this is very simple. We're in a globally competitive market, and we need to make investments into our kids and into our future. That's what this bill does.

Now what you're saying is, with tuition costs going up 40 percent, health insurance going up \$100 a year, and energy costs going up \$3,200 a year, that the solution to that problem and every other problem we have in the country right now is a .5 percent cut that would put additional burdens on families who are trying to send their kids to school, would reduce the money that we're making into making our citizens healthier and community health clinics so that at the end of the day would allow us to prevent people from ending up in the emergency room and costing us billions and billions of dollars more.

These are good investments, voted on in a bipartisan way, and will secure the strength of our country in the future.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, I won't be at the Fringe Festival this weekend, I will be going home to Colorado. I will be talking to the folks that are working hard every day, raising their children, trying to make ends meet, and worrying about higher taxes. And I think they should be worrying about higher taxes because when we have increases like this, we're going to see those placards in the hallway with a national debt ever increasing.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank the gentlelady from Colorado for yielding, and for her excellent, truly excellent amendment.

I have been following the debate for some time now. Like many of our colleagues, sometimes we have to follow it in our office as we are conducting other business. And I hate that we have stooped to sort of name calling, which unfortunately I have seen.

I guess the gentleman from Ohio says that we're embracing the "fringe"

label, and so therefore I suppose I'm down here to make the fringe larger. And I guess there is a little humor in that, and I will just take it in that sense because I'm sure my friend from Ohio didn't mean any harm by it.

But as my good friend, Mr. PENCE, said in his comments, that if the fringe are those hardworking Americans who think they make better decisions on how to spend the money that they earn than we do here in Congress, then I'm in the right place.

We heard that this amendment, this very modest amendment to look for .5 percent savings would place an increased burden, a .5 percent increased burden on the American people. There is no question that the largest tax increase in American history will place a huge burden on the working families of America.

And with all respect to my good friend and colleague from Ohio, the Democrats' budget, in order to balance as the rules require by the end of the budget period, does impose the largest tax increase in American history. And already we're starting to see the majority party have to start to pay the price for some of the budget gimmicks that have been involved in making that work.

Now, the Democrats, while increasing spending, it seems like almost across the board, certainly in the Department of Labor, couldn't manage to keep the spending for the Office of Labor Management Standards at last year's level. There they could find the cut. When it came to the office whose responsibility is to find the crooks who are stealing from union members, they found a way to impose a 4 percent cut in that office. And what a shame that is.

I offered an amendment, it received some bipartisan support, but nevertheless, on a largely partisan basis, that amendment was defeated. That amendment would have just restored the funding to last year's level for the only office in government who has the responsibility and the capability to hunt down and catch the crooks that steal from our American workers, but the majority party could find a way to cut there.

So, I think that the choice here is clear. It's been stated by many of my colleagues. Many of us, fringe or not fringe, believe that the American people can make better decisions on how to spend their money, and we should let them do it.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chair, I would just pose a question to the gentlewoman from Colorado and would yield to her for a response.

I am just curious as to how public education is funded in the State of Colorado.

I will yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. The public education system in Colorado is funded by tax dollars, primarily coming from property taxes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Thank you. Reclaiming my time, the gentlewoman's proposal

would impose an across-the-board cut in No Child Left Behind. No Child Left Behind is a Federal program that local school districts must honor. It is a huge unfunded Federal mandate. And I don't know about the gentlewoman's school districts, but I know that my school districts come to me all the time saying, Washington is forcing us to do these programs, but they're not giving us the money that they promised, which means that we have to raise taxes.

And so I would respectfully suggest to the gentlewoman that a .5 percent cut in this bill is a .5 percent property increase in her congressional district, because those poor school districts don't have the ability to say yes or no to those programs. They've just got to provide the services and find the money for it.

We don't think that local property taxpayers should have to bear that burden. We believe, along with every single Republican in the Appropriations Committee, that the Federal Government should assist in those programs.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wanted to take a moment to address the nature of the proposed amendment, and the amendment before it, and perhaps the amendment after it, the whole nature of the across-the-board amendments. Because I think the beauty of across-the-board amendments, in the eyes of the authors of those amendments, is that they're anonymous in their cuts; they're anonymous in the pain they distribute. They can go home to their district and say, oh, I'm not in favor of cutting education, I'm in favor of across-the-board cuts. Or I'm not in favor of cutting home heating oil for people, no, that would lack compassion, but I am for across-the-board cuts. What's a 1 percent cut? What's a half of 1 percent cut? Well, what it is is hundreds of millions of dollars taken out of education or out of home heating oil or out of health care or out of cancer research or out of special education.

So let's not take ourselves off the hook here. And I would be willing to yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Do you support cuts in home heating oil assistance? Are you ready to stand up here and say to your constituents, yes, I am for cutting home heating assistance? Do you support cuts in special education? Are you willing to say here today to your constituents that I support cuts in special education? I support cuts in abstinence programs. I support cuts in cancer research. Would you tell us if you support cuts in home heating assistance?

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Well, there is a thing called "Orwellian speak." And when we have a bill that has a 4.8 percent increase and we go to 4.3, that is not a cut.

Mr. SCHIFF. Reclaiming my time, I will be happy to yield if you will an-

swer the question. The question is, do you support cutting home heating oil assistance? It's a yes or no question, it's not complicated. Do you support cutting heating home assistance for poor people? Yes, I support it?

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Well, if the gentleman would yield, that funding is increased in this legislation, and you know it.

What is at issue here is how do you define "cut"? 4.8 to 4.3 increase.

Mr. SCHIFF. Reclaiming my time. I'm not surprised that I can't get a yes or no answer. I'm not surprised that the gentlewoman is not willing to stand up and say, yes, I support cutting this because I have other priorities. Home heating oil, that's not one of them. Large oil industry profits, that's one of my priorities. Halliburton, that's one of my priorities. But cutting heating oil, that's not a priority, or cutting special ed.

Let me ask you another question; do you think that cuts in college education funding, higher education funding, can be done without cutting the number of kids who have access to college? Do you think we can cut funding from this bill for higher education funding without reducing the number of kids that can go to college?

And you say, it's just half a percent we're cutting from higher ed, or the increase in higher ed, or however you want to phrase it. But the cut is real that you're proposing. So what does that mean? 25,000 more kids can't go to college?

□ 1445

Is that a fair number? Well, maybe that is too much. Should we say 10,000 more American kids can't go to college because of your cut? Is that a fair number? Would you support that? Would you support your amendment if you knew that?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and to follow customary courtesy in the process of yielding and reclaiming time.

The gentleman may continue.

Mr. SCHIFF. Through the Chair, in my remaining time, I would ask the gentlewoman from Colorado whether she is willing to support her cuts if she knows that it will mean fewer children in Colorado can go to college.

I would be happy to yield for an answer to this question. Through the Chair, to my colleague from Colorado, if her cuts mean that fewer of her constituents in Colorado can go to college, is she still willing to propose those cuts?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, I think what I should do is purchase a dictionary and have my friend on the other side of the aisle look up what a cut is.

When you go from 4.8 percent increase in spending and you take away

.5, you end up with a 4.3 percent increase in spending. That is what this legislation does. Even with this modest amendment that I offer, it would still be a 4.3 percent increase.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Madam Chairman, I have been enjoying hearing the debate here today. As usual, sometimes Republicans and Democrats appear to be passing each other a little bit in the night. It seems to me from hearing comments now from a number of Democratic speakers that there is an implicit assumption based on all of their arguments, and that is, hey, this is important, education is important, and this is important, and heating oil is important, and all this stuff; therefore, the government has to do it all for everybody.

Now, I think the other assumption, and this is the assumption that I make, is that Americans are buying an awful lot more government than we can afford. That is what my constituents are telling me. That is common sense. Going back to my district, things are getting more and more expensive. We keep increasing everything that government does.

The idea is, well, you are not compassionate because you don't want to add more money to government subsidies to do this and government subsidies to do that. Hey, the logical conclusion on that is the government would get 100 percent of your paycheck. I don't think that is why we are competitive.

I have also heard people say that we are in a global economy, as though being in a global economy somehow excuses that the Federal Government should do everything for everybody. I am not buying that assumption. The reason we are competitive in a global economy is because of free enterprise. There is one thing about a safety net. But we are buying too much government.

To add insult to injury, now the Democrats have just passed the biggest tax increase in the history of the United States. They are griping about one-half of 1 percent of a cut in one little bill in discretionary income, and they are adding the average of \$3,000 per household across this entire Nation. Now, it would be interesting enough if they just add \$3,000. The trouble with doing that this year is, guess what, you will get the \$3,000 next year and the next year after that and the next year after that. But the spending is even more.

So we are hearing an objection, and it is all couched in this, oh, don't you care about poor people with fuel oil heating bills and about education and stuff. The trouble is, we are spending too much. What part of that don't we get? So somebody offers this timid little amendment for one-half of 1 percent, and it is like the wheels are going to fall off.

I have to say in answer to the questions, look, we are just buying too

much government. We have to start somewhere. I appreciate the gentlewoman's amendment. She is at least starting on one piece of one bill here. While I call it a little bit of a timid amendment, I am certainly prepared to vote for it.

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

Madam Chairman, I would yield to the gentlewoman if she cares to answer this: The committee report states that the committee recommends \$15,027,000 for prevention grants to reduce the abuse of runaway youth. Does the gentlewoman advocate a .5 percent reduction in a \$15 million budget to prevent the abuse of runaway youth, which was supported unanimously in the committee?

Madam Chairman, I will yield to the gentlewoman.

If the gentlewoman can't answer, I will ask her to give us an answer to this: the committee report, unanimously approved in committee, recommends \$42,430,000 for community-based child abuse prevention.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I ask the gentlewoman whether she is advocating a .5 percent reduction in a \$42 million line item for community-based child abuse prevention. I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman for an answer.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISRAEL. I will yield to the gentlewoman for an answer, since it is her amendment. I will not, at this time, yield to the gentleman.

I would like to yield to the gentlewoman, since it is her amendment.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. If I may answer your question, first, I would like to point out that, I just realized this, up here to my right in the front of the room, in the front of the Chamber, there is a dictionary. Perhaps the gentleman would like to look up the word "cut." Perhaps the gentleman would like to look up the word "rationalization." Because the gentleman knows that there is still an increase of 4.3 percent in this bill, even with this modest amendment.

You know what? You can rationalize anything. You can be altruistic with someone else's money. We need to curb spending.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I reclaim my time.

Madam Chairman, I am using the terms the gentlewoman insists on. I am reading directly from the committee report. The committee report states that there is \$26,848,000 for adoption opportunities. Because we all want to reduce the number of abortions in the United States, so there is \$26,848,000 for adoption opportunities. The gentlewoman's amendment would, as I understand it, reduce by .5 percent the amounts that are in this bill.

So, Madam Chairman, I ask the gentlewoman again, and I will yield to her, is she advocating a .5 percent reduction in the committee recommendation of \$26,848,000 for adoption opportunities?

I will yield to the gentlewoman, since it is her amendment.

If she cares not to take the time, I will ask the gentleman. I will yield to the gentleman if he can answer this, Madam Chairman. I would yield to the gentleman, if he would choose to answer this question.

The committee report recommends \$9.5 million, out of a \$2.5 trillion Federal budget, \$9.5 million for the adoption incentives programs. I would ask, Madam Chairman, whether the gentleman supports a .5 percent reduction in adoption incentives.

I would also ask, Madam Chairman, this: the committee recommends a total level of funding of \$141 million for the Community Based Abstinence Education program. That is the level of funding that the committee, on a unanimous basis, Republicans in the mainstream and Democrats in the mainstream, agree on.

I will yield to the gentleman, Madam Chairman, if he can say is it the position of the fringe that we should actually cut by .5 percent \$141 million for Community Based Abstinence programs.

I will yield to the gentleman, Madam Chairman.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman that under his logic that \$141 million proposed in here is actually a cut, because it is a cut from \$150 million. It is a \$9 million cut from \$150 million. Why aren't we spending \$150 million?

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I reclaim my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. You see, you only can measure from what—

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I reclaim my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded to follow customary courtesy in the process of yielding and reclaiming time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, may I ask how much time I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1½ minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I would just state at some point, two plus two has to equal four. It can't equal what you want it to be; it has to equal four.

These are the amounts of funding that are in this bill, reported by Republicans and Democrats. Every single mainstream Republican, every conservative Republican on the Appropriations Committee, supported these numbers. The gentlewoman says, no, no, we have to shave .5 percent from these numbers.

I am still waiting to hear whether a single Member on that side would pub-

licly say that they want to cut adoption programs, abstinence programs, runaway youth programs, child abuse programs.

I will yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I hate to interrupt this beautiful debate going on, but I think it is important for us to make a point. We offered our friends in the fringe an opportunity within the first 100 hours we were here to strip \$14 billion from the oil companies, corporate welfare that they were getting from the United States taxpayers, and you all voted against it, or at least most of you did. You had a chance for \$14 billion from the oil companies. But you choose to come here now and take it out of the hide of the students and the middle-class families who are trying to make ends meet.

That is the difference. This is a change in priorities. You had a chance for \$14 billion from the oil companies. You were silent. Now you choose to do it for programs that are going to make us stronger in the long run.

So I thank the gentleman, I thank the Chair, I thank the ranking member for putting together such a great bill here, and I think we should leave it as it is and not ask the people who have had increased energy costs, a 40 percent tuition increase, now to say wait a minute, we don't want to help you with that. We want to cut that by .5 percent, too.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, since we had a rudimentary arithmetic thing here, two plus two equals four, I just want to remind my friend, Madam Chairman, that a 4.8 percent increase minus .5 percent still equals a 4.3 percent increase in spending.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Florida (Mr. FEENEY).

Mr. FEENEY. I thank the gentlewoman.

I would suggest that the real math is that this amendment would still anticipate a \$6.5 billion increase, yet it is being called a cut.

I had to come down from my office, because I heard that if you were an advocate for taxpayers, you are now part of the fringe of this Congress. If you are an advocate for fiscal responsibility, suddenly you are part of the fringe. Sadly, I would have to acknowledge, if you care about fiscal responsibility and taxpayers in this Congress, you are becoming part of the fringe.

Increasing the budget expenditures by 4.3 percent is somehow going to lead to the end of civilization and the death of all of the children out there and throwing people out of hospital beds.

I would remind all of my colleagues, we have a 10th amendment in this country. Over the years, we now have a \$150 billion-plus annual budget to deal with things like labor, health care and education. It isn't a question of whether or not we are going to spend money in America on health care and education. It is a question of who does the spending and who gets to control it.

I would ask every American, as the Federal budget has skyrocketed and we have taken control and micromanaged their health care and education, has public education gotten cheaper? Has it gotten better? Has America's health care system, as we spend so much money on health care, gotten cheaper and gotten better?

Winston Churchill once famously said, there is nothing one government learns so readily from the last as how to spend other people's money, i.e., the taxpayers.

Sadly, this new majority did not learn the lesson that some of us learned in the last several Congresses: we are spending too much, we are abusing American taxpayers, and the notion is that if you care for children, if you care for people that need health care, you have to confiscate as much money out there from taxpayers and working people as possible and you have to micromanage the way it gets spent on so-called "their behalf."

The bureaucrats are happy. The regulators are happy. The politicians in Washington are fat and happy. But the American taxpayer and the people that need real education services and need choices in health care are not happy.

With that, on behalf of the fringe that cares about taxpayers in this Congress, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, as I hear the comments from my friends on the other side of the aisle, I would almost remember when my children were small and they actually believed in Santa Claus. They thought that whatever they wanted, they could have. We had to learn some lessons. They had a wish-list, and then we had to live within our means.

When I think of the good things, and, by the way, I am very happy to hear that my friend on the other side of the aisle supports abstinence education, when I hear about spending in these areas, there is a finite amount of money. When you are promoting government programs, you are reaching into the pocket of the taxpayer. That is the only place we get our money, from the American taxpayer. And as we think about the largest tax increase in history, I think we ought to realize this burden, and I just picture this enormous burden on our children and our grandchildren that we are leaving.

In the meantime, we can be proud of our spending, because we are spending for very noble things, and there are very many noble things in this bill.

□ 1500

But what we are doing is we are crushing our children and our grandchildren with this \$8.8 trillion debt, this \$8.8 trillion debt that is growing under this majority.

I was one of the ones in the back of the room, you're right, my friends on the other side of the aisle are right. We spent too much. The Republican Party are guilty of that.

But there were those of us who were budget hawks then that said our party not only should cut taxes but should restrain spending. We were saying that and we are saying it now as we see the majority party going down the road at an even more rapid pace, spending more money, increasing that enormous burden on our children and grandchildren.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I will make the same observation as I made last night. What we have going on here, in my judgment, is Operation Diversion. You have a bunch of people in this House who are perfectly comfortable with the fact that the tax policies that they have voted for will deliver \$57 billion in tax cuts this year to people who make over a million dollars a year. That is five times as much money as the increase that we have in this bill above the President's request.

And you have people who have voted for the war in Iraq, which has spent \$600 billion in a case of mistaken identity as they mistook the stocky guy with the mustache, Saddam Hussein, for the tall guy with the beard, Osama bin Laden, and that mistake has cost us \$600 billion when you take into account the President's newest request. That is 60 times as much as the addition we have above the President's budget for these programs.

They voted for all of that, and now they want to scramble away from the deficits and the debt that that has produced. And they try to divert the attention of the public and say, oh, the real cause of our fiscal mess is the fact that these crazy Democrats are trying to put more money into education and more money into health care and more money into job training.

Well, I plead fully guilty. We are trying to do that because yes, we do believe that these are investments. We think that kids are better off if you put more money into education than if you take it away. And we think society is better off economically and morally if we do more to help people who need health care than less.

Now this amendment would cut the following amounts from the bill: It would cut \$128 million from this bill for No Child Left Behind.

It would cut \$74 million from Title I. It would cut \$56 million from IDEA. Republicans and Democrats alike have spent the last 2 days trying to increase funds for IDEA; now they want to cut it back by \$56 million.

They want to cut from this bill \$78 million for Pell Grants, despite the fact that college costs have exploded.

They want to cut \$148 million from this bill for the National Institutes of Health.

They want to cut \$48 million from this bill for the Social Security Administration.

They want to cut \$69 million from this bill out of programs that we have here to try to discourage women from having abortions. Now if they want to vote for that, be my guest. We don't happen to think, and I think there are significant numbers of our friends on the minority side of the aisle who don't happen to think that is a good idea.

We do have to make choices, and the basic choices here are do we want to defend the 2 percent increase in these programs above the President's level, because that is what it is, it is a 2 percent difference. And if you don't believe my definition, then take a look at CQ and National Journal because that is the way they define it.

Do you want to put 2 percent more into the health and education of the country, into the training of our workforce, or do you instead want to use it for additional money in Iraq and additional money for tax cuts for the most wealthy people in this country, most of whom would gladly see a reduction in their take if we could improve the quality of our workforce and the quality of our education and the quality of our law enforcement?

I plead fully guilty to agreeing with them, and I would ask for a "no" vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam 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. CAMPBELL of California:

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

SEC. _____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.25 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, first of all, I am happy to stand up here and identify myself with, as the majority party says, "the fringe." You know, you may have noticed recently that the approval ratings for this Congress are not

very good. In fact, I think the latest I saw was that only 17 percent of Americans believe that this Congress is doing a good or a fair job. So I guess that being on the fringe of this Congress is meaning that we agree and associate ourselves with 83 percent of the American people. I would tell my friends on the majority that I am very happy to be on the fringe in Washington but on the mainstream outside of Washington.

And the mainstream outside of Washington wants to keep their own money to spend it on what they want. And they believe, Madam Chairman, even if the other side doesn't, Americans believe, and they are right, that government wastes some of their tax money. And what this proposed amendment does is it would increase spending on this bill by 4.6 percent instead of 4.8 percent. It is a reduction over what is proposed by a quarter of a percent. A quarter of a percent. It still provides an increase of \$6.6 billion over last year.

So under this amendment if there is a government program that is scheduled to get a million dollars, it would instead have to struggle through on \$997,500.

Madam Chairman, I would ask you, I understand that it appears that the Members of the majority party believe that life as we know it will end if that million-dollar government program must exist on \$997,500, but I don't think that the majority of Americans feel that.

Let me point out again that first of all this amendment is not a cut because one equals one. Two is more than one even if you want three. So this amendment still enables a gigantic \$6.6 billion increase in spending on this bill. But what it would do is it would put \$379 million back in taxpayers' pockets, back towards deficit reduction. So it is not a cut.

The other thing that is amazing to me in this whole debate and discussion is there seems to be a direct correlation on the majority side between how much you spend on something and the outcome you are going to get. If that were the case, you could take every school in America, line them up by how much money is spent per student and you should see a direct correlation with the outcomes with how those students succeed out of school.

Well, there are many situations where there are schools spending \$3,000 to \$4,000 a student significantly outperforming schools spending 10, 12, \$15,000 per student in the same place.

Why if there were a direct correlation between how much you spend on something and the outcome, then wouldn't Paris Hilton be the most well-adjusted kid on the planet; and I think perhaps she is not.

So does anybody out there believe that in this gigantic bill of billions and billions of dollars, that there is not one-quarter of a percent of waste, that is not one-quarter of a percent less that any given agency could do without than they have now?

Now I know that my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to have a very difficult time understanding what it means to save the taxpayers a little money, what it means to ask government to be a little more efficient, so I would like to explain it to you graphically, if I may.

This, Madam Chairman, represents 100 percent of a government program. I have used a donkey because I feel that is something that the majority party has some familiarity with. This represents 100 percent of a government spending program.

Let's look and see what we have seen so far. There was an amendment to reduce this program which has already been increased by 1 percent, so there is 99 percent of a government spending program.

Madam Chairman, I would suggest perhaps people in the gallery and people at home may not even be able to tell much of a difference. But the majority party rejected that.

The amendment from the lady from Colorado was a half a percent reduction, so here is 99½ percent of a government spending program. Looks to me like that donkey is pretty much intact. I think it could probably survive. But that was rejected just a moment ago by the majority party.

So here is one last chance, one more chance. I would ask my Democratic colleagues: Can this government program survive like that with 99.75 percent of its spending? You know what, I think the American people will look at this and say yeah, they can. You know what that means, it means that \$379 million back in the American people's pockets and back to reduce this deficit and hopefully leading us towards no longer stealing the Social Security surplus. I don't think they see much difference here, but they will see a difference at home.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

□ 1515

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I appreciate all these donkeys on posters. We won't say anything about the 3 trillion elephants that ought to be on these posters, the \$3 trillion in debt that part of this fringe has supported when they wanted to spend more money on Halliburton, more money on tax cuts for big oil companies, didn't see any amendments to cut those amendments. Now we see amendments to cut or reduce the amount of spending and investment in other funds.

I would, Madam Chairman, through the Chair, ask the gentleman that if we were, you know, I guess in Washington two plus two can equal whatever you want it to be if you listen to other side, Madam Chairman. But I would like to, using the gentleman's own definition of

cuts and no cuts and using his posters, I would ask the gentleman, Madam Chairman, and I'd be happy to yield to him through the Chair.

The gentleman seeks a cut, an actual cut, in Abandoned Infants Assistance. Now, this isn't a cut in any increased investment, I would say to the Chair. In fact, funding for Abandoned Infants Assistance is at \$11,835,000 for abandoned infants, and if the gentleman would read the report, he would note that it says this amount is the same as the fiscal year 2007 funding level. No increase here.

Madam Chairman, I would ask the gentleman through the Chair whether he is standing on this floor advocating an actual cut in the Abandoned Infant Assistance Program match.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISRAEL. I yield to the gentleman from California if he would like to answer that specific question.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Thank you. You know, the question before us is \$11.8 million, as I mentioned to you before, is a cut from \$12.5 million. So the question I would ask you back is, well, why is it not \$12.5 million?

Mr. ISRAEL. I reclaim my time. The gentleman has argued that a cut's really not a cut because the rate of spending is increasing. The rate of spending does not increase in this program, Madam Chairman. It is the same spending as last year, which means that the gentleman's cut is an actual, concrete, specific, documented reduction in Abandoned Infants Assistance from last year.

Madam Chairman, I would go on to another program and through the Chair ask the gentleman if he would like to, since he was unable to give me a yes or no answer on the last example, I will provide another one.

Madam Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman if he would like. Is the gentleman advocating an actual cut in community-based child abuse prevention? Because the funding for community-based child abuse prevention is not increased in this budget, not by a penny, and so the gentleman's cut actually reduces it below last year's level.

Madam Chairman, does the gentleman advocate to his constituents a cut in community-based child abuse prevention? And I would yield to the gentleman if he desires to respond.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Thank you for yielding. You know, I was trying to do the math on the previous one. I guess the question before us is this: can the program you described before, because I'm a little behind on my math here, that was \$11.8 million, can it survive on \$11.78 million? Is that going to mean the end of the world as we know it? Is that going to mean that this program is devastated? Are you telling me that there is not a quarter of a percent that any agency or any program in government can find that they can do their job as well?

Mr. ISRAEL. Reclaiming my time, I'm suggesting that it was more than a quarter percent when it came to a \$13 billion tax cut for the biggest oil company executives on Earth, and it was more than a quarter percent cut when it came to excessive fraudulent payments to Halliburton.

But when it comes to runaway youth, domestic violence, law and order, abandoned infants, anti-gang programs, I would rather that the money go to those investments rather than to special interests.

So I would ask, again, to the gentleman through the Chair, is the gentleman advocating a cut in adoption opportunities because the adoption opportunities program, Madam Chairman, is funded without an increase at the same level as last year. Would the gentleman agree, Madam Chairman, that the cut that he proposes means an actual cut in the program for adoption opportunities from last year's level? At least can we agree that two plus two equals four or four minus two equals two. Can we at least agree on that, Madam Chairman?

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I guess that means that you have proposed a cut in that program if it's already below where it was. So I guess you had proposed a cut in that program. So I would ask you, I guess, if you cut that program, you must have some reason that you believe that it should be cut.

Mr. ISRAEL. I reclaim my time one more time, and then I will reserve the balance of my time. The gentleman has offered an amendment to actually cut programs. We have listed, Madam Chairman, a variety of programs that didn't receive one penny of increase in this budget, in this appropriation, and I've asked the gentleman will the gentleman acknowledge that his amendment is an actual cut on these programs: adoption assistance, abstinence, anti-gang activities, safe and stable families, domestic violence. Is it actually a cut below last year's level? Yes or no, and I would yield to the gentleman for a yes or no answer.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. If you already established it as a cut below last year's level, then yes, it is. But I would ask the gentleman that, is the gentleman proposing to increase the deficit, which, with this amendment, the deficit would go down and taxpayers would have more money?

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, this amendment and this appropriations bill saves \$1.1 billion.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair must ask Members to bear in mind the principle that proper courtesy in the process of yielding and reclaiming time in debate, and especially in asking another to yield, helps to foster the spirit of mutual comity that elevates our deliberations above mere argument. Members, when yielded to,

should defer to the yielding member when he or she reclaims the time.

The gentleman may continue.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the Chairman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished Republican whip, Mr. BLUNT, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for bringing this amendment to the floor.

I'd actually thought, based on the other things I was doing today, that the case was being well-made that a \$7 billion increase is an increase. And I didn't plan to come to the floor this afternoon. I had a number of other things I was working on that I thought were important. I was watching the debate and assuming that the case was being well-made until I heard in the last debate that a 4.3 percent increase was a cut. And I was so stunned by that, a 4.3 percent increase was a cut, a six-something billion dollar increase of the \$7 billion that the majority hopes to increase was a cut, that I decided I'd come to the floor for a minute, and I've been amazed on the floor at what I've heard.

I've heard the gentleman just ask a series of questions about the Abandoned Infants Assistance Program that's the same funding as last year's level; the community-based child abuse program, prevention program, that's the same funding as last year's level; adoption opportunities that I believe I heard were below last year's level.

And I'm not asking the gentleman specifically this question, but I'm asking myself this question: why is that? Why is that that Abandoned Infants Assistance could be funded at last year's level and somehow that's appropriate? Is it less important than it was last year? Is it less important than the many unauthorized things that this bill funds for the first time ever? Why is it that we're not doing more, as the past Congress always tried to do more, in IDEA? Why is it that NIH, in the debate we heard yesterday, the National Institutes of Health, didn't deserve the funding that the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee found a funding source for for that to be raised? Why is it, if inflation is a factor, that we don't care at least at an inflationary level about Abandoned Infant Assistance or we don't care at least at an inflationary level about community-based child abuse prevention?

The gentleman from California is saying let's just cut this by one-quarter of 1 percent, one-quarter of 1 percent, a growth of still almost \$7 billion, but instead, we're funding the unauthorized Full Service Schools Act. Now, why are we funding the unauthorized Full Service Schools Act, but we can't find enough money to keep adoption opportunities at at least last year's level? I'm amazed by what I've heard here on the floor.

Why is it we're funding the unauthorized sexual education program? Why is it that grants to local education that could be funded at \$25 billion, because that's what the Congress in the past says we could allow, are only funded at \$14.4 billion?

Part of the problem here is, once again, we're authorizing on an appropriations bill. We're trying to come up with new programs instead of fulfill the promise of the last programs. IDEA took major growth in funding in the last 10 years, but we haven't sustained that level in this bill because we're trying to fund new things.

And I just close by saying that every American knows that \$7 billion is an increase and 4.9 percent is an increase, as was 4.3, as is 4.4.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California, a member of the committee, Mr. SCHIFF.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to address some of the arguments.

I wanted to say about my friends on the other side of the aisle because, in fact, my friends on the other side of the aisle in committee, the Republican Members, uniformly supported this bill and support this bill. So I have to say that I address these remarks to a minority of the minority, the self-applied fringe that we've been describing or talking to today.

The beginning of their argument was, well, we want across-the-board cuts, we don't really want to have to identify exactly what we're cutting. That's a little hard to sell back home, so we're going to do across-the-board cuts. That's a little more palatable.

We said, well, let's look at where we're cutting, and then the argument was, okay, they're not cuts. They're reductions in the increase.

So then we point out, well, actually you're giving the impression that everything's being increased. Everything is not being increased. Many things are being kept flat. So aren't we really cutting those things that are flat in the budget? And my friends in the minority of the minority said, yes, I guess that's right. I guess we are really making real cuts with these across-the-board proposals, but let's not really look at what we're cutting. That's not very attractive.

And my friend says, okay, so if we're making real cuts, is it really the end of the world if we're making real cuts? Well, I guess it depends on who you ask.

One of the things we're making a real cut to is the bone marrow program. Is that the end of the world for us here in Congress to make a real cut, in real dollar terms, to the bone marrow program? Well, it may not be to any of us at this moment, but for some child out there, it just may be the end of the world. For some parent of that child, some parent has to watch their child suffer with cancer, the inability to get a bone marrow transplant and the failure of research into bone marrow

transplants, it just might be the end of the world for that parent as well as that child.

What are the things that my friend would make real cuts to? He would make real cuts to scholarships for disadvantaged students. He would make real cuts for nurse education. Does my friend think we have more nurses than we need? He would make real cuts for emergency medical services for children. Again, is that the end of the world? Well, for one child it just might be.

He would make real cuts for organ transplantation, real cuts for the National Cord Blood Inventory. Is that the end of the world? Well, for some child, maybe not our children, it just might be.

We would make real cuts, under the gentleman's amendment, to children's mental health. Is that the end of the world? Well, for a child who ends up taking their own life, it just might be the end of the world.

It sounds a lot more palatable when we say, well, it's a 1 percent cut or it's a half a percent cut. Is that the end of the world? Well, for one child it just may be.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time each side, I suppose, has remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes. The gentleman from New York has 6 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, you know, this is so interesting listening to this fiscal debate and talking about we are the fringe. Well, let me tell you, FRINGE is a great acronym, and let me tell you what FRINGE is a great acronym for.

And I think it is very appropriate for those of us on our side of the aisle because fringe means this: Fiscal responsibility includes no government excess. Fiscal responsibility includes no government excess. Now, Madam Chairman, that is what the people tell us they want. Get this fiscal house in order.

□ 1530

That is what they want. They don't want you to spend more. They want you to spend less. Government does not have a revenue problem. Government has a spending problem. All of this about across-the-board cuts don't work.

If I may tell you why across-the-board cuts do work, the reason is this. You have the opportunity within a department to decide where you would like to reduce. I would recommend, as with many of our States, you go in and you make those reductions out of the bureaucracy.

You don't have to take one single penny out of any program. You can take it out of the bureaucracy. That is

where you go, and that is why across-the-board cuts work. That is why they use them in State after State after State because they have balanced budget amendments, because they cannot spend more than the rate of growth of the economy in that State.

They work. And, yes, fiscal responsibility includes no government excess. Now, yes, there is some real long fringe down there because, it is way down by great big, overblown, heavy bureaucratic programs that do not respond to the needs of the American people.

I think it is time that we say let's get this under control. It is the hold-on-to-your-wallet Congress. If we are not happy, they will leave you in tatters, not fringe.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chair, I don't know if every single Republican on the Appropriations Committee who supported this bill would appreciate being called big spenders or fiscally irresponsible. I am very pleased that the mainstream of Republicans and Democrats worked together on this.

I don't know where all the talk was about fiscal responsibility when we were appropriating \$13 billion in tax cuts for big oil companies and spending money on fraudulent payments and no-bid contracts to Halliburton.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the committee.

Ms. LEE. Let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for your diligence in this debate.

Madam Chairman, I would like to briefly make a couple of points with regard to this whole notion of government excess. When you look at, for example, the military budget, we all support a strong national security, a strong military.

However, a military budget of close to \$500 billion, when you look at the waste, fraud and abuse that is in this budget, and also when you look at a measly \$60 billion that should be cut in Cold War era weapons systems, I can't, for the life of me, figure out why we shouldn't get the kind of scrutiny and the laser focus on this government excess over at the Pentagon. It makes a lot of sense to me if you really want to put your deeds and your words into some kind of real action as it relates to our Federal budget.

Also, let me just say something about these across-the-board cuts and who they impact. When you look at our future, when you look at our young people, when you look at individuals who deserve a second chance such as ex-offenders who had done their time who now want to pick up with their lives, who need education, job training, vocational training, when you look at our health care system that is in shambles, when you look at our young people and the drop-out rates and the type of after-school programs and drop-out prevention programs that we are talking about, these across-the-board cuts in many ways would decimate these programs. That means that certain

segments of our society who need this safety net and need these initiatives would just drop through the safety net, whatever is left of that safety net. For the most part, it has been decimated over the last few years.

Also, many of these people do pay Federal taxes and they deserve some of their Federal taxes back. I hear you all talk about tax cuts, and the American people deserving their tax dollars back to spend more, right? Fine. Many of these programs that you are talking about cutting are programs that are designed to help those who do pay tax, and who do deserve some of their Federal taxes back and who do deserve to live and seek the American dream, just like anybody else who makes \$100,000 more or more.

I would hope that some type of rational thinking would prevail out of this debate today and rethink some of these notions of cutting initiatives and cutting the safety net out of those that really need it the most, those that the American dream is still a nightmare for and those that, if we listened and did all that you want us to do, we would have more homeless on the streets. We would have more people just hanging on in the twilight of their lives. I think that we need to know that this budget that the chairman has crafted today really will help enhance the quality of life for millions of Americans.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chair, just one comment for my colleague from California, let me just say that I completely agree with you that the Pentagon is not immune from waste, fraud and abuse, nor is the Defense budget, nor is any part of the Federal Government. I agree with you on that point.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, after all of this debate, I still cannot believe that people don't understand what the word "cut" means. I took the opportunity to go look it up in my dictionary. I would urge my Democrat colleagues to do the same.

They might find a reduction in amount. Only in Washington would somebody call an increase of 4.6 percent a cut. People all over America would love to have their salaries cut if it would only increase 4.6 percent.

I think I just heard the previous speaker say that people who pay taxes ought to get some of their money back. Well, maybe it shouldn't be taken from them in the first place.

But let's go back to the term "cut," because the only budgets that are being cut here today are the family budgets of hard-working Americans all across this land. It is their budgets that are being cut.

The budgets like the Flores family in Garland, who says, "I am a divorced mother with a child in college and a

child in daycare." When you increase taxes, you are going to wipe out the hope of the first college graduate in the family. To my colleagues on the other said of the aisle, that is the budget they are cutting. They are cutting the Flores family budget. They are cutting their education program.

They are cutting the education program of the Mouton-Tedder family in Chandler, this largest tax increase in history, that they are imposing on the American people. They write in, "If I have to pay more taxes, then I can't afford to go to school." Once again, Democrats cutting education budgets for families in America.

They are cutting the health budget as well. I heard from the Winters family in Tennessee Colony. "Please do what you can to stop the wasteful spending. I am retired and disabled. I am raising my three grandchildren and one great grandchild. I sometimes can't afford my own medicine."

The only budgets that are being cut here are the Democrats cutting the health budgets and the education budgets of the American family. It ought to stop.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, may I ask how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2½ minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Chairman, we have an interesting contrast here. We have these self-described fringe legislators that are here on the floor speaking up. You might call them extremists or radicals, whatever.

But we also, in comparison to that, we have an incredible bipartisan process that has been going on this. This subcommittee met for many, many hours, the Labor-H Subcommittee chaired by our wonderful chairman, Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member WALSH, met for many hours and came up with a bipartisan bill.

Then that bill was presented to 66 Members of this House in a full appropriations hearing, and it was approved. Not a single Member of the 66 Members voted against that bill. They all approved it, sent it on to the floor. You have this marvelous work product that Members have put many, many hours into, and they have labored over. They were all laboring over education, health care, worker protection. That is really the thrust of what we are doing here today.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. How much time do I have remaining, Madam Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1 minute.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, I stand here as a member of this fringe that is happy to associate with the 83 percent of Americans who think this Congress is doing a poor job.

We have got a lot of talk about cuts, but there is one thing that's clear.

There is an increase in this bill as written. There is an increase of \$6.6 billion in the deficit over what there would be if this bill held spending flat. That is an increase in raiding the Social Security surplus, and that will lead to the many tax increases that your side is currently proposing both in your budget and in other bills floating around in both this Chamber and the other. Those are increases there. This bill will not stop those increases, but just a little bit of a time, a quarter of a percent, it will help to slow the growth.

I would ask for everyone's support on this bill.

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Chairman, we have heard in this debate that the other side is not really cutting programs, they are cutting the rate of growth of programs. But we provided about a dozen programs that get no increase in this budget, that in fact will be cut from last year's. So the fact of the matter is that these cuts are real, and these cuts hurt families.

Now, this is all about choices, and it goes back to this. Not a single member of this fringe group who disagrees with their own Republican caucus that supported this bill in the Appropriations Committee came to this floor to argue for a 2 percent cut, a 1 percent cut, a 5 percent, a .5 cut. When it came time to give \$13 billion to the big oil companies, then there was plenty of money to go around.

But now the argument is we can't afford to give people who want to send their kids to college an increase in Pell Grants. Not a single amendment was offered by this fringe group when it was time to provide Halliburton with dollar after dollar after dollar so that \$1.47 billion was found to be fraudulent and excessive. I didn't hear a single one of this fringe group come to the floor and argue for cuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, it is sometimes amazing to me just how small some congressional debates can be. We have heard a lot of bloviating on this floor today about whether something is a cut and whether it isn't a cut. We have had a boy scout debate about dictionary terms.

But the real question to ask about this bill is simply to ask, is it adequate to the needs of the country? Do we really need to simply continue the status quo by going back to last year's level, or do we need to recognize that there is more than one deficit in the country? Do we really think that we can afford to continue to avoid dealing with the deficit in educational quality, the deficit in health care access, the deficit in worker training?

Do we really think that we can avoid, or that we can afford to avoid investing

to increase the number of quality teachers in this country? Do we think that we need to do more or not to help millions of kids who need a better deal in special education? Do we need to do more than we are doing now to help workers who lose their life's work because of the forces of globalization?

Are we comfortable continuing to see the number of research grants for cancer, for heart disease, for Parkinson's disease, continue to decline, or do we think that we ought to make an investment, a collective societal investment, so that we can do more to attack those diseases?

Those are values questions. That is what we have to decide here today. This amendment is largely symbolic. It gives people a chance on both sides to talk to some more, as though we haven't, God help us, talked enough already.

But we are now roughly at the point where we will have to decide what our priorities are.

□ 1545

This bill is about 2 percent above the President's budget for these items. That is what we are talking about; we are talking about devoting 2 percent more of the Federal budget than the President wants to devote to deal with the deficits in education, health care, job training, worker protection, and the like.

Each Member is invited, in my view, to make their own choice, but I think the choice is clear. We have had a huge increase in the gap between the richest people in this country and everybody else over the past 20 years. This bill attempts to deal with the results of that gap by providing additional grace notes to help the people who haven't been in that top 1 percent so they get a little better deal in sending their kids to college, so that they get a little better deal in being able to find doctors who will take care of them without begging in the community health clinic, so they can find some job training so they maybe can get a job that pays two-thirds of what their job paid before they were bounced because of bad trade deals or globalization. That is what this bill attempts to do.

It has traditionally had bipartisan support through the years in this country. It would be a shame if that bipartisan support didn't continue. I urge rejection of the amendment and support for the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 67 offered by Mr. PENCE:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act shall be available to Planned Parenthood for any purpose under title X of the Public Health Services Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

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

Mr. PENCE. Allow me to say there are many good things happening in federally funded Family Planning clinics nationwide: 5 million Americans served, 90 percent of whom are low income; 900,000 unintended pregnancies were averted by title X family planning funding; and it is reassuring that abstinence education is required for all clients. But today, I am offering an amendment that is very simple.

The Pence amendment states that no funds under title X may be granted to Planned Parenthood. Planned Parenthood is the largest recipient of title X funding, and it is the largest abortion provider in America. Last year alone, Planned Parenthood's own annual report states that it received more than one-third of its \$1 billion budget from government contracts and grants. And, again, according to their annual report, Planned Parenthood performed more than one quarter of a million abortions.

Millions of pro-life Americans should not be asked to fund the leading abortion provider in the United States. Now, let me stipulate, I know that title X funds may not be used for abortion. And my amendment does not cut or reduce the budget for family planning in this appropriation bill; it simply prevents appropriated funds from reaching an organization that profits from the abortion trade.

It is time the American people stop funding the Nation's largest abortion provider, and I urge support for the Pence amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I seek the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin such time as he may consume.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I really wish that the gentleman had not offered this amendment, and let me be very frank. I spent most of the last 6

months trying to convince Democrats, primarily liberals, who are now in control of the House, not to try to use their new majority to change any language in this bill that had anything to do with abortion or family planning. I have asked them, in an effort to provide bipartisan support for this bill, to recognize other people's values as well as their own. I have asked them, therefore, to leave alone the six abortion-related or family planning provisions which are in the existing law which many on this side of the aisle oppose and some on the other side of the aisle oppose.

I have asked them to leave alone the Hyde amendment; I have asked them to leave alone Dr. WELDON's amendment. And I had some real fights on this side of the aisle about that, not just with people in my caucus, but with a lot of outside groups. A lot of like-minded people on the left will get together and talk and, after they talk to each other, they think they have taken a public opinion poll. And I have asked them to lay off this bill so that we can try to find common ground on an issue that has divided us for so long.

And we put together an initiative which provided well over half a billion dollars in special funding for programs to help discourage women from having abortions, and we have been able to keep that issue out of here. I have asked Members not to offer amendments on any of these items.

But now, in return for that, we get from the other side of the aisle from one gentleman an amendment that in essence upsets the apple cart. I think that is unfortunate. I can't do a whole lot about it, but I think the gentleman knows that an amendment like this would not survive conference anyway, and yet it is being offered. And what it does, at the last minute, is to blow up a consensus which we have tried to build over the last 3 days that we all ought to be willing to live under the same laws that we were living under when the Republicans were controlling this House and when they passed the legislation that I am now defending. So I would simply ask the gentleman, in the interest of our being able to work together on these issues, to withdraw his amendment.

He doesn't like Planned Parenthood. I don't care whether Planned Parenthood gets money or not. What I do care about is that the women who are served by Planned Parenthood get the services to which they are entitled under the Constitution. And so I would ask the gentleman, in the interest of the bipartisan neutrality that we have tried to build over the past 2 months, to consider withdrawing the amendment, and I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, with acknowledgement of the gracious remarks of the chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Pence amendment.

Planned Parenthood claims to work to reduce abortions, but happens to be the number one abortion provider in this country. This raises an obvious question: Why are taxpayer dollars being used to subsidize the largest abortion supplier in the United States?

Planned Parenthood clinics receive funding in the name of their family planning services; however, there are many clinics in which family planning and abortion services are co-located in the same building, share a common set of basic resources, out one door and into the other.

Abortion services generate more net revenue when clinics can rely on Federal dollars to pay for lighting, heating, building maintenance, and even rent. Planned Parenthood receives a recordbreaking \$305 million in taxpayer funding, and they made record profits last year. And what did they do with those record profits last year? Planned Parenthood performed 265,000 abortions, the most ever in a year.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this Federal backdoor subsidy of Planned Parenthood, the world's largest abortion provider, and support the Pence amendment.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Title X of the Public Health Services Act reaches our most vulnerable populations and is a primary source of reproductive health services for low-income women, lowering the rate of unintended pregnancies, reducing the need for abortion, and decreasing infant mortality and morbidity. It is good public policy.

For many women, Planned Parenthood is their only source of health care. In some States like Wisconsin, Utah, and my own Connecticut, Planned Parenthood is the only title X provider. It sees 65,000 patients a year in Connecticut and provides critical family-planning infrastructure in our State.

This amendment would be devastating, especially for the thousands of women whose sole source of medical care is these clinics. This amendment plainly discriminates against the uninsured, leaving the most vulnerable in our society in the most helpless situation. If we truly do value, if we value, as we say we do, women's health, we cannot sabotage title X, we cannot strip Planned Parenthood of funding, and we cannot pass this amendment.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I want to respond substantively to the gracious comments of the chairman whose work on this legislation I acknowledge heartily. But as to the issue of protecting all the values that the Republican majority advanced, I would hasten to remind that in the Foreign Operations bill we did great violence to the historic Mexico City policy. That change came. We must end the practice of funding Planned Parenthood.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, I would remind one of the previous speakers that there are no title X cuts in this amendment.

What this amendment does is to state that Planned Parenthood cannot receive those funds. Planned Parenthood in 2005 did perform 260,000 abortions. That is something that we know. I think it is also important for us to note that it was Planned Parenthood who was the lead plaintiff in the legal challenge against the partial birth abortion ban legislation that is now the law of the land.

This is the right move. I commend the gentleman from Indiana for bringing the amendment forward and for bringing to our attention the need to make certain that taxpayer dollars are not used in abortion clinics around this Nation.

Mr. PENCE. Might I ask how much time I have remaining, Madam Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1¾ minutes.

Mr. PENCE. I yield 50 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Madam Chairman, there is one thing regardless of where you happen to be a Congressman. Every single one of us has something in common if you are from Congress, and that is that we have people in our districts, some who call themselves pro-life and others who call themselves pro-choice, and many of them are deeply convicted of their views on this issue.

Now, the question before us today is, is it reasonable to force people who really do believe that abortion is killing children, is it reasonable to force them to pay money to subsidize that killing? Is that respectful to do that? Planned Parenthood is the biggest abortion provider in America. Is it reasonable to compel some of our constituents who believe that this is killing to take part in that?

Mr. PENCE. It is my pleasure to yield 50 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona, the eloquent Mr. FRANKS.

□ 1600

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Chairman, abortion on demand in America is the greatest single cause of death in our Nation's history. We have killed nearly 50 million of our own unborn children since the criminal Roe vs. Wade decision in 1973. That is 15,000 times the number of lives lost in the 9/11 terrorist attack.

Planned Parenthood is the foremost promoter and provider of abortion on demand for any reason or no reason. In the last fiscal year, this government appropriated more than \$300 million to this death dealing organization.

Madam Chairman, it has been said that a government is what it spends. For this government to appropriate one penny of the taxpayers' money to an organization that kills unborn children and emotionally impoverishes

their mothers is a disgrace that undermines the core essence of the United States of America and betrays everything that our soldiers lying out in Arlington National Cemetery died to preserve.

And Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to find the courage to vote for the Pence amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, the issue here is not Planned Parenthood. The issue is whether women have a right to have full access to family planning. State health departments run 57 percent of the clinics that receive Title X funds. Planned Parenthood affiliates operate 14 percent of Title X supported clinics. Hospitals and family planning clinics and other non-privates make up the rest of the Title X clinic system.

Under the law, none of these funds can be spent for abortion. But Planned Parenthood clinics use their Title X funding to provide family planning and health services to millions of women, and it is those women who would be hurt today by this action, not Planned Parenthood.

I would urge a vote against the amendment. It seems to me that we ought to be content to live under the same arrangements that we were content to live under when the Republican Congresses were writing the law.

It seems to me that we need to be finding ways to avoid dividing the Congress and dividing the country because of our ideologies.

This amendment has nothing to do with abortion. It has everything to do with whether or not we are trying to find common ground on this cluster of issues, and whether or not women are going to be allowed to get the services they need in areas where the only services available to them come from the organization in question.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I would like to just say, I have voted for the ban on partial birth abortion. I consider myself a pro-life Democrat.

But I will say that this amendment will increase the number of abortions that are performed. Fifty percent of abortions are performed on women who live within 200 percent of poverty. If they don't have access to prevention, they will end up getting an abortion. And I believe that if we truly want to prevent abortions from happening in the United States of America, we have an obligation, a moral obligation, to fund programs like this and prevent unintended pregnancies. Those are the poor women who end up going to abortion clinics and having abortions.

Let's prevent the number of abortions from increasing by rejecting this amendment. And the more money we

spend on prevention, that will mean we will continue to reduce the number of abortions.

And I want to thank the gentleman for working on this with us.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, this amendment is not related to abortion. This amendment is a frontal assault on family planning. Make no mistake about it. Whether you are pro-life or whether you are pro-choice or anything in between, you ought to be pro-family planning. And this amendment negates that, and I would urge defeat of the amendment.

If I have any time left, I would yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPP. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and associate myself with the remarks and the eloquent statement of Chairman OBEY and my colleagues.

And I speak from the perspective of a nurse who worked for many years with these women and their families in the community I'm from. Title X is our Nation's primary program to provide family planning services. According to the Guttmacher Institute, Title X has been so successful that for every public dollar invested in family planning, \$3 are saved in Medicaid costs alone for pregnancy and newborn care.

In hundreds of communities across this country, the nonprofit Planned Parenthood is the major implementation of precisely the reproductive health care necessary to carry out effective family planning and to reduce unintended pregnancies. And they are contributing, these nonprofit organizations, to the successful implementation of Title X services.

So I urge my colleagues to stand for family values and to vote against this amendment so that you can protect your constituents' access to proven, effective family planning services which have as their goal to reduce unintended pregnancies.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. I thank the Chair for yielding, and at this time I would yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Pence amendment as strongly as I can advocate. The Title X program provides comprehensive family planning services, as well as a wide range of other preventative health care services, including breast exams and instruction on breast self-examination, pap tests for early detection of cervical cancer or pre-cancerous conditions, testing for high blood pressure, screening and appropriate treatment for sexually transmitted infections, HIV screening, counseling or adoption, foster care and pregnancy termination referrals to specialized health care.

Pursuant to Federal statute, no Title X funds may be spent on abortions.

The question was raised, is it reasonable to ask us, members of Congress, to fund abortions when we find abortions so abhorrent? But that's not the question before us.

The question before us is, is it reasonable to deprive women of reproductive information and services to prevent unwanted pregnancies, and therefore, even avoid the question of whether or not to have an abortion? And the answer is no.

This is about family planning. Planned Parenthood is the Nation's leading reproductive health care provider. For over 9 years Planned Parenthood has provided low-income, uninsured and underinsured women with vital reproductive health care services they need.

I'll conclude by pointing out Planned Parenthood operates health care centers in every State in the Nation, serving over 5 million, men, women and teens and their communities each year. The services Planned Parenthood provides are needed, and to deprive them of this funding, I think, would be a colossal mistake.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, at this time I would yield such time as he may consume to the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. I thank my colleague from New York for his extraordinary courtesy. And let me say, I regret that this debate will only take 15 minutes. It is a great and serious matter, and I think the dignity with which it's been conducted thus far is evidence of the capacity of this Congress to discuss even the most contentious issues of our time in a manner that reflects civility and favorably on the institution.

Now, that being said, let me clear up a few points. This is not, as the chairman said, "a frontal assault on family planning." There are no cuts in Title X in the Pence amendment. The Pence amendment states plainly that no funds under Title X may be granted to Planned Parenthood.

Planned Parenthood is the largest recipient of Title X funding, and it's also the largest abortion provider in America.

And as to whether we are living under the same arrangements, as the chairman said, and I respectfully quote, "same arrangements under Republican rule," it seems to me just a short time ago we saw this new majority overturn much of the decades long Mexico City policy that prevented Federal dollars from going to organizations overseas that provide abortion for family planning.

I think this Nation needs a domestic Mexico City policy. And frankly, if the common ground that this Congress has reached means tens of millions of Federal tax dollars going to the largest abortion provider in America, that is not a common ground I can accept.

Say "no" to Federal funds for Planned Parenthood in Title X. Say

"yes" to family planning funding through Title X. Say "yes" to the Pence amendment.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Chairman, I oppose this amendment, which is nothing less than an attack on the nation's most trusted source of reproductive health services and information. The Pence amendment would single out Planned Parenthood for exclusion from the Title X program, at odds with the principles repeatedly articulated by the United States Supreme Court.

Planned Parenthood is the nation's leading reproductive health care provider. The vast majority of services that Planned Parenthood provides are services to prevent unintended pregnancies, and test and treat for sexually transmitted infections, as well as breast and cervical cancer screening.

The vast majority of Planned Parenthood patients have incomes at or below 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level, women who are four times more likely to face an unintended pregnancy. For many women, and especially those in rural areas and underserved communities, Planned Parenthood is their only source of health care. Title X helps 575 Planned Parenthood clinics to provide over 3 million women with family planning services each year.

Madam Chairman, if we are to reduce the number of abortions in this country, as Mr. PENCE clearly desires, we must get serious about prevention. Each year publicly funded contraceptive services help women prevent 1.3 million unintended pregnancies, which would otherwise result in 533,800 births, 632,300 abortions and 165,000 miscarriages. In the absence of publicly funded family planning, the number of abortions each year in the United States would be 40 percent higher than it currently is. In fact, from 1980 to 2000, Tide X clinics helped women prevent nearly 20 million unintended pregnancies, nine million of which would have ended in abortion. By restricting Title X, Mr. PENCE's amendment would likely increase the number of abortions, particularly among our teenagers.

We should oppose Mr. PENCE's amendment because it is an inhumane attack on the quality of life of low-income women in this country, but moreover, we should oppose it because it does not make good public health sense. Gutting funding for family planning will never bring us towards a day with fewer abortions, it will only increase the devastating costs imposed on society by unintended pregnancies among young women and teenaged girls.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chairman, the activities of Planned Parenthood are a concern for many of us. In Alabama, there was an unsuccessful abortion at a Planned Parenthood clinic, and the baby was born with severe injuries including a hole in her heart. Planned Parenthood has always been a glaring exception to the long-standing policy in the House of not allowing taxpayer money to be used to provide abortions. It claims that Title Ten money is not being used for abortions. The reality is that any Federal dollar that goes to a clinic where abortions are being performed, ends up facilitating an abortion.

The Pence Amendment is a simple way to clear up whether Federal tax dollars are being used properly. Title Ten money should not go to any organization that provides abortions. This is an issue of being accountable to taxpayers and consistent with the Hyde Amend-

ment that we have passed on a bipartisan basis for 31 consecutive years. Therefore, I urge support for the Pence Amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chairman, I am dismayed that this Congress, including Members of my own party, has again decided to eliminate funding for the Denali Commission and cripple the economic lifeline to hundreds of small communities throughout rural Alaska.

When health crises arise, options are often extremely limited in rural Alaska. Health issues or emergencies that require hospital care often involve costly air transportation that can take as much time and money as a flight from New York to Los Angeles, if weather permits. For local health care, the typical rural community health facility is aging, small and inadequate to provide necessary services. In one of its earliest decisions, the Denali Commission designated rural health care as a top priority for Commission support and is continuing its work to provide safe and appropriate infrastructure which will improve health care delivery for rural Alaskans.

Through its health care program, and in partnership with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and Alaska health providers, the Commission is working to address the infrastructure needs of communities statewide to ensure all Alaskans receive safe and reliable health care.

In 1999, the Commission was granted authority by Congress to address rural Alaska health care issues. This authority authorized the Denali Commission to plan, construct and equip health, nutrition and child care projects across the state. Potential projects include hospitals, health care clinics, and mental health facilities including drug and alcohol treatment centers. In 2001, the Commission identified rural primary care facility needs in more than 288 rural communities, and estimated the cost of needed rural primary care facilities to be \$253 million.

Since then, more than 200 communities have sought assistance from the Denali Commission. And in addition to constructing several essential village primary care clinics, the Denali Commission has funded major design initiatives for needed replacement hospitals in Nome and Barrow. It has now completed clinics in over 65 of these remote communities.

Now, in 2007, Congress is telling the Commission that they no longer see a need for the Denali Commission. They are looking to cut \$39 million when the real need in my State is several times that amount. Have the health care problems in rural Alaska been miraculously fixed overnight? Have any Members of the House visited Alaska and seen firsthand that rural health care is no longer an issue for Alaskans? The answer to both is a resounding "No."

The Commission works tirelessly each year to make sure that my Alaskans are not treated like second class citizens and eliminating these funds will be devastating. It is my hope that the Senate has more sense and will continue funding this essential program. I will work with my colleagues in the other chamber to make sure that this happens—Alaskans deserve better.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Chairman, I would like to express my support for the FY 2008 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Bill. This bill takes an important step in providing affordable education and quality health care. The strength

and the future security of our country depend on our investment in health, education, and insuring that the needs of our workforce are addressed. H.R. 3043, as drafted, includes increased funding for many programs important to our state and local education, health, and labor agencies.

The bill addresses increases in funding at all education levels from early childhood to higher education. Although most of these increases are still below FY 2005 levels, it is the beginning of reversing the decline in Federal funding which has not been compatible with increased costs related to NCLB (which imposed new and stronger mandates on our State and local education agencies). H.R. 3043 provides for \$1.6 billion over last year's level to fund NCLB programs, especially for Title I programs to help poor children. The bill also provides for increased funding for Head Start centers, as well as special education grants that benefit 6.9 million children with disabilities.

I would like to extend my support to the Gwen Moore-Tom Cole-Bobby Scott-Carol Shea-Porter amendment that will put a stop to the harmful Upward Bound (UB) evaluation that is being conducted by the Department of Education. The Upward Bound program has been threatened both financially and administratively and I am hopeful that my colleagues will not support provisions that threaten to eliminate this long-standing program. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment that would eliminate the Absolute Priority program, which is an evaluation tool used by the Administration to justify the elimination of the UB program.

As the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Health Braintrust, I would be remiss if I did not mention the positive direction that this bill takes the health and well being of Americans, and the important steps it takes to bolster our health care infrastructure.

This bill increases funding for critically important programs, such as HCOP and other provider training programs, as well as for critically important Federal agencies and offices, such as the National Center for Minority Health and Health Disparities at the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and SAMHSA.

Unlike the President's budget, this bill represents the positive direction we need and should take to ensure that our health care system—at every level, from research, to training, to actual care—has the capacity and resources to adequately treat the millions of Americans who access it. I am enthusiastic about provisions in H.R. 3043 that provide funding in my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, for follow-up glaucoma screening and perinatal care. These programs are an important part of bridging the gap for the elderly, low income and uninsured individuals.

Despite its numerous amendments and three days of debate, the bill as written provides funding for programs that help to improve our Nation's education, health care and labor programs. I urge my colleagues to support its final passage.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I rise today to oppose the amendment offered by my colleague from Indiana, Mr. PENCE to the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2008.

Mr. PENCE's amendment would deny Federal funding under Title X of the Public Health

Services Act to Planned Parenthood health facilities throughout the country. As a supporter of Planned Parenthood and the services that it offers to my constituents in my central New Jersey district, I firmly oppose this purely political amendment.

This should not be an anti-choice or pro-choice debate about one of the many services that Planned Parenthood provides. In fact, according to Federal statute, no money from Title X can be used for abortion services. Title X makes grants to public and private nonprofit organizations to provide family planning and basic reproductive health care information and services to low-income women. Therefore this debate should be about prevention. It should be about continuing to provide women with the necessary tools for proper prevention, including contraception and education. It should be about protecting women's health by providing women with access to reproductive health care.

Planned Parenthood's 841 affiliates provide reproductive health care services to 5 million men and women annually including 84,500 in the state of New Jersey. 63 percent of these patients receive reproductive health care services and 37 percent receive family planning services. Through family planning services Planned Parenthood estimates that its services prevent over 631,000 unwanted pregnancies annually.

Cutting Title X funding to Planned Parenthood is nothing short of irresponsible. The low income women who are served through Title X are four times more likely to face an unintended pregnancy. As a safety net provider, Planned Parenthood plays a critical role in serving these women. Title X has proven to be effective and prevents 1 million unwanted pregnancies each year. Planned Parenthood, as the Nation's oldest and largest family planning provider, is responsible for preventing 60 percent of unwanted pregnancies and we should not act to prevent women from getting the reproductive health care they need. I urge my colleagues not to support the Pence amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The only purpose this amendment serves is to decrease access to family planning services and to mischaracterize the critical, life-saving work of Planned Parenthood affiliates.

Let me be clear. Under current law, Title X funds can not be used to pay for abortions. Nothing in the underlying bill changes that. Therefore, I am left to assume that the services the sponsor of this amendment wishes to cut include family planning, cancer screening, prenatal care and deliveries, fertility information and support groups, and support and advocacy for victims of sexual assault.

I am proud to defend the hundreds of Planned Parenthood affiliates, including the Hudson Peconic affiliate in my Congressional District. The dedicated work this affiliate and others like it engage in are the reason that more than five million men and women have access to any health care at all.

Their commitment is something that should be recognized and commended, not demonized. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Pence amendment, which would deny Federal funding to one of the most important family plan-

ning and women's health organizations in the country. Current law prohibits using Title X funds to provide abortion services. Planned Parenthood has not violated this law. In fact, Planned Parenthood uses completely separate funds to provide these services.

Ninety-seven percent of the services that Planned Parenthood provides are related to pregnancy prevention and women's health. The majority of their work focuses on low-income women, a population at greater risk for unintended pregnancies. Oftentimes a local Planned Parenthood clinic is the only place where women have access to basic health care, including birth control. In addition to family planning assistance, Planned Parenthood also provides cancer screening for breast and cervical cancers, as well as testing and treatment for sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV and AIDS. These are essential health services for women, and it would be irresponsible to discontinue Federal funding for them. I urge my colleagues to support healthcare and family planning for women by voting no on this amendment.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam 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 Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds in this Act may be used to employ workers described in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. OBEY. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. We've been asking Members through the day if they would drop their remarks if we accept their amendments so that Members can catch their planes. Would the gentleman be willing to do that?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I'm very amenable to that process of doing business about every time I come to the floor. I would be happy to thank you for that.

Mr. OBEY. In that case we'll accept the amendment on this side of the

aisle. In accepting this amendment, I would make the following two points:

One, I believe it is merely a re-statement of current law which already prohibits the employment of unauthorized aliens. I do not read it as imposing any new burdens on those who use funds appropriated under this Act. Rather it is fully consistent with the current legal obligations imposed on all employers, regardless of whether or not they use such funds.

Two, I am concerned that the amendment may place an undue enforcement burden on the agencies that receive funding under this bill. I plan to discuss that aspect with the administration.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And I would drop my remarks, except to say that this closes the issue with government working and hiring illegals. That's a State issue.

I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 37 offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Public Broadcasting Service to sponsor events at the Filmmaker Lodge at the Sundance Film Festival.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. OBEY. Again, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. OBEY. Same deal.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I'll close the same deal with the chairman, and I will not describe this. The RECORD will show what this amendment does. And I'd be happy to urge adoption.

I yield back.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. My understanding is that there are no further amendments or colloquies left on either side of the aisle. Is that his understanding, also?

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, that's my understanding, also. There are no further amendments, no further colloquies.

Mr. OBEY. Then, what I would simply like to say, Madam Chairman, is

that this bill is the product of 5 months work on both sides of the aisle by some very dedicated people. Mr. WALSH is the new ranking member on the subcommittee, but he has performed like an old timer. I am proud of the fact that the subcommittee worked hard on hearings. And, I'm proud of the fact that we've largely come together on substance.

I would hope that that would be recognized by the endorsement of many Members on both sides of the aisle when the roll call vote is opened. This bill is not a matter of accounting.

□ 1615

This bill is not a matter of political theory or political party platforms.

This bill, more than any other, meets the needs of all of those in society who are not among the most well-connected and the most privileged. But even for the most well-connected and privileged, this bill provides a lot because all of us benefit every time a child is educated. All of us benefit every time an American citizen gets the health care he or she needs. All of us benefit every time a worker is educated so that our workforce becomes more competitive. All of us benefit when a single teacher achieves new skills. There is nothing in the world more damaging than a dull or a bad teacher, and there is nothing more wonderful than a well-trained, intelligent one.

So I would urge Members to recognize that the issue isn't whether some program is defined as a cut or an increase. The issue isn't whether we like the President of the United States or not. The issue is whether or not we are building the kind of country we want to have over the next 10 years. To do that, it takes investments. And, yes, investments cost money. And, yes, I plead fully guilty to wanting to provide even more than we can in this bill. But it is essential if we want to remain competitive. It is essential if we want to have equal access to opportunity in this country. It is essential that we invest in bills like this.

And I thank the gentleman from New York for his assistance in trying to do just that, as well as every other member of the committee and subcommittee.

There is a reason why there were no votes expressed in opposition to this bill in full committee, and that is because this is the people's bill. It is the product of input from each and every Member from the most conservative to the most liberal, and I think there is not a member of the subcommittee who would not verify that.

With that, Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

For my part, it was a great experience going through this 5 months with you. It was a lot of work. I think I speak for the staff as well when I say we are all pretty tired from all the

work that we have done. And, of course, they had to put together a continuing resolution and a supplemental to boot. So I know I join the chairman in thanking the staff for the remarkable work that they have done, both sides of the aisle. These are professional people who obviously care about the issues, but they are not as concerned about the partisan aspects of this as we are.

When the chairman talked about our experience here together, we combined about 57 years of experience here in the Congress. Most of that side falls on his watch and not mine, but I am getting up there too. And it is great to be able to work with someone who has the command of these issues that he does. And I remember asking him, and I have said this a couple of times, Why on God's green Earth would you want to be chairman of the full committee and the subcommittee also? And he said, Because the subcommittee issues are the issues I came here for 38 years ago. And he is making a mark on them today.

There has been some partisan back-and-forth here, which is as it should be. The Founding Fathers wanted us to have a clash of ideas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. They wanted us to have the contest of ideas here. The fight should be over words and ideas and not with swords and other weaponry.

But mostly what we have done is we have found what we disagree on and talked about it. But overall, overwhelmingly, both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, agree that the issues in this bill are priorities for the Nation. Maybe we think we should spend 5 percent less or they think they should spend 5 percent more, and I don't want to discount the differences. There are big differences between the two parties. And I am very proud that our party on our watch did balance the Federal budget, did produce surpluses before a crisis of international proportions affected us in 2001.

But suffice to say, I have great respect for the gentleman from Wisconsin. Over the years he has made me as mad as anyone else because sometimes his arguments are just too good to argue with.

So let me just end by thanking him for honoring our requests. I think we worked out a pretty good bill here, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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:

An amendment by Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. SOUDER of Indiana.

An amendment by Mr. CAMP of Michigan.

An amendment by Mr. WESTMORELAND of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

Amendment No. 62 by Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Amendment No. 16 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 23 by Mrs. MUSGRAVE of Colorado.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Amendment No. 67 by Mr. PENCE of Indiana.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

Page 125, after line 2, insert the following:
SEC. 522. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay a bonus or other performance-based cash award to any employee of the Social Security Administration or the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services who holds a position to which such employee was appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or a Senior Executive Service position (as defined by section 3132 of title 5, United States Code).

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 185, noes 238, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 672]

AYES—185

Akin	Boustany	Chabot
Alexander	Boyda (KS)	Coble
Bachmann	Brown-Waite,	Cole (OK)
Bachus	Ginny	Conaway
Baker	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Barrett (SC)	Burgess	Cuellar
Barrow	Burton (IN)	Culberson
Bartlett (MD)	Calvert	Davis (KY)
Barton (TX)	Camp (MI)	Davis, David
Bilbray	Campbell (CA)	Deal (GA)
Billirakis	Cannon	Dent
Bishop (UT)	Cantor	Diaz-Balart, M.
Blackburn	Capito	Donnelly
Blunt	Carney	Drake
Boehner	Carter	Dreier
Boozman	Castle	Duncan

Ellsworth	Kuhl (NY)	Regula
Emerson	Lamborn	Rehberg
English (PA)	LaTourette	Renzi
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)
Fallin	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (KY)
Feeney	Loeb sack	Rogers (MI)
Flake	Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen
Forbes	Lungren, Daniel	Roskam
Fortuño	E.	Royce
Fossella	Mahoney (FL)	Ryan (WI)
Fox	Manzullo	Sali
Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Schmidt
Frelinghuysen	McCaul (TX)	Sensenbrenner
Gallegly	McCotter	Sessions
Gerlach	McCrery	Shadegg
Gilchrest	McHenry	Shays
Gillibrand	McHugh	Shuler
Gillmor	McKeon	Shuster
Gohmert	McMorris	Simpson
Goode	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Goodlatte	McNerney	Smith (TX)
Gordon	Mica	Souder
Granger	Miller (FL)	Space
Graves	Miller (MI)	Stearns
Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary	Sullivan
Hastert	Mitchell	Tanner
Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)	Taylor
Hayes	Murphy (CT)	Terry
Heller	Murphy, Patrick	Thornberry
Hensarling	Murphy, Tim	Tiahrt
Hill	Musgrave	Tiberi
Hobson	Myrick	Turner
Hoekstra	Neugebauer	Upton
Hunter	Paul	Walberg
Issa	Pearce	Walden (OR)
Johnson (IL)	Pence	Walsh (NY)
Johnson, Sam	Peterson (PA)	Wamp
Jones (NC)	Petri	Weldon (FL)
Jordan	Pickering	Weller
Keller	Pitts	Westmoreland
King (IA)	Platts	Whitfield
King (NY)	Poe	Wicker
Kingston	Porter	Wilson (NM)
Kirk	Pryce (OH)	Wilson (SC)
Klein (FL)	Putnam	Young (AK)
Kline (MN)	Radanovich	Young (FL)
Knollenberg	Ramstad	

NOES—238

Abercrombie	Davis (AL)	Inglis (SC)
Ackerman	Davis (CA)	Inslee
Aderholt	Davis, Lincoln	Israel
Allen	Davis, Tom	Jackson (IL)
Altmire	DeFazio	Jackson-Lee
Andrews	DeGette	(TX)
Arcuri	Delahunt	Jefferson
Baca	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Baird	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson, E. B.
Baldwin	Dicks	Jones (OH)
Bean	Dingell	Kagen
Becerra	Doggett	Kanjorski
Berkley	Doolittle	Kaptur
Berman	Doyle	Kennedy
Berry	Edwards	Kildee
Biggert	Ehlers	Kilpatrick
Bishop (GA)	Ellison	Kind
Bishop (NY)	Emanuel	Kucinich
Blumenauer	Engel	LaHood
Bonner	Eshoo	Lampson
Boren	Etheridge	Langevin
Boswell	Farr	Lantos
Boucher	Fattah	Larsen (WA)
Boyd (FL)	Ferguson	Larson (CT)
Brady (PA)	Fortenberry	Latham
Brady (TX)	Frank (MA)	Lee
Braley (IA)	Garrett (NJ)	Levin
Brown (SC)	Giffords	Lewis (GA)
Butterfield	Gingrey	Linder
Buyer	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Capps	Green, Al	LoBiondo
Capuano	Green, Gene	Lofgren, Zoe
Cardoza	Grijalva	Lowey
Carnahan	Gutierrez	Lynch
Castor	Hall (NY)	Mack
Chandler	Hare	Maloney (NY)
Christensen	Hastings (FL)	Markey
Clarke	Herger	Matheson
Clay	Herseeth Sandlin	Matsui
Cleaver	Higgins	McCarthy (CA)
Clyburn	Hinchey	McCarthy (NY)
Cohen	Hinojosa	McCollum (MN)
Conyers	Hirono	McDermott
Cooper	Hodes	McGovern
Costa	Holden	McIntyre
Costello	Holt	McNulty
Courtney	Honda	Meek (FL)
Cramer	Hooley	Meeks (NY)
Crowley	Hoyer	Melancon
Cummings	Hulshof	Michaud

Miller (NC)	Rohrabacher	Stark
Miller, George	Ross	Stupak
Mollohan	Rothman	Sutton
Moore (KS)	Roybal-Allard	Tauscher
Moore (WI)	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)
Moran (VA)	Rush	Thompson (MS)
Murtha	Ryan (OH)	Tierney
Nadler	Salazar	Towns
Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Udall (CO)
Neal (MA)	T.	Udall (NM)
Norton	Sanchez, Loretta	Van Hollen
Nunes	Sarbanes	Velázquez
Oberstar	Saxton	Visclosky
Obey	Schakowsky	Walz (MN)
Olver	Schiff	Wasserman
Ortiz	Schwartz	Schultz
Pallone	Scott (GA)	
Pascarell	Scott (VA)	Waters
Pastor	Serrano	Watson
Payne	Sestak	Watt
Perlmutter	Shea-Porter	Waxman
Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Weiner
Pomeroy	Shimkus	Welch (VT)
Price (GA)	Sires	Wexler
Price (NC)	Skelton	Wilson (OH)
Rahall	Slaughter	Wolf
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Woolsey
Reichert	Smith (WA)	Wu
Reyes	Snyder	Wynn
Reynolds	Solis	Yarmuth
Rodriguez	Spratt	

NOT VOTING—13

Bono	Davis (IL)	Jindal
Bordallo	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall
Brown, Corrine	Faleomavaega	Tancred
Carson	Filner	
Cubin	Harman	

□ 1649

Messrs. BRADY of Texas, INGLIS of South Carolina, LAMPSON and PRICE of Georgia changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. GARY G. MILLER of California, SHAYS and LOEBSACK 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. KLEIN. Madam Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 672 on H.R. 3043, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “aye” when I should have voted “no.”

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 672, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The next 14 votes in this series are 2-minute votes. The Chair requests the cooperation of Members in processing these votes in an expeditious manner.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. GINGREY:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by the Commissioner of Social Security or the Social Security Administration to pay the compensation

of employees of the Social Security Administration to administer Social Security benefit payments, under any agreement between the United States and Mexico establishing totalization arrangements between the social security system established by title II of the Social Security Act and the social security system of Mexico, which would not otherwise be payable but for such agreement.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 254, noes 168, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 673]

AYES—254

Aderholt	Emerson	Lynch
Akin	English (PA)	Mack
Alexander	Everett	Mahoney (FL)
Allen	Fallin	Manzullo
Altmire	Feeney	Marchant
Arcuri	Ferguson	Matheson
Bachmann	Flake	McCarthy (CA)
Bachus	Forbes	McCaul (TX)
Baker	Fortenberry	McCotter
Barrett (SC)	Fossella	McHenry
Barrow	Fox	McHugh
Bartlett (MD)	Franks (AZ)	McKeon
Barton (TX)	Frelinghuysen	McMorris
Bean	Gallegly	Rodgers
Biggart	Garrett (NJ)	McNerney
Bilbray	Gerlach	Melancon
Bilirakis	Giffords	Mica
Bishop (GA)	Gilchrest	Michaud
Bishop (UT)	Gillibrand	Miller (FL)
Blackburn	Gillmor	Miller (MI)
Blunt	Gingrey	Miller, Gary
Boehner	Gohmert	Mitchell
Bonner	Goode	Moore (KS)
Boozman	Goodlatte	Moran (KS)
Boren	Gordon	Murphy, Patrick
Boswell	Granger	Murphy, Tim
Boucher	Graves	Musgrave
Boustany	Green, Gene	Myrick
Boyd (FL)	Hall (TX)	Neugebauer
Boyd (KS)	Hare	Nunes
Brady (TX)	Hastert	Pearce
Brown (SC)	Hastings (WA)	Pence
Brown-Waite,	Hayes	Peterson (MN)
Ginny	Heller	Peterson (PA)
Buchanan	Hensarling	Petri
Burgess	Herger	Pickering
Burton (IN)	Herse	Pitts
Buyer	Higgins	Platts
Calvert	Hill	Poe
Camp (MI)	Hobson	Pomeroy
Campbell (CA)	Hodes	Porter
Cannon	Hoekstra	Price (GA)
Cantor	Hoolley	Pryce (OH)
Capito	Hulshof	Putnam
Cardoza	Hunter	Radanovich
Carnahan	Inglis (SC)	Rahall
Carney	Israel	Ramstad
Carter	Issa	Regula
Castle	Johnson (IL)	Rehberg
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Chandler	Jones (NC)	Renzi
Coble	Jordan	Reynolds
Cole (OK)	Kagen	Rogers (AL)
Conaway	Keller	Rogers (KY)
Costa	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)
Costello	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Cramer	Kingston	Roskam
Crenshaw	Kirk	Ross
Culberson	Kline (MN)	Royce
Davis (AL)	Knollenberg	Ryan (OH)
Davis (KY)	Kuhl (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Davis, David	LaHood	Salazar
Davis, Lincoln	Lamborn	Sali
Davis, Tom	Lampson	Saxton
Deal (GA)	Latham	Schmidt
DeFazio	LaTourette	Schwartz
Dent	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Donnelly	Lewis (KY)	Sessions
Doolittle	Linder	Shadegg
Drake	Lipinski	Shays
Dreier	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Duncan	Lucas	Shuler
Edwards	Lungren, Daniel	Shuster
Ellsworth	E.	Simpson

Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor
Terry

Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—168

Abercrombie	Hinojosa	Olver
Ackerman	Hirono	Ortiz
Andrews	Holden	Pallone
Baca	Holt	Pascrell
Baird	Honda	Pastor
Baldwin	Hoyer	Payne
Becerra	Inslee	Perlmutter
Berkley	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Berman	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Berry	(TX)	Reyes
Bishop (NY)	Jefferson	Rodriguez
Blumenauer	Johnson (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman
Braley (IA)	Jones (OH)	Roybal-Allard
Butterfield	Kanjorski	Ruppersberger
Capps	Kaptur	Rush
Capuano	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Castor	Kildee	T.
Christensen	Kilpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kind	Sarbanes
Clay	Klein (FL)	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kucinich	Schiff
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott (GA)
Cohen	Lantos	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sestak
Courtney	Lee	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Levin	Sherman
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Cummings	Loeb sack	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Lowey	Snyder
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)	Solis
DeLauro	Markey	Stark
Diaz-Balart, L.	Matsui	Stupak
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (NY)	Sutton
Dicks	McCollum (MN)	Tauscher
Dingell	McCrery	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McGovern	Tierney
Ehlers	McIntyre	Towns
Ellison	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Emanuel	Meek (FL)	Van Hollen
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Etheridge	Miller, George	Wasserman
Farr	Mollohan	Schultz
Fattah	Moore (WI)	Waters
Fortuño	Moran (VA)	Watson
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Watt
Gonzalez	Murtha	Waxman
Green, Al	Nadler	Weiner
Grijalva	Napolitano	Welch (VT)
Gutierrez	Neal (MA)	Weller
Hall (NY)	Norton	Wexler
Hastings (FL)	Oberstar	Woolsey
Hinche	Oby	Wynn

NOT VOTING—14

Bono	Davis (IL)	Jindal
Bordallo	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall
Brown, Corrine	Faleomavaega	Paul
Carson	Filner	Tancredo
Cubin	Harman	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 1655

Mr. MEEK of Florida changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. WU, Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. POMEROY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MCINTYRE. Madam Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 673 on H.R. 3043, I mistak-

only recorded my vote as “no” when I should have voted “aye.”

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 673, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOUDER:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the National Labor Relations Board to recognize as the exclusive bargaining representative of employees any labor organization that has not been certified as such by the National Labor Relations Board pursuant to section 9(c) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 159).

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 255, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 674]

AYES—167

Akin	Drake	Knollenberg
Bachmann	Dreier	LaHood
Bachus	Duncan	Lamborn
Baker	Ehlers	Latham
Barrett (SC)	Everett	Lewis (CA)
Bartlett (MD)	Fallin	Lewis (KY)
Barton (TX)	Feeney	Linder
Bilbray	Flake	Lucas
Bilirakis	Forbes	Lungren, Daniel
Bishop (UT)	Fortenberry	E.
Blackburn	Fortuño	Mack
Blunt	Fox	Manzullo
Boehner	Franks (AZ)	Marchant
Bonner	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)
Boozman	Gallegly	McCaul (TX)
Boren	Garrett (NJ)	McCrery
Boustany	Gilchrest	McHenry
Brady (TX)	Gillmor	McIntyre
Brown (SC)	Gingrey	McKeon
Brown-Waite,	Gohmert	McMorris
Ginny	Goode	Rodgers
Buchanan	Goodlatte	Mica
Burgess	Granger	Miller (FL)
Burton (IN)	Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary
Buyer	Hastert	Moran (KS)
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Musgrave
Camp (MI)	Hayes	Myrick
Campbell (CA)	Heller	Neugebauer
Cannon	Hensarling	Nunes
Cantor	Herger	Pearce
Carter	Hobson	Pence
Chabot	Hulshof	Peterson (PA)
Coble	Hunter	Petri
Cole (OK)	Inglis (SC)	Pickering
Conaway	Issa	Pitts
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Platts
Culberson	Jones (NC)	Poe
Davis (KY)	Jordan	Price (GA)
Davis, David	Keller	Pryce (OH)
Davis, Tom	King (IA)	Putnam
Deal (GA)	Kingston	Radanovich
Dent	Kirk	Ramstad
Doolittle	Kline (MN)	Rehberg

Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg

Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Tiahrt
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner

Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Terry
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler

Bono
Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Cubin
Davis (IL)

Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu

Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

Jindal
Marshall
Paul
Tancredo

Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger

Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaull (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce

Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—255

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords

Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseht Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
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
King (NY)
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCormack (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)

Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman

NOT VOTING—14

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).
Members are advised 1 minute remains
in this vote.

□ 1659

Mr. KIRK changed his vote from
“no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Chairman, on rollcall
No. 674, had I been present, I would have
voted “no.”

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall
No. 674, I was on official business outside the
National Capital region in my capacity as
chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted
“no.”

Mr. MCINTYRE. Madam Chairman, during
rollcall vote No. 674 on H.R. 3043, I mistak-
enly recorded my vote as “aye” when I should
have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMP OF
MICHIGAN

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The text of the amendment is as fol-
lows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAMP of Michi-
gan:

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

TITLE VI

ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. None of the funds made available
in this Act may be used to implement any
policy prohibiting a Medicare beneficiary
from electing during a coverage election pe-
riod described in section 1851(e) of the Social
Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-21(e)) to receive
health care benefits under title XVIII of such
Act through enrollment in a Medicare Ad-
vantage plan under part C of such title.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has
been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 192, noes 228,
not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 675]

AYES—192

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman

NOES—228

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
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
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseht Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos

Larsen (WA) Neal (MA) Sires
Larson (CT) Norton Skelton
Lee Oberstar Slaughter
Levin Obey Smith (WA)
Lewis (GA) Ortiz Snyder
Lipinski Pallone Solis
Loeb sack Pascarell Space
Lofgren, Zoe Pastor Spratt
Lowey Payne Stark
Lynch Perlmutter Stupak
Maloney (NY) Peterson (MN) Sutton
Markey Pomeroy Tanner
Matheson Price (NC) Tauscher
Matsui Rahall Taylor
McCarthy (NY) Rangel Thompson (CA)
McCollum (MN) Renzi Thompson (MS)
McDermott Reyes Tierney
McGovern Rodriguez Towns
McIntyre Ross Udall (CO)
McNerney Rothman Udall (NM)
McNulty Roybal-Allard Van Hollen
Meek (FL) Ruppersberger Velázquez
Meeks (NY) Rush Visclosky
Melloncon Ryan (OH) Walz (MN)
Michaud Salazar Wasserman
Miller (NC) Sánchez, Linda Schultz
Miller, George T. Waters
Mitchell Sanchez, Loretta Watson
Mollohan Sarbanes Watt
Moore (KS) Schakowsky Waxman
Moore (WI) Schiff Weiner
Moran (KS) Schwartz Welch (VT)
Moran (VA) Scott (GA) Wexler
Murphy (CT) Scott (VA) Wilson (OH)
Murphy, Patrick Serrano Woolsey
Murphy, Tim Sestak Wu
Murtha Shea-Porter Wynn
Nadler Sherman Yarmuth
Napolitano Shuler Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—16

Berkley Faleomavaega Oliver
Bono Filner Paul
Bordallo Harman Ros-Lehtinen
Brown, Corrine Jindal Tancredo
Cubin Kaptur
Davis, Jo Ann Marshall

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).
Members are advised 1 minute remains on the vote.

□ 1703

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 675 I inadvertently voted “no” but intended to vote “aye.”

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 675, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WESTMORELAND

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 233, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 676]
AYES—191
Aderholt Frelinghuysen Mitchell
Alkin Gallegly Moran (KS)
Alexander Garrett (NJ) Musgrave
Altmire Gerlach Myrick
Bachmann Gingrey Neugebauer
Bachus Gohmert Nunes
Baird Goode Pence
Baker Goodlatte Peterson (PA)
Barrett (SC) Gordon Petri
Barrow Granger Pickering
Bartlett (MD) Graves Pitts
Barton (TX) Hall (TX) Platts
Bilbray Hastert Poe
Bilirakis Hastings (WA) Porter
Bishop (UT) Hayes Price (GA)
Blackburn Heller Putnam
Blunt Hensarling Radanovich
Boehner Herger Ramstad
Bonner Hill Kennedy
Boozman Hobson Regula
Boren Hoekstra Rehberg
Boustany Hulshof Reynolds
Boyda (KS) Hunter Rogers (AL)
Brown (SC) Inglis (SC) Rogers (KY)
Issa Johnson (IL) Rogers (MI)
Johnson (IL) Johnson, Sam Rohrabacher
Jones (NC) Roskam
Jordan Jones (NC) Ross
Keller Ryan (WI) Royce
King (IA) Sali
King (NY) Saxton
Kingston Schmidt
Kline (MN) Sensenbrenner
Knollenberg Sessions
Kuhl (NY) Shadegg
Lamborn Shimkus
Latham Shuster
LaTourette Simpson
Lewis (CA) Skelton
Lewis (KY) Smith (NE)
Linder Smith (TX)
LoBiondo Souder
Lucas Space
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack Stearns
Manzullo Sullivan
Marchant Tanner
Matheson Taylor
McCarthy (CA) Terry
McCaul (TX) Thornberry
McCotter Tiahrt
McCrery Tiberi
McHenry Turner
McHugh Upton
McIntyre Walsh (NY)
McKeon Wamp
McMorris Weldon (FL)
Flake Rodgers Westmoreland
Forbes Melancon Whitfield
Fortenberry Mica Wicker
Fossella Miller (FL) Wilson (SC)
Foxy Miller (MI) Young (AK)
Franks (AZ) Miller, Gary Young (FL)

NOES—233

Abercrombie Castle
Ackerman Castor
Allen Chandler
Andrews Christensen
Arcuri Clarke
Baca Clay
Baldwin Cleaver
Bean Clyburn
Becerra Cohen
Berkley Conyers
Berman Cooper
Berry Costello
Biggert Courtney
Bishop (GA) Crowley
Bishop (NY) Cuellar
Blumenauer Cummings
Boswell Davis (AL)
Boucher Davis (CA)
Boyd (FL) Davis (IL)
Brady (PA) Davis, Tom
Brady (TX) DeFazio
Braley (IA) DeGette
Butterfield Delahunt
Capito DeLauro
Capps Diaz-Balart, L.
Capuano Diaz-Balart, M.
Cardoza Dicks
Carnahan Dingell
Carson Doggett

Hinchey McNerney Schakowsky
Hinojosa McNulty Schiff
Hirono Meek (FL) Schwartz
Hodes Meeks (NY) Scott (GA)
Holden Michaud Scott (VA)
Holt Miller (NC) Serrano
Honda Miller, George Sestak
Hooley Mollohan Shays
Hoyer Moore (KS) Shea-Porter
Inlee Moore (WI) Sherman
Israel Moran (VA) Sires
Jackson (IL) Murphy (CT)
Jackson-Lee Murphy, Patrick
(TX) Murphy, Tim
Jefferson Murtha
Johnson (GA) Nadler
Johnson, E. B. Napolitano
Jones (OH) Neal (MA)
Kagen Norton
Kanjorski Oberstar
Kaptur Obey
Kennedy Oliver
Kildee Ortiz
Kilpatrick Pallone
Kind Pascarell
Kirk Pastor
Klein (FL) Payne
Kucinich Pearce
LaHood Perlmutter
Lampson Peterson (MN)
Langevin Pomeroy
Lantos Price (NC)
Larsen (WA) Pryce (OH)
Larson (CT) Rahall
Lee Rangel
Levin Reichert
Lewis (GA) Renzi
Lipinski Reyes
Loeb sack Rodriguez
Lofgren, Zoe Ros-Lehtinen
Lowey Rothman
Lynch Roybal-Allard
Mahoney (FL) Ruppersberger
Maloney (NY) Rush
Markey Ryan (OH)
Matsui Salazar
McCarthy (NY) Sánchez, Linda
McCollum (MN) T.
McDermott Sanchez, Loretta
McGovern Sarbanes

NOT VOTING—12

Bono Davis, Jo Ann Jindal
Bordallo Faleomavaega Marshall
Brown, Corrine Filner Paul
Cubin Harman Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).
Members are advised 1 minute remains on this vote.

□ 1707

Mrs. MALONEY of New York changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”
So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 676, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF GEORGIA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 412, noes 12, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 677]

AYES—412

Abercrombie	Davis (AL)	Hunter
Ackerman	Davis (CA)	Inglis (SC)
Aderholt	Davis (IL)	Inslee
Akin	Davis (KY)	Israel
Alexander	Davis, David	Issa
Allen	Davis, Lincoln	Jackson (IL)
Altmire	Davis, Tom	Jackson-Lee
Andrews	DeFazio	(TX)
Arcuri	DeGette	Jefferson
Baca	Delahunt	Johnson (GA)
Bachmann	DeLauro	Johnson (IL)
Bachus	Dent	Johnson, E. B.
Baird	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson, Sam
Baker	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jones (NC)
Baldwin	Dicks	Jones (OH)
Barrett (SC)	Dingell	Jordan
Barrow	Doggett	Kagen
Bartlett (MD)	Donnelly	Kanjorski
Bean	Doolittle	Kaptur
Becerra	Doyle	Keller
Berkley	Drake	Kennedy
Berman	Dreier	Kildee
Berry	Duncan	Kilpatrick
Biggert	Edwards	Kind
Bilbray	Ehlers	King (NY)
Bilirakis	Ellison	Kingston
Bishop (GA)	Ellsworth	Kirk
Bishop (NY)	Emanuel	Klein (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Emerson	Kline (MN)
Blackburn	Engel	Knollenberg
Blumenauer	English (PA)	Kucinich
Blunt	Eshoo	Kuhl (NY)
Boehner	Etheridge	LaHood
Bonner	Everett	Lamborn
Boozman	Fallin	Lampson
Boren	Farr	Langevin
Boswell	Fattah	Lantos
Boucher	Feeney	Larsen (WA)
Boustany	Ferguson	Larson (CT)
Boyd (FL)	Forbes	Latham
Boyd (KS)	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Brady (PA)	Fortuño	Lee
Brady (TX)	Fossella	Levin
Braley (IA)	Fox	Lewis (GA)
Brown (SC)	Frank (MA)	Lewis (KY)
Brown-Waite,	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Ginny	Gallely	LoBiondo
Buchanan	Garrett (NJ)	Loeb
Burgess	Gerlach	Lofgren, Zoe
Burton (IN)	Giffords	Lowe
Butterfield	Gilchrest	Lucas
Buyer	Gillibrand	Lungren, Daniel
Calvert	Gillmor	E.
Camp (MI)	Gingrey	Lynch
Cannon	Gohmert	Mack
Cantor	Gonzalez	Mahoney (FL)
Capito	Goode	Maloney (NY)
Capps	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Capuano	Gordon	Marchant
Cardoza	Granger	Markey
Carnahan	Graves	Matheson
Carney	Green, Al	Matsui
Carson	Green, Gene	McCarthy (CA)
Carter	Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)
Castle	Gutierrez	McCaul (TX)
Castor	Hall (NY)	McCollum (MN)
Chabot	Hall (TX)	McCotter
Chandler	Hare	McDermott
Christensen	Hastings (FL)	McGovern
Clarke	Hastings (WA)	McHenry
Clay	Hayes	McHugh
Cleaver	Heller	McIntyre
Clyburn	Hensarling	McKeon
Coble	Herger	McMorris
Cohen	Herseth Sandlin	Rodgers
Cole (OK)	Higgins	McNerney
Conaway	Hill	McNulty
Conyers	Hinchey	Meek (FL)
Cooper	Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)
Costa	Hirono	Melancon
Costello	Hobson	Mica
Courtney	Hodes	Michaud
Cramer	Holden	Miller (FL)
Crenshaw	Holt	Miller (MI)
Crowley	Honda	Miller (NC)
Cuellar	Hoolley	Miller, Gary
Culberson	Hoyer	Miller, George
Cummings	Hulshof	Mitchell

Mollohan	Rogers (AL)	Stupak
Moore (KS)	Rogers (KY)	Sullivan
Moore (WI)	Rogers (MI)	Sutton
Moran (KS)	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Moran (VA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauscher
Murphy (CT)	Roskam	Taylor
Murphy, Patrick	Ross	Terry
Murphy, Tim	Rothman	Thompson (CA)
Murtha	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)
Musgrave	Royce	Thornberry
Myrick	Ruppersberger	Tiahrt
Nadler	Rush	Tiberi
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Tierney
Neal (MA)	Ryan (WI)	Towns
Neugebauer	Salazar	Turner
Norton	Sali	Udall (CO)
Nunes	Sánchez, Linda	Udall (NM)
Oberstar	T.	Upton
Obey	Sanchez, Loretta	Van Hollen
Oliver	Sarbanes	Velázquez
Ortiz	Saxton	Visclosky
Pallone	Schakowsky	Walberg
Pascarella	Schiff	Walden (OR)
Pent	Schmidt	Walsh (NY)
Payne	Schwartz	Walsh (MN)
Pearce	Scott (GA)	Wamp
Pence	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Perlmutter	Sensenbrenner	Schultz
Peterson (MN)	Serrano	Sessions
Peterson (PA)	Sessions	Waters
Petri	Sestak	Watson
Pickering	Shays	Watt
Pitts	Shea-Porter	Waxman
Platts	Sherman	Weiner
Poe	Shimkus	Welch (VT)
Pomeroy	Shuler	Weldon (FL)
Porter	Shuster	Weller
Price (GA)	Simpson	Westmoreland
Price (NC)	Sires	Wexler
Pryce (OH)	Skelton	Whitfield
Putnam	Slaughter	Wicker
Radanovich	Smith (NE)	Wilson (NM)
Rahall	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (OH)
Ramstad	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Regula	Snyder	Woolsey
Rehberg	Solis	Wu
Reichert	Souder	Wynn
Renzi	Space	Yarmuth
Reyes	Spratt	Young (AK)
Reynolds	Stark	Young (FL)
Rodriguez	Stearns	

NOES—12

Barton (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (CA)
Campbell (CA)	Hastert	Linder
Deal (GA)	Hoekstra	McCrery
Flake	King (IA)	Shadegg

NOT VOTING—12

Bono	Davis, Jo Ann	Jindal
Bordallo	Faleomavaega	Marshall
Brown, Corrine	Filner	Paul
Cubin	Harman	Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains on the vote.

□ 1712

Mr. CAMPBELL of California changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. LARSEN of Washington changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 677, I was on official business outside the National Capital region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 108, noes 316, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 678]

AYES—108

Akin	Franks (AZ)	Myrick
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Neugebauer
Barrett (SC)	Gerlach	Nunes
Biggert	Gingrey	Pearce
Bilbray	Gohmert	Pence
Bilirakis	Goode	Petri
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Pitts
Blackburn	Granger	Platts
Brown-Waite,	Graves	Poe
Ginny	Hastert	Price (GA)
Buchanan	Hastings (WA)	Putnam
Buyer	Heller	Radanovich
Campbell (CA)	Hensarling	Reichert
Cannon	Hoekstra	Rogers (MI)
Cantor	Hulshof	Roskam
Carter	Inglis (SC)	Ryan (WI)
Castle	Issa	Sali
Chabot	Jordan	Schmidt
Coble	Keller	Sensenbrenner
Cole (OK)	King (IA)	Sessions
Conaway	Kingston	Shadegg
Cooper	Kirk	Shimkus
Crenshaw	Kline (MN)	Shuster
Culberson	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Davis (KY)	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Davis, David	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (TX)
Davis, Tom	E.	Stearns
Deal (GA)	Mack	Sullivan
Dent	Manzullo	Terry
Duncan	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Ehlers	McCaul (TX)	Walberg
Fallin	McHenry	Walden (OR)
Feeney	McMorris	Weldon (FL)
Flake	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Forbes	Mica	Wilson (NM)
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Musgrave	Wolf

NOES—316

Abercrombie	Brown (SC)	Diaz-Balart, L.
Ackerman	Burgess	Diaz-Balart, M.
Aderholt	Burton (IN)	Dicks
Alexander	Butterfield	Dingell
Allen	Calvert	Doggett
Altmire	Camp (MI)	Donnelly
Andrews	Capito	Doolittle
Arcuri	Capps	Doyle
Baca	Capuano	Drake
Bachus	Cardoza	Dreier
Baird	Carnahan	Edwards
Baker	Carney	Ellison
Baldwin	Carson	Ellsworth
Barrow	Castor	Emanuel
Bartlett (MD)	Chandler	Emerson
Barton (TX)	Christensen	Engel
Bean	Clarke	English (PA)
Becerra	Clay	Eshoo
Berkley	Cleaver	Etheridge
Berman	Clyburn	Everett
Berry	Cohen	Farr
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Fattah
Bishop (NY)	Costa	Ferguson
Blumenauer	Costello	Fortuño
Blunt	Courtney	Fossella
Boehner	Cramer	Frank (MA)
Bonner	Crowley	Frelinghuysen
Boozman	Cuellar	Gallely
Boren	Cummings	Giffords
Boswell	Davis (AL)	Gilchrest
Boucher	Davis (CA)	Gillibrand
Boustany	Davis (IL)	Gillmor
Boyd (FL)	Davis, Lincoln	Gonzalez
Boyd (KS)	DeFazio	Gordon
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Green, Al
Brady (TX)	Delahunt	Green, Gene
Braley (IA)	DeLauro	Grijalva

Gutierrez Matsui Salazar
Hall (NY) McCarthy (NY) Sánchez, Linda
Hall (TX) McCollum (MN) T.
Hare McCotter Sanchez, Loretta
Hastings (FL) McCrery Sarbanes
Hayes McDermott Saxton
Herger McGovern Schakowsky
Herseth Sandlin McHugh Schiff
Higgins McIntyre Schwartz
Hill McKeon Scott (GA)
Hinchey McNerney Scott (VA)
Hinojosa McNulty Serrano
Hirono Meek (FL) Sestak
Hobson Meeks (NY) Shays
Hodes Melancon Shea-Porter
Holden Michaud Sherman
Holt Miller (MI) Shuler
Honda Miller (NC) Simpson
Hooley Miller, Gary Sires
Hoyer Miller, George Skelton
Hunter Mitchell Slaughter
Inslee Mollohan Smith (WA)
Israel Moore (KS) Snyder
Jackson (IL) Moore (WI) Solis
Jackson-Lee Moran (KS) Souder
(TX) Moran (VA) Space
Jefferson Murphy (CT) Spratt
Johnson (GA) Murphy, Patrick Stark
Johnson (IL) Murphy, Tim Stupak
Johnson, E. B. Murtha Sutton
Johnson, Sam Nadler
Jones (NC) Napolitano Tanner
Jones (OH) Neal (MA) Tauscher
Kagen Norton Taylor
Kanjorski Oberstar Thompson (CA)
Kaptur Obey Thompson (MS)
Kennedy Oliver Tiahrt
Kildee Ortiz Tiberi
Kilpatrick Pallone Tierney
Kind Pascrell Towns
King (NY) Pastor Turner
Klein (FL) Payne Udall (CO)
Knollenberg Perlmutter Udall (NM)
Kucinich Peterson (MN) Upton
Kuhl (NY) Peterson (PA) Van Hollen
LaHood Pickering Velázquez
Lampson Pomeroy Visclosky
Langevin Porter Walsh (NY)
Lantos Price (NC) Walz (MN)
Larsen (WA) Pryce (OH) Wamp
Larson (CT) Rahall Wasserman
LaTourette Ramstad Schultz
Lee Rangel Waters
Levin Regula Watson
Lewis (CA) Rehberg Watt
Lewis (GA) Renzi Waxman
Lewis (KY) Reyes Weiner
Linder Reynolds Welch (VT)
Lipinski Rodriguez Weller
LoBiondo Rogers (AL) Wexler
Loeb sack Rogers (KY) Whitfield
Lofgren, Zoe Rohrabacher Wicker
Lowey Ros-Lehtinen Wilson (OH)
Lucas Ross Woolsey
Lynch Rothman Wu
Mahoney (FL) Roybal-Allard Wynn
Mahoney (NY) Royce Yarmuth
Marchant Ruppertsberger Young (AK)
Markey Rush Young (FL)
Matheson Ryan (OH)

NOT VOTING—12

Bono Davis, Jo Ann Jindal
Bordallo Faleomavaega Marshall
Brown, Corrine Filner Paul
Cubin Harman Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains on this vote.

□ 1717

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 678, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 96, noes 327, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 679]

AYES—96

Akin Flake Neugebauer
Bachmann Fossella Nunes
Barrett (SC) Franks (AZ) Pearce
Barrow Gallegly Pence
Bartlett (MD) Garrett (NJ) Petri
Barton (TX) Gingrey Pitts
Blibray Gohmert Platts
Bilirakis Granger Poe
Bishop (UT) Hall (TX) Price (GA)
Blackburn Hastert Putnam
Boehner Heller Ramstad
Boozman Hensarling Rohrabacher
Brady (TX) Herger Roskam
Brown-Waite, Inglis (SC) Royce
Ginny Ryan (WI)
Buchanan Johnson, Sam Sali
Burton (IN) Jordan Schmidt
Buyer Keller Sensenbrenner
Camp (MI) King (IA) Sessions
Campbell (CA) Kingston Shadegg
Cannon Kline (MN) Shimkus
Cantor Walz (MN) Shuster
Castle Lungren, Daniel Smith (NE)
Chabot E. Stearns
Coble Mack Sullivan
Conaway Marchant Terry
Cooper McCarthy (CA) Thornberry
Davis (KY) McCaul (TX) Upton
Davis, David McHenry Walberg
Deal (GA) Mica Weldon (FL)
Duncan Miller (FL) Westmoreland
Ehlers Musgrave Wilson (SC)
Feeney Myrick

NOES—327

Abercrombie Capps Diaz-Balart, M.
Ackerman Capuano Dicks
Aderholt Cardoza Dingell
Alexander Carnahan Doggett
Allen Carney Donnelly
Altman Carson Doolittle
Andrews Carter Doyle
Arcuri Castor Drake
Baca Chandler Dreier
Bachus Christensen Edwards
Baird Clarke Ellison
Baker Clay Ellsworth
Baldwin Cleaver Emanuel
Bean Clyburn Emerson
Becerra Cohen Engel
Berkley Cole (OK) English (PA)
Berman Conyers Eshoo
Berry Costa Etheridge
Biggert Costello Everett
Bishop (GA) Courtney Fallin
Bishop (NY) Cramer Farr
Blumenauer Crenshaw Fattah
Blunt Crowley Ferguson
Bonner Cuellar Forbes
Boren Culberson Fortenberry
Boswell Cummings Fortuño
Boucher Davis (AL) Foxx
Boustany Davis (CA) Frank (MA)
Boyd (FL) Davis (IL) Frelinghuysen
Boyda (KS) Davis, Lincoln Gerlach
Brady (PA) Davis, Tom Giffords
Braley (IA) DeFazio Gilchrest
Brown (SC) DeGette Gillibrand
Burgess Delahunt Gillmor
Butterfield DeLauro Gonzalez
Calvert Dent Goode
Capito Diaz-Balart, L. Goodlatte

Gordon Markey Salazar
Graves Matheson Sánchez, Linda
Green, Al Matsui T.
Green, Gene McCarthy (NY) Sanchez, Loretta
Grijalva McCollum (MN) Sarbanes
Gutierrez McCotter Saxton
Hall (NY) McCrery Schakowsky
Hare McDermott Schiff
Hastings (FL) McGovern Schwartz
Hastings (WA) McHugh Scott (GA)
Hayes McIntyre Scott (VA)
Herseth Sandlin McKeon Serrano
Higgins McMorris Sestak
Hill Rodgers Shays
Hinchey McNerney Shea-Porter
Hinojosa McNulty Sherman
Hirono Meek (FL) Shuler
Hobson Meeks (NY) Simpson
Hodes Melancon Sires
Hoekstra Michaud Skelton
Holden Miller (MI) Slaughter
Holt Miller (NC) Smith (NJ)
Honda Miller, Gary Smith (TX)
Hooley Miller, George Smith (WA)
Hoyer Mitchell Snyder
Hulshof Mollohan Solis
Hunter Moore (KS) Souder
Inslee Moore (WI) Space
Israel Moran (KS) Spratt
Jackson (IL) Moran (VA) Stark
Jackson-Lee, Murphy (CT) Stupak
(TX) Murphy, Patrick Sutton
Jefferson Murphy, Tim Tanner
Johnson (GA) Murtha Tauscher
Johnson (IL) Nadler Taylor
Johnson, E. B. Napolitano Thompson (CA)
Jones (NC) Neal (MA) Thompson (MS)
Jones (OH) Norton Tiahrt
Kagen Oberstar Tiberi
Kanjorski Obey Tierney
Kaptur Oliver Towns
Kennedy Ortiz Turner
Kildee Pallone Udall (CO)
Kilpatrick Pascrell Udall (NM)
Kind Pastor Van Hollen
King (NY) Payne Velázquez
Kirk Perlmutter Visclosky
Klein (FL) Peterson (MN) Walden (OR)
Knollenberg Peterson (PA) Walsh (NY)
Kucinich Pickering Walz (MN)
Kuhl (NY) Pomeroy Wamp
LaHood Porter Wasserman
Lampson Price (NC) Schultz
Langevin Pryce (OH) Waters
Lantos Radanovich Watson
Larsen (WA) Rahall Watt
Larson (CT) Rangel Waxman
Latham Regula Weiner
LaTourette Rehberg Welch (VT)
Lee Reichert Weller
Levin Renzi Wexler
Lewis (CA) Reyes Whitfield
Lewis (GA) Reynolds Wicker
Lewis (KY) Rodriguez Wilson (NM)
Lipinski Rogers (AL) Wilson (OH)
LoBiondo Rogers (KY) Wolf
Loeb sack Rogers (MI) Woolsey
Lofgren, Zoe Ros-Lehtinen Wu
Lowey Ross Yarmuth
Lucas Rothman Young (AK)
Lynch Roybal-Allard Young (FL)
Mahoney (FL) Ruppertsberger
Mahoney (NY) Rush
Maloney (NY) Ryan (OH)

NOT VOTING—13

Bono Faleomavaega Marshall
Bordallo Filner Paul
Brown, Corrine Harman Tancredo
Cubin Jindal
Davis, Jo Ann Lamborn

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1720

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 679, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 136, noes 288, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 680]

AYES—136

Akin	Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)
Bachmann	Galleghy	Miller, Gary
Bachus	Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)
Barrett (SC)	Gillmor	Musgrave
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Myrick
Biggert	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Bilbray	Goode	Nunes
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Pearce
Blackburn	Granger	Pence
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Petri
Boehner	Hastert	Pickering
Bonner	Hastings (WA)	Pitts
Boozman	Hayes	Poe
Brady (TX)	Heller	Price (GA)
Brown (SC)	Hensarling	Putnam
Brown-Waite,	Herger	Radanovich
Ginny	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Burgess	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Burton (IN)	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Buyer	Issa	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp (MI)	Jones (NC)	Roskam
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Royce
Cannon	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	King (IA)	Sali
Carter	Kingston	Schmidt
Chabot	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Lamborn	Sessions
Cole (OK)	Lewis (KY)	Shadegg
Conaway	Linder	Shimkus
Crenshaw	Lucas	Shulster
Culberson	Lungren, Daniel	Shuler
Davis (KY)	E.	Shuster
Davis, David	Mack	Smith (NE)
Deal (GA)	Mahoney (FL)	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Sullivan
Drake	McCarthy (CA)	Taylor
Dreier	McCaul (TX)	Terry
Duncan	McCotter	Thornberry
Fallin	McCrery	Tiahrt
Feeney	McHenry	Walberg
Flake	McKeon	Wamp
Forbes	McMorris	Weldon (FL)
Fortuño	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Fossella	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	Miller (FL)	

NOES—288

Abercrombie	Berkley	Butterfield
Ackerman	Berman	Capito
Aderholt	Berry	Capps
Alexander	Bilirakis	Capuano
Allen	Bishop (GA)	Cardoza
Altmire	Bishop (NY)	Carnahan
Andrews	Blumenauer	Carney
Arcuri	Boren	Carson
Baca	Boswell	Castle
Baird	Boucher	Castor
Baker	Boustany	Chandler
Baldwin	Boyd (FL)	Christensen
Barrow	Boyd (KS)	Clarke
Barton (TX)	Brady (PA)	Clay
Bean	Braley (IA)	Cleaver
Becerra	Buchanan	Clyburn

Cohen	Kagen	Regula
Conyers	Kanjorski	Rehberg
Cooper	Kaptur	Reichert
Costa	Kennedy	Renzi
Costello	Kildee	Reyes
Courtney	Kilpatrick	Rodriguez
Cramer	Kind	Rogers (AL)
Crowley	King (NY)	Ross
Cuellar	Kirk	Rothman
Cummings	Klein (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Davis (AL)	Knollenberg	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Rush
Davis (IL)	Kuhl (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Davis, Lincoln	LaHood	Salazar
Davis, Tom	Lampson	Sanchez, Linda
DeFazio	Langevin	T.
DeGette	Lantos	Sanchez, Loretta
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Dent	Larson (CT)	Saxton
Dicks	Latham	Schakowsky
Dingell	LaTourette	Schiff
Doggett	Lee	Schwartz
Donnelly	Levin	Scott (GA)
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Scott (VA)
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Edwards	Lipinski	Sestak
Ehlers	LoBiondo	Shays
Ellison	Loeb sack	Shea-Porter
Ellsworth	Lofgren, Zoe	Sherman
Emanuel	Lowey	Simpson
Emerson	Lynch	Sires
Engel	Maloney (NY)	Skelton
English (PA)	Markey	Slaughter
Eshoo	Matheson	Smith (NJ)
Etheridge	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Everett	McCarthy (NY)	Snyder
Farr	McCollum (MN)	Solis
Fattah	McDermott	Souder
Ferguson	McGovern	Space
Fortenberry	McHugh	Spratt
Frank (MA)	McIntyre	Stark
Frelinghuysen	McNerney	Stupak
Gerlach	McNulty	Sutton
Giffords	Meek (FL)	Tanner
Gilchrest	Meeks (NY)	Tauscher
Gillibrand	Melancon	Thompson (CA)
Gonzalez	Michaud	Thompson (MS)
Gordon	Miller (NC)	Tiberi
Graves	Miller, George	Tierney
Green, Al	Mitchell	Towns
Green, Gene	Mollohan	Turner
Grijalva	Moore (KS)	Udall (CO)
Gutierrez	Moore (WI)	Udall (NM)
Hall (NY)	Moran (VA)	Upton
Hare	Murphy (CT)	Van Hollen
Hastings (FL)	Murphy, Patrick	Velázquez
Herse th Sandlin	Murphy, Tim	Visclosky
Higgins	Murtha	Walden (OR)
Hill	Nadler	Walsh (NY)
Hinches	Napolitano	Walz (MN)
Hinojosa	Neal (MA)	Wasserman
Hirono	Norton	Schultz
Hobson	Oberstar	Waters
Hodes	Obey	Watson
Holden	Olver	Watt
Holt	Ortiz	Waxman
Honda	Pallone	Weiner
Hooley	Pascrell	Welch (VT)
Hoyer	Pastor	Weller
Hulshof	Payne	Wexler
Inlee	Perlmutter	Whitfield
Israel	Peterson (MN)	Wicker
Jackson (IL)	Peterson (PA)	Wilson (NM)
Jackson-Lee	Platts	Wilson (OH)
(TX)	Pomeroy	Wolf
Jefferson	Porter	Woolsey
Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)	Wu
Johnson (IL)	Pryce (OH)	Wynn
Johnson, E. B.	Rahall	Yarmuth
Jones (OH)	Ramstad	Young (AK)
	Rangel	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Bono	Davis, Jo Ann	Jindal
Bordallo	Faleomavaega	Marshall
Brown, Corrine	Filner	Paul
Cubin	Harman	Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1725

Messrs. RUSH, HOLDEN and BUCHANAN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 680, I was on official business outside the national capital region in my capacity as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 256, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 681]

AYES—165

Akin	Fossella	Miller, Gary
Altmire	Foxx	Mitchell
Bachmann	Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)
Bachus	Galleghy	Musgrave
Baker	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Barrett (SC)	Gillmor	Neugebauer
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Nunes
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Pearce
Bean	Goode	Pence
Biggert	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Bilbray	Granger	Petri
Bilirakis	Graves	Pickering
Bishop (UT)	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Blackburn	Hastert	Poe
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Boehner	Hayes	Pryce (OH)
Bonner	Heller	Putnam
Boozman	Hensarling	Radanovich
Brady (TX)	Herger	Reynolds
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Rogers (AL)
Brown-Waite,	Hulshof	Rogers (KY)
Ginny	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Inglis (SC)	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Buyer	Jones (NC)	Royce
Calvert	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Camp (MI)	Keller	Sali
Campbell (CA)	King (IA)	Schmidt
Cannon	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Sessions
Carney	Knollenberg	Shadegg
Carter	Lamborn	Shimkus
Castle	Lampson	Shuler
Chabot	Latham	Shuster
Coble	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NE)
Cole (OK)	Linder	Smith (TX)
Conaway	Lucas	Souder
Crenshaw	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Culberson	E.	Sullivan
Davis (KY)	Mack	Tanner
Davis, David	Mahoney (FL)	Taylor
Davis, Tom	Manzullo	Terry
Deal (GA)	Marchant	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, L.	Matheson	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Donnelly	McCaul (TX)	Upton
Drake	McCotter	Walberg
Dreier	McCrery	Walden (OR)
Duncan	McHenry	Wamp
English (PA)	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Fallin	McMorris	Westmoreland
Feeney	Rodgers	Whitfield
Flake	Mica	Wicker
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Fortuño	Miller (MI)	Young (FL)

NOES—256

Abercrombie Green, Gene
Ackerman Grijalva
Aderholt Gutierrez
Alexander Pascarell
Allen Hall (NY)
Allen Hare
Andrews Hastings (FL)
Arcuri Herseth Sandlin
Baca Higgins
Baird Hill
Baldwin Hinchey
Barrow Hinojosa
Becerra Hirono
Berkley Hobson
Berman Hodes
Berry Holden
Bishop (GA) Holt
Bishop (NY) Honda
Blumenauer Hooley
Boren Hoyer
Boswell Inslee
Boucher Israel
Boustany Jackson (IL)
Boyd (FL) Jackson-Lee
Boyd (KS) (TX)
Brady (PA) Jefferson
Braley (IA) Johnson (GA)
Butterfield Johnson (IL)
Capito Johnson, E. B.
Capps Jones (OH)
Capuano Kagen
Cardoza Kanjorski
Carnahan Kaptur
Carson Kennedy
Castor Kildee
Chandler Kilpatrick
Christensen Kind
Clarke King (NY)
Clay Kirk
Cleaver Klein (FL)
Clyburn Kucinich
Cohen Kuhl (NY)
Conyers LaHood
Cooper Langevin
Costa Lantos
Costello Larsen (WA)
Courtney Larson (CT)
Cramer LaTourette
Crowley Lee
Cuellar Levin
Cummins Lewis (CA)
Davis (AL) Lewis (GA)
Davis (CA) Lipinski
Davis (IL) LoBiondo
Davis, Lincoln Loeb sack
DeFazio Lowey
DeGette Lynch
Delahunt Maloney (NY)
DeLauro Markey
Dent Matsui
Dicks McCarthy (NY)
Dingell McCollum (MN)
Doggett McDermott
Doolittle McGovern
Doyle McHugh
Edwards McIntyre
Ehlers McNerney
Ellison McNulty
Ellsworth Meek (FL)
Emanuel Meeks (NY)
Emerson Melancon
Engel Michaud
Eshoo Miller (NC)
Etheridge Mollohan
Everett Moore (KS)
Farr Moore (WI)
Fattah Moran (VA)
Ferguson Murphy (CT)
Fortenberry Murphy, Patrick
Frank (MA) Murphy, Tim
Frelinghuysen Murtha
Gerlach Nadler
Giffords Napolitano
Gilchrest Neal (MA)
Gillibrand Norton
Gonzalez Oberstar
Gordon Obey
Green, Al Oliver

NOT VOTING—15

Bono Faleomavaega
Bordallo Filner
Brown, Corrine Harman
Cubin Jindal
Davis, Jo Ann Lofgren, Zoe

Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Rooley
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1728

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 681, I was on official business outside the national capital region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MRS.

MUSGRAVE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 245, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 682]

AYES—177

Aderholt Donnelly
Akin Drake
Altmire Dreier
Bachmann Duncan
Bachus Ellsworth
Baker English (PA)
Barrett (SC) Fallin
Bartlett (MD) Feeney
Barton (TX) Flake
Bean Forbes
Biggart Fortenberry
Bilbray Fortuño
Bilirakis Fossella
Bishop (UT) Foxx
Blackburn Franks (AZ)
Blunt Frelinghuysen
Boehner Gallegly
Bonner Garrett (NJ)
Boozman Giffords
Brady (TX) Gillmor
Brown (SC) Gingrey
Brown-Waite, Gohmert
Ginny Goode
Buchanan Goodlatte
Burgess Granger
Burton (IN) Graves
Buyer Hall (TX)
Calvert Hastert
Camp (MI) Hastings (WA)
Campbell (CA) Hayes
Cannon Heller
Cantor Hensarling
Carney Herger
Carter Hill
Castle Hobson
Chabot Hoekstra
Coble Hulshof
Cole (OK) Hunter
Conaway Inglis (SC)
Crenshaw Issa
Culberson Johnson, Sam
Davis (KY) Jones (NC)
Davis, David Jordan
Davis, Tom Keller
Deal (GA) King (IA)
Diaz-Balart, L. Kingston
Diaz-Balart, M. Kirk

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg

Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry

NOES—245

Abercrombie Grijalva
Ackerman Gutierrez
Alexander Hall (NY)
Allen Hare
Andrews Hastings (FL)
Arcuri Herseth Sandlin
Baca Higgins
Baird Hinchey
Baldwin Hinojosa
Barrow Hirono
Becerra Hodes
Berkley Holden
Berman Holt
Berry Honda
Bishop (GA) Hooley
Bishop (NY) Hoyer
Blumenauer Inslee
Boren Israel
Boswell Jackson (IL)
Boucher Jackson-Lee
Boustany (TX)
Boyd (FL) Jefferson
Boyd (KS) Johnson (GA)
Brady (PA) Johnson (IL)
Braley (IA) Johnson, E. B.
Butterfield Jones (OH)
Capito Kagen
Capps Kanjorski
Capuano Kaptur
Cardoza Kennedy
Carnahan Kildee
Carson Kilpatrick
Castor Kind
Chandler King (NY)
Christensen Scott (GA)
Clarke Klein (FL)
Clay Kucinich
Cleaver Kuhl (NY)
Clyburn LaHood
Cohen Langevin
Conyers Lantos
Cooper Larsen (WA)
Costa Larson (CT)
Costello LaTourette
Courtney Lee
Cramer Levin
Crowley Lewis (CA)
Cuellar Lewis (GA)
Cummins Lipinski
Davis (AL) LoBiondo
Davis (CA) Loeb sack
Davis (IL) Lowey
Davis (LA) Lynch
Davis, Lincoln Maloney (NY)
DeFazio Markey
DeGette Matsui
Delahunt McCarthy (NY)
DeLauro McCollum (MN)
Dent McDermott
Dicks McGovern
Dingell McHugh
Doggett McIntyre
Doolittle McNulty
Doyle Meek (FL)
Edwards Meeks (NY)
Ehlers Michaud
Ellison Miller (NC)
Emanuel Mollohan
Emerson Moore (KS)
Engel Moore (WI)
Eshoo Moran (VA)
Etheridge Murphy (CT)
Everett Murphy, Patrick
Farr Murphy, Tim
Fattah Murtha
Ferguson Nadler
Frank (MA) Napolitano
Gerlach Neal (MA)
Gilchrest Norton
Gillibrand Oberstar
Gonzalez Obey
Gordon Ortiz
Green, Al Pallone
Green, Gene

Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Kind
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Bono	Faleomavaega	Marshall
Bordallo	Filner	Miller, George
Brown, Corrine	Harman	Paul
Cubin	Jindal	Tancredo
Davis, Jo Ann	Lofgren, Zoe	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1732

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 682, I was on official business outside the national capital region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 245, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 683]

AYES—177

Aderholt	Culberson	Herger
Akin	Davis (KY)	Hill
Altmire	Davis, David	Hoekstra
Bachmann	Davis, Tom	Hulshof
Bachus	Deal (GA)	Hunter
Baker	Diaz-Balart, L.	Inglis (SC)
Barrett (SC)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Issa
Bartlett (MD)	Donnelly	Johnson, Sam
Barton (TX)	Drake	Jones (NC)
Bean	Dreier	Jordan
Biggert	Duncan	Keller
Bilbray	Ellsworth	King (IA)
Bilirakis	Emerson	Kingston
Bishop (UT)	English (PA)	Kirk
Blackburn	Fallin	Kline (MN)
Blunt	Feeney	Knollenberg
Boehner	Flake	Lamborn
Bonner	Forbes	Lampson
Boozman	Fortenberry	Latham
Brady (TX)	Fortuño	Lewis (KY)
Brown (SC)	Fossella	Linder
Brown-Waite,	Fox	Lucas
Ginny	Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	E.
Burgess	Gallely	Mack
Burton (IN)	Garrett (NJ)	Mahoney (FL)
Buyer	Giffords	Manzullo
Calvert	Gillmor	Marchant
Camp (MI)	Gingrey	Matheson
Campbell (CA)	Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)
Cannon	Goode	McCaul (TX)
Cantor	Goodlatte	McCotter
Carney	Granger	McCreery
Carter	Graves	McHenry
Castle	Hall (TX)	McKeon
Chabot	Hastert	McMorris
Coble	Hastings (WA)	Rodgers
Cole (OK)	Hayes	McNerney
Conaway	Heller	Mica
Crenshaw	Hensarling	Miller (FL)

Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Stearns
Miller, Gary	Rogers (KY)	Sullivan
Mitchell	Rogers (MI)	Tanner
Moran (KS)	Rohrabacher	Taylor
Musgrave	Ros-Lehtinen	Terry
Myrick	Roskam	Thornberry
Neugebauer	Royce	Tiaht
Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Tiberi
Pearce	Sali	Upton
Pence	Schmidt	Walberg
Peterson (PA)	Sensenbrenner	Walden (OR)
Petri	Sessions	Wamp
Pickering	Shadegg	Weldon (FL)
Pitts	Shays	Weller
Poe	Shimkus	Westmoreland
Price (GA)	Shuler	Whitfield
Pryce (OH)	Shuster	Wicker
Putnam	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Radanovich	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Reynolds	Souder	Young (FL)

NOES—245

Abercrombie	Gillibrand	Murphy (CT)
Ackerman	Gonzalez	Murphy, Patrick
Alexander	Gordon	Murphy, Tim
Allen	Green, Al	Murtha
Andrews	Green, Gene	Nadler
Arcuri	Grijalva	Napolitano
Baca	Gutierrez	Neal (MA)
Baird	Hall (NY)	Norton
Baldwin	Hare	Oberstar
Barrow	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Becerra	Herseth Sandlin	Olver
Berkley	Higgins	Ortiz
Berman	Hinchey	Pallone
Berry	Hinojosa	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Hirono	Pastor
Bishop (NY)	Hobson	Payne
Blumenauer	Hodes	Perlmutter
Boren	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Boswell	Holt	Platts
Boucher	Honda	Pomeroy
Boustany	Hookey	Porter
Boyd (FL)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Boyda (KS)	Inslee	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Israel	Ramstad
Braley (IA)	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Butterfield	Jackson-Lee	Regula
Capito	(TX)	Rehberg
Capps	Jefferson	Reichert
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Renzi
Cardoza	Johnson (IL)	Reyes
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Carson	Jones (OH)	Ross
Castor	Kagen	Rothman
Chandler	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Christensen	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Clarke	Kennedy	Rush
Clay	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kilpatrick	Salazar
Clyburn	Kind	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	King (NY)	T.
Conyers	Klein (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cooper	Kucinich	Sarbanes
Costa	Kuhl (NY)	Saxton
Costello	LaHood	Schakowsky
Courtney	Langevin	Schiff
Cramer	Lantos	Schwartz
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Scott (GA)
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Cummings	LaTourette	Serrano
Davis (AL)	Lee	Sestak
Davis (CA)	Levin	Shea-Porter
Davis (IL)	Lewis (CA)	Sherman
Davis, Lincoln	Lewis (GA)	Simpson
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sires
DeGette	LoBiondo	Skelton
DeLahunt	Loeb	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lowey	Smith (NJ)
Dent	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Dicks	Maloney (NY)	Snyder
Dingell	Markey	Solis
Doggett	Matsui	Space
Doolittle	McCarthy (NY)	Spratt
Doyle	McCaul (MN)	Stark
Edwards	McDermott	Stupak
Ehlers	McGovern	Sutton
Ellison	McGuire	Tauscher
Emanuel	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)
Engel	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Meek (FL)	Tierney
Everidge	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Everett	Melancon	Turner
Farr	Michaud	Udall (CO)
Fattah	Miller (NC)	Udall (NM)
Ferguson	Mollohan	Van Hollen
Frank (MA)	Moore (KS)	Velázquez
Gerlach	Moore (WI)	Visclosky
Gilchrest	Moran (VA)	Walsh (NY)

Walz (MN)	Waxman	Woolsey
Wasserman	Weiner	Wu
Schultz	Welch (VT)	Wynn
Waters	Wexler	Yarmuth
Watson	Wilson (NM)	Young (AK)
Watt	Wilson (OH)	

NOT VOTING—14

Bono	Faleomavaega	Marshall
Bordallo	Filner	Miller, George
Brown, Corrine	Harman	Paul
Cubin	Jindal	Tancredo
Davis, Jo Ann	Lofgren, Zoe	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1736

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 683, I was on official business outside the national capital region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) 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 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 231, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 684]

AYES—189

Aderholt	Conaway	Goodlatte
Akin	Costello	Graves
Alexander	Crenshaw	Hall (TX)
Bachmann	Culberson	Hastert
Bachus	Davis (KY)	Hastings (WA)
Baker	Davis, David	Hayes
Barrett (SC)	Davis, Lincoln	Heller
Bartlett (MD)	Deal (GA)	Hensarling
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Herger
Bilbray	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoekstra
Bilirakis	Donnelly	Hulshof
Bishop (UT)	Doolittle	Hunter
Blackburn	Drake	Inglis (SC)
Blunt	Dreier	Issa
Boehner	Duncan	Johnson (IL)
Bonner	Ehlers	Johnson, Sam
Boozman	Ellsworth	Jones (NC)
Boren	Emerson	Jordan
Boustany	English (PA)	Keller
Brady (TX)	Fallin	King (IA)
Brown (SC)	Feeney	King (NY)
Buchanan	Ferguson	Kingston
Burgess	Flake	Kline (MN)
Burton (IN)	Forbes	Knollenberg
Buyer	Fortenberry	Kuhl (NY)
Calvert	Fortuño	LaHood
Camp (MI)	Fossella	Lamborn
Campbell (CA)	Fox	Latham
Cannon	Franks (AZ)	LaTourette
Cantor	Gallely	Lewis (KY)
Carter	Garrett (NJ)	Linder
Chabot	Gillmor	Lipinski
Coble	Gingrey	LoBiondo
Cole (OK)	Goode	Lucas

Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Muggrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Ortiz
Pearce
Pence

Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg

Shimkus
Shuler
Simpson
Skeltton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Walberg
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns

Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson

Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Bono
Bordallo
Brown, Corrine
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Faleomavaega

Filner
Gohmert
Harman
Jindal
Lofgren, Zoe
Marshall

Miller, George
Paul
Shuster
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1739

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 684, I was on official business outside the National Capital region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3043, the FY 2008 Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations bill. Let me first commend my dignified colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative DAVID OBEY, for his tenacity and strong leadership in steering this important piece of legislation. Among many things, this bill will provide the support and additional resources in areas where our Nation is currently facing scarcity—health care, social security, medical research, skilled workers and job training, community services, as well as the quality, accessibility and affordability of higher education and education for the disabled.

Madam Chairman, I must certainly agree with the rationale behind this bill—"we cannot continue to disinvest in our Nation's future." Over the past several years, the previous Republican-led Congress significantly cut investments for the Labor-HHS-Education bill, and our 43rd United States President has once again proposed drastic cuts—\$7.6 billion below FY 2007. As a Representative of the people of the United States, I am committed to reversing this trend of disinvestment. Our Nation's future is dependent on quality health care, job opportunities for our citizens, decent education, improvement of life-saving technologies, and national security. With \$151.7 billion of projected discretionary spending in FY 2008, this bill will provide a modest increase of \$4.3 billion (or 3 percent) over 2007, after adjusting for inflation and population. Although this bill will not completely rectify the problem, it is indeed a step towards a positive direction.

This bill promises to make college more affordable because its provisions include an increase in the maximum Pell Grant of \$390, which is in addition to the \$260 enacted in February 2007 by this Democratic-led Congress. This measure will benefit the more than 5.5 million low-and middle-income students across America's higher education system. In addition,

this bill provides an increase of 4.8 percent for the TRIO programs, educational opportunity outreach programs designed to motivate and support students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Madam Chairman, this bill is of significant importance to my constituents. For the past twelve years, I have served as a Representative of the 18th Congressional District of Texas. In the heart of my district are several community colleges and three major universities—the University of Houston, the University of Houston—Downtown, as well as one of our nations leading Historically Black College/University, Texas Southern University. In the heart of my district are also three ABA-approved law schools—the University of Houston Law Center, Thurgood Marshall School of Law, and South Texas College of Law. With the rising cost of college education, many of these students in my district are reliant on Federal financial aid to complete their education. Because investment in education system today yields high returns for the individual, as well as society, I support this measure to make college more affordable and accessible.

Madam Chairman, quality health care is close to non-existent in this great nation that we call America. As a nation of abundant natural resources and high productivity, it is humiliating to know that 46.6 million citizens are without health insurance. If current policy plans are to continue, by 2013, the number of uninsured Americans will increase by 11 million. This is simply an unacceptable national problem and must be rectified. H.R. 3043 will expand access to health care for the uninsured by providing access for more than 2 million uninsured Americans. Funds will be directed to community health centers, which will enable them to serve an additional 1 million uninsured Americans. The bill also includes a \$50 million initiative to assist states in providing high-risk insurance pools, thereby supporting affordable insurance for almost 200,000 medically high-risk people. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill, which invests in initiatives that will provide new access to health care for more than 2 million uninsured Americans.

H.R. 3043 invests in life-saving medical research by reversing the previous Republican disinvestment plans and providing an increase for National Institute of Health of \$750 million. As once stated by Senator JOE LIEBERMAN, "by expanding our knowledge of human diseases, we can help reduce health care costs by discovering more effective treatments and learning how to prevent onset of serious illnesses. Biomedical research is a fundamental component of a preventive care approach to health care reform." Medical research at NIH offers optimism to millions of American families—with groundbreaking research into diseases such as cancer, AIDS, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, and many more. This bill provides an increase of \$750 million, which in essence allows for NIH to support another 545 new and competing research grants. Expanding and funding life-saving medical research programs must become a top priority if the United States hopes to combat the inefficiencies and inequities in our health care system.

Madam Chairman, it is time that we take a new course of action in investing in our Nation's future. I strongly believe that H.R. 3043 is this new course. Forty-one low priority programs were cut or eliminated, saving \$1.1 billion below 2007. Through passage of this bill,

NOES—231

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaever
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison

Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinche
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebach
Lowey
Lynch

Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markley
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder

our Nation will benefit from the increase in quality, accessibility and affordability of higher education with the \$3.3 billion directed to student financial aid. The academic performance of our American children will be improved through the \$1 billion allocation for No Child Left Behind Programs. Our citizens, especially the uninsured, will have the opportunity to receive quality health care, through the \$1.3 billion being directed to the Health Resources and Services Administration. This bill also allows for an investment in the skills and training of America's workers and the workforce through additional funding to programs similar to Job Corps, as well as community services initiatives, such as the Community Services Block Grant. Our disabled citizens will be cared for through federal contributions for special education for children with disabilities through the funding of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Madam Chairman, I am a strong believer that our children are our future. Family is the backbone to the success of any child, as well as the success of our Nation. For this reason, all members of society must be granted access to quality health care, education, and job skills training. It is students like my current Congressional Black Caucus Foundation Intern, Daria Awusah, that gives me strong faith that our future is in good hands. As my constituent, as well as a student at the University of Houston (which is in my district), she has worked tirelessly and endlessly to finance the past three years of her college education. It is her testimony that although not enough, financial aid has been an instrumental element in financing her education. Let us continue to support students like Ms. Awusah.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support H.R. 3043. Once again, I thank you, Congressman OBEY, for your leadership in this endeavor. Our country's future is dependent on the role that we take as Members of Congress through the policies that we choose to implement. Let us begin with the reinvestment in our country's future by passing H.R. 3043.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chairman, the Act of August 25th, 1916, more commonly referred to as the National Park Service Organic Act, states that, "there is hereby created in the Department of the Interior a service to be called the National Park Service, which shall be under the charge of a director, who shall be appointed by the President."

Since 1916, the National Park Service created by the Organic Act has grown to include 22,000 people, conserving and interpreting 391 units in a National Park System that will welcome more than 270 million visitors this year. Our National Parks are a source of enormous pride for millions of Americans and examples for the world regarding the conservation of places and resources which make a Nation and a people unique. And of course, Madam Chairman, much of the credit for the tremendous success of the National Park idea is due to the professionalism, commitment and expertise of the men and women working for the NPS.

As the centennial of the Organic Act approaches, there is consensus—among policymakers and the American people—that this 100th anniversary must be viewed as an opportunity to recommit ourselves to building a stronger, more diverse, better trained and better equipped National Park Service. In February, the Bush Administration proposed legis-

lation to increase funding for the NPS over the next decade in recognition of this milestone. Two of my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee—full committee Ranking Member DON YOUNG and subcommittee Ranking Member ROB BISHOP—have introduced that legislation, by request, as H.R. 2959.

Today, with the support of Natural Resources Committee Chairman NICK RAHALL, I am honored to introduce H.R. 3094, legislation we believe will best commemorate this 100th anniversary while also preparing the National Parks and the National Park Service for another 100 years. H.R. 3094 authorizes mandatory spending expected to total \$100 million a year for ten years. The bill creates a process whereby the Executive Branch will coordinate annual proposals for how best to spend this new funding and the Congress, through the Interior Appropriations bill, will allocate the funds.

In contrast to the Administration's proposal, H.R. 3094 identifies six specific program areas within which this increased funding is to be spent. These areas include education in the parks, diversity programs, an environmental leadership initiative, professional development, resource protection and construction. This mix of funding priorities—investing in natural resources, bricks and mortar and human capital—will insure our parks and park employees can meet the challenge of the next 100 years successfully.

Also in contrast to the legislation proposed by the Administration, H.R. 3094 provides this new spending without requiring private matching funds. While we recognize the critical role private giving has played in creating and sustaining the National Park System, we remain concerned regarding the ever-increasing reliance on private funds. H.R. 3094 encourages private giving but makes absolutely certain that NPS spending priorities are determined by the Congress and the Administration without regard to which projects might, or might not, be most attractive to private donors.

And finally, Madam Chairman, H.R. 3094 differs from the Administration's proposal in that all of the spending in our bill is paid for—meaning this bill addresses the stringent PAYGO requirements instituted by the Democratic majority. The Administration's failure to identify a source for the mandatory expenditures in H.R. 2959 makes that proposal simply unrealistic.

Madam Chairman, the American people treasure their national parks and care deeply about their future. The funding levels we provide for the National Park Service, at this critical milestone in its history, should reflect that. The initiatives funded through this legislation—especially those which will use our national parks as classrooms for young people—will create new generations of stewards to safeguard our national parks for the next 100 years.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Chairman, I have always said that the working men and women of Michigan are my top priority. I believe that every working family deserves access to a quality education, strong healthcare, jobs that are safe for its workers and secure retirement plans. Today the House will consider the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations bill, H.R. 3043, which will fund programs families need and rely on. I rise in support of this legislation because I believe it will provide our families with healthy

and secure environment in which to raise their children.

By 2014, nearly half of nation's growing occupations will require higher education. If we want to help families succeed and help children prepare for work in the global marketplace, then we must help them earn a college degree. H.R. 3043 will provide the Department of Education with \$61.7 billion, which is \$4.2 billion or 7.4 percent above 2007 funding. In addition, this legislation will provide \$2 billion, a 14.6 percent increase above 2007, in funding for Pell Grants to raise the maximum Pell grant by \$390 to \$4,700, benefiting over 5.5 million students.

This legislation will also help prepare our students for college by providing \$2 billion for No Child Left Behind, an 8.4 percent increase above 2007. Specifically, \$1.9 billion will go towards Title I grants, which benefit nearly 55,000 disadvantaged students in preschool, elementary and secondary levels. This funding will also provide reading and math instruction for 161,000 low-income students. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B grants will receive \$174.5 million, ending the previous Congress's habit of declining Federal contributions for special education.

We also must focus on preparing workers, many of whom who have been displaced due to layoffs or company closings, for second career opportunities. H.R. 3043 will increase funding for the Department of Labor, including a \$227.4 million increase for employment, training and worker protection programs. This funding will greatly help our great state of Michigan because \$1.2 billion will be used to provide state grants that training and supportive services, such as rapid-response assistance to help workers affected by mass layoffs and plant closures.

H.R. 3043 will also provide for the health and well-being of our families. Currently over 44 million Americans do not have health insurance; by 2013, the number of uninsured Americans will grow by 11 million. Universal health care has always been one of my top priorities, and I believe this legislation reflects a strong commitment to improving health care in our country.

Democrats took the first step towards helping the uninsured by passing a \$207 million increase in funding for community health centers in the FY2007 Continuing Resolution, benefiting an additional 1.2 million people. The legislation before us today will provide an additional \$200 million for community health centers. This bill also includes \$50 million to assist states in providing affordable insurance for almost 200,000 people who are considered medically high risk and are not able to obtain health insurance in the commercial market. Lastly, H.R. 3043 will provide \$45 million for health insurance counseling to assist 45 million Medicare beneficiaries to understand and fully utilize the benefits to which they are entitled.

This legislation will go farther than just providing health care to the uninsured; it will also provide much needed funding to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and emergency responders who served during 9/11. While the administration proposed reducing funding for the Federal government's public health activities by \$159 million, this bill will provide a \$255 million increase for a total of \$6.5 billion. This funding will be dedicated to programs that focus on childhood immunization, state and local public health emergency

preparedness, and efforts to combat chronic diseases such as diabetes and heart disease and emerging infectious diseases. In the aftermath of 9/11, many first responders were exposed to dust and other harmful debris at the World Trade Center site. H.R. 3043 provides \$50 million to improve the health monitoring and treatment of the World Trade Center emergency responders. It will also require that the Administration develop a comprehensive plan for how they will address the current health needs of these first responders.

The Labor-HHS Appropriations bill will also help families keep warm. The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) has helped over 500,000 families in Michigan heat their homes during Michigan's tough winters. This year it will see a critical increase of \$500 million, 23.2 percent above 2006, to provide energy assistance to nearly 1 million more low-income seniors and families. The Community Services Block Grant, which provides funding to States to expand services such as housing, home weatherization, parenting education, adult literacy classes, and emergency food assistance will see a \$30 million increase to \$660 million. In order to help improve processing time for Social Security disability claims and hearings, the Social Security Administration (SSA) will receive \$9.7 billion, \$401 million above 2006. Over the years, disability claims and hearings have increased, creating a backlog in casework. This funding will help to reduce the backlog and allow the SSA to continue providing monthly cash benefits to nearly 55 million Americans each year.

Our Founding Fathers trusted Congress with the task of funding the Federal government through the annual appropriations process. While this process is never easy, it is one of the most important duties we have to the American people. Not only has President Bush threatened to veto this legislation, but he also proposed cutting funding for these programs \$7.6 billion below last year. This bill invests in families and their health, the workforce and their job training, and students and their education. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and show the American people Congress is dedicated to improving their quality of life.

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Chairman, Congress created the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation program in the FY 2001 Defense Authorization Act. This program compensates workers who were exposed to nuclear radiation while on the job within the Department of Energy and who later developed cancer and other illnesses.

While the program was a step toward righting the wrongs that these hard-working Americans had to suffer, there have been many problems since the enactment of this program. Many DOE workers have had difficulty proving that their cancer was directly caused by the radiation they were exposed to in the line of duty. The years-long process that the program requires workers to go through to prove they deserve compensation is intrusive and drawn-out.

This is an issue that directly affects my constituents. The Nevada Test site is an area larger than the State of Rhode Island, located about 65 miles north of Las Vegas. After years of exposure to nuclear radiation, many DOE workers who were employed at the Nevada Test Site during Cold War nuclear testing are

now battling several forms of cancer, and many have already passed away. Unfortunately, many of these workers have also been turned away from Federal compensation.

However, there is an alternative for workers to qualify for Federal compensation. Workers at other Energy Department facilities across the country have been designated as part of the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC). Workers at these locations qualify for EEOIC benefits without going through an arduous and bureaucratic process. Since the creation of the program, Nevada Test Site workers have petitioned to be included in the SEC, but have only succeeded in part. Currently, only NTS workers who worked at the site between 1951 and 1962 are part of the Cohort and therefore automatically qualify for benefits. This only accounts for one third of all NTS claimants, leaving a large group of former Federal employees who are awaiting the compensation they deserve.

Madam Chairman, I understand this appropriations bill is not the time to designate Special Exposure Cohorts. However, it is imperative that we as a Congress act on this issue before it's too late: before the victims of nuclear radiation are gone. Before their families are left behind without their loved ones. This is long overdue and we must act now.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Chairman, in recent years, the GOP-led Congress significantly cut investments for priorities in the Labor-HHS-Education bill. This year, the President has once again proposed significant cuts to programs of \$7.6 billion below 2007 levels. This is the wrong message and the wrong policy for America.

My colleagues and I are determined to reverse the funding cuts put forth over the past several years. This bill rejects most of the President's damaging cuts and provides an increase of \$4.3 billion (or 3 percent) over the 2007 funding levels. The bill makes college more affordable—including increasing the maximum Pell Grant by \$390. The bill helps raise the achievement levels of America's students, providing \$2 billion increase above 2007 and \$1 billion above the President's request for No Child Left Behind programs.

H.R. 3043 expands access to health care for the uninsured by investing in initiatives that will provide for new and innovative ways to reduce costs while expanding coverage. This legislation provides \$200 million for community health centers, enabling these centers to serve an additional 1 million uninsured Americans. The bill provides \$75 million for a new initiative of state health access grants, providing start-up grants to states that are ready with plans to expand health care coverage to targeted groups. It also includes \$50 million for an initiative to assist states in providing insurance pools to support affordable insurance for almost 200,000 people who are medically high-risk.

H.R. 3043 meets the domestic healthcare and education needs of our Nation. For too long, Congress has ignored the needs of the American people. Today, I will move with my colleagues in a new direction to fully fund the vital healthcare and education programs utilized by the American people.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Chairman, I rise for two reasons.

First, this has been a long and very difficult bill on the floor. I think the House should recognize the fabulous

work of both Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin and my colleague from New York (Mr. WALSH). They endured all this. Congratulations for a good job.

Further, I believe we ought to extend our appreciation to the Chairwoman who has done a wonderful job and a fair job in the process, Mrs. TAUSCHER of California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008".

Mr. OBEY. Madam 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. HASTINGS of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mrs. TAUSCHER, 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. 3043) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, she reported 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. Under House Resolution 547, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LEWIS of California. In its present form I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lewis of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3043 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly with an amendment providing that funds made available to any child welfare agency, private or public elementary school, private or public secondary school, local educational agency, or State educational agency under titles II or III of the bill may be used to pay for any fees charged under the Schools Safely Acquiring Faculty Excellence Act of 2006 for

conducting background checks authorized by law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk's reading essentially explained what my motion to recommit is all about. Essentially for the House's better understanding, we provide simply discretionary flexibility to school districts to use funding in these titles to make certain that they know well the backgrounds of those people who will be working with and around children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) because he spent a good deal of time in this arena, and his district is adjacent to mine in the beautiful downtown Nevada. We understand some of the same difficulties we are facing.

□ 1745

Mr. PORTER. I would like to ask this body to take 2 minutes and listen to something very compelling. This bill does not matter on its face if our children are not safe. This body, with an amendment that I passed last year, has helped protect 27 million more children across this country by providing for school districts that could not in the past do criminal background checks. In this session alone, we passed additional legislation to help kids that are in Head Start by giving them additional protection for 1 million children who did not have that before.

An example of what is happening in this epidemic nationwide is we have teachers, we have professionals, we have individuals that are predators, sexual predators following our children. We need to make sure we add one additional tool, and that eliminates barrier to help fund these programs that we passed last session and this session. Head Start alone, one particular program had 660 teachers; of that, they were not inspected for 5 years. They discovered, out of 660 teachers, 100 teachers and support staff had criminal backgrounds. Of that, 50 had serious offenses from first-degree murder to child predator to domestic violence.

What I am asking this body to do is to use common sense, allow for these school districts to eliminate one more barrier to help them pay for these backgrounds checks. It is common sense. It is a way to provide protection. It is something that we can do to ensure and add one additional guarantee for our families and our children that they will be safe within our schools.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, JON PORTER said it all. I urge your positive vote on this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if this issue were in fact the real problem, it can

easily be dealt with in conference by Mr. WALSH and myself and the rest of the committee, but in fact it is not a problem. The fact is that under the bill money in the Safe and Drug Free Schools account can already be used for exactly the same purpose.

I would also like to point out, however, that this is a program which was cut by the President to \$100 million, and the House has restored \$146 million above the President's figure to take care of problems just such as this.

But the membership should also understand that this recommit kills the bill. It is dressed up in language on fees, but in fact it calls for the bill to be referred to the committee and reported back promptly, not forthwith. And, as Members know, that is a device that kills the bill.

We have endured over the last 3 days filibusters by amendment. We have had 25 hours of amendments, sometimes repetitious amendments. We have spent twice as much time on this bill as was spent the last time that the bill was considered by the Congress.

And I would make one other point. The sponsors of this proposal could have used it to do anything they wanted to do with the bill. They could have cut the bill, they could have changed the priorities. They didn't. And the fact that they didn't, in my view, is an admission that, in terms of policy, this is a good bill. It is a backhanded admission that this bill ought to pass as is.

So I would ask Members to vote "no" on the motion and vote "yes" on passage. They can then go home having done good things for America's children, for Americans who need help to get health care, and for American workers.

Let me also take just a second to thank the House for its indulgence over the last 3 days. I know that it has often been tiresome, but I appreciate the fact that they understood that the committee was just trying to do its job.

I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This motion will be defeated because it kills the bill. If the gentleman from Nevada were serious about this motion, he would have asked that it be forthwith. That would have passed his amendment. This is not a serious amendment, I tell my friend. This is, unfortunately, however, why the American public is so upset with the Congress of the United States: because what they see, they say that Congress is not getting its work done, and they are right. And they are right because obstructionism is occurring on this floor and on the floor across the hall.

And if it were in the name of serious legislating, perhaps they would understand. But this is not serious legislating, A, because the money can be spent for that now; and, B, because it kills a bill that is for the education and the health care of our people.

Reject this specious motion. Pass this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank Members of both parties who have helped through the process. I urge a "no" vote on this motion and a bipartisan "yes" vote on final passage.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that if indeed this motion passed, this bill could be reported back to the respective committee through which it was designated, and that the bill could be reported back to the House the very next legislative day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unlike the case of a motion to recommit with instructions to report back forthwith, the adoption of which occasions an immediate report on the floor, the adoption of a motion to recommit with instructions to report back promptly sends the bill to committee, whose eventual report, if any, would not be immediately before the House. This is illuminated in Deschler's Precedents, volume 7, chapter 23, section 32.25.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Is it not true that this bill could be reported back the next legislative day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A re-committed bill may be reported from committee again.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Is it untoward for me or someone to ask for unanimous consent that this vote be a 2-minute vote rather than a more extended vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain that request under the current circumstances.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 206, nays 213, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 685]

YEAS—206

Aderholt Frelinghuysen Murphy, Tim
Akin Gallegly Musgrave
Alexander Garrett (NJ) Myrick
Altmire Gerlach Neugebauer
Bachmann Gilchrest Nunes
Bachus Gillmor Pearce
Baker Gingrey Pence
Barrett (SC) Gohmert Peterson (PA)
Barrow Goode Petri
Bartlett (MD) Goodlatte Pickering
Barton (TX) Granger Pitts
Bean Graves Platts
Biggert Hall (TX) Poe
Bilbray Hastert Porter
Bilirakis Hastings (WA) Price (GA)
Bishop (UT) Hayes Pryce (OH)
Blackburn Heller Putnam
Blunt Hensarling Radanovich
Boehner Herger Ramstad
Bonner Hobson Regula
Boozman Hoekstra Rehberg
Boustany Hulshof Reichert
Brady (TX) Hunter Renzi
Brown (SC) Inglis (SC) Reynolds
Brown-Waite, Issa Rogers (AL)
Ginny Johnson (IL) Rogers (KY)
Buchanan Johnson, Sam Rogers (MI)
Burgess Jones (NC) Rohrabacher
Burton (IN) Jordan Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer Keller
Calvert King (IA) Roskam
Camp (MI) King (NY) Royce
Campbell (CA) Kingston Ryan (WI)
Cannon Sali
Cantor Kirk Saxton
Capito Kline (MN) Schmidt
Carney Knollenberg Sensenbrenner
Carter Kuhl (NY) Sessions
Castle LaHood Shadegg
Chabot Lamborn Shays
Coble Latham Shimkus
Cole (OK) LaTourette Shuler
Conaway Lewis (CA) Shuster
Crenshaw Lewis (KY) Simpson
Cuellar Linder Smith (NE)
Culberson LoBiondo Smith (NJ)
Davis (KY) Lucas Smith (TX)
Davis, David Lungren, Daniel
Davis, Tom E.
Deal (GA) Mack
Dent Manzullo
Diaz-Balart, L. Marchant
Diaz-Balart, M. Matheson
Doolittle McCarthy (CA)
Drake McCaul (TX)
Dreier McCotter
Duncan McCreery
Ehlers McHenry
Emerson McHugh
English (PA) McKeon
Everett McMorris
Fallin Rodgers
Feeney McNerney
Ferguson Mica
Flake Miller (FL)
Forbes Miller (MI)
Fortenberry Miller, Gary
Fossella Mitchell
Foxy Moran (KS)
Franks (AZ) Murphy, Patrick

NAYS—213

Abercrombie Capuano DeGette
Ackerman Cardoza Delahunt
Allen Carnahan DeLauro
Andrews Carson Dicks
Arcuri Castor Dingell
Baca Chandler Doggett
Baird Clarke Donnelly
Baldwin Clay Doyle
Becerra Cleaver Edwards
Berkley Clyburn Ellison
Berman Cohen Ellsworth
Berry Conyers Emanuel
Bishop (GA) Cooper Engel
Bishop (NY) Costa Eshoo
Blumenauer Costello Etheridge
Boren Courtney Farr
Boswell Cramer Fattah
Boucher Crowley Frank (MA)
Boyd (FL) Cummings Giffords
Boyd (KS) Davis (AL) Gillibrand
Brady (PA) Davis (CA) Gonzalez
Braley (IA) Davis (IL) Gordon
Butterfield Davis, Lincoln Green, Al
Capps DeFazio Green, Gene

Grijalva Markkey Sarbanes
Gutierrez Matsui Schakowsky
Hall (NY) McCarthy (NY) Schiff
Hare McCollum (MN) Schwartz
Hastings (FL) McDermott Scott (GA)
Herseht Sandlin McGovern Scott (VA)
Higgins McIntyre Serrano
Hill McNulty Sestak
Hinchey Meek (FL) Shea-Porter
Hinojosa Meeks (NY) Sherman
Hirono Melancon Sires
Hodes Michaud Skelton
Holden Miller (NC) Slaughter
Holt Mollohan Smith (WA)
Honda Moore (KS) Snyder
Hooley Moore (WI) Solis
Hoyer Moran (VA) Space
Insee Murphy (CT) Spratt
Israel Murtha Stark
Jackson (IL) Nadler Stupak
Jackson-Lee Napolitano Sutton
(TX) Neal (MA) Tanner
Jefferson Oberstar Tauscher
Johnson (GA) Obey Taylor
Johnson, E. B. Olver Thompson (CA)
Jones (OH) Ortiz Thompson (MS)
Kagen Pallone Tierney
Kanjorski Pascrell Towns
Kaptur Pastor Udall (CO)
Kennedy Payne Udall (NM)
Kildee Perlmutter Van Hollen
Kilpatrick Peterson (MN) Velázquez
Kind Pomeroy Visclosky
Klein (FL) Price (NC) Walz (MN)
Kucinich Rahall Wasserman
Langevin Rangel Schultz
Lantos Reyes Waters
Larsen (WA) Rodriguez Watson
Larson (CT) Ross Watt
Lee Rothman Waxman
Levin Roybal-Allard Weiner
Lewis (GA) Ruppersberger Welch (VT)
Lipinski Rush Wexler
Loeb sack Ryan (OH) Wilson (OH)
Lowey Salazar Woolsey
Lynch Sánchez, Linda Wu
Mahoney (FL) T. Wynn
Maloney (NY) Sanchez, Loretta Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Bono Filner Marshall
Brown, Corrine Harman Miller, George
Cubin Jindal Paul
Davis, Jo Ann Lofgren, Zoe Tancredo

□ 1809

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 685, I was on official business outside the national capital region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 276, nays 140, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 686]

YEAS—276

Abercrombie Bilirakis Capuano
Ackerman Bishop (GA) Cardoza
Allen Bishop (NY) Carnahan
Altmire Blumenauer Carney
Andrews Boren Carson
Arcuri Boswell Castle
Baca Boucher Castor
Baird Boyd (FL) Chandler
Baldwin Boyda (KS) Clarke
Barrow Brady (PA) Clay
Becerra Braley (IA) Cleaver
Berkley Buchanan Clyburn
Berman Butterfield Cohen
Berry Capito Conyers
Biggert Capps Cooper

Costa Kaptur Reichert
Costello Keller Renzi
Courtney Kennedy Reyes
Cramer Kildee Rodriguez
Crowley Kilpatrick Rogers (AL)
Cuellar Kind Rogers (MI)
Cummings Kirk Ross
Davis (AL) Klein (FL) Rothman
Davis (CA) Kucinich Roybal-Allard
Davis (IL) LaHood Ruppersberger
Davis, Lincoln Lampson Rush
DeFazio Langevin Ryan (OH)
DeGette Lantos Salazar
Delahunt Larsen (WA) Sánchez, Linda
DeLauro Larson (CT) T.
Dent Latham Sanchez, Loretta
Dicks LaTourette Sarbanes
Dingell Lee Saxton
Doggett Levin Schakowsky
Donnelly Lewis (GA) Schiff
Doyle Lipinski Schwartz
Edwards Scott (GA)
Ehlers Loeb sack Scott (VA)
Ellison Lowey Serrano
Ellsworth Lynch Sestak
Emanuel Mahoney (FL) Shays
Emerson Maloney (NY) Shea-Porter
Engel Markey Sherman
English (PA) Matheson Shuler
Eshoo Matsui Simpson
Etheridge McCarthy (NY) Sires
Everett McCollum (MN) Skelton
Farr McDermott Slaughter
Fattah McGovern Smith (NJ)
Ferguson McHugh Smith (WA)
Fortenberry McIntyre Snyder
Frank (MA) McNerney Solis
Gerlach McNulty Space
Giffords Meek (FL) Spratt
Gilchrest Meeks (NY) Stark
Gillibrand Melancon Stupak
Gonzalez Michaud Sutton
Gordon Miller (MI) Tanner
Graves Miller (NC) Tauscher
Green, Al Mitchell Taylor
Green, Gene Mollohan Thompson (CA)
Grijalva Moore (KS) Thompson (MS)
Gutierrez Moore (WI) Tierney
Hall (NY) Moran (VA) Towns
Hare Murphy (CT) Turner
Hastings (FL) Murphy, Patrick Udall (CO)
Hayes Murphy, Tim Udall (NM)
Herseht Sandlin Murtha Upton
Higgins Nadler Van Hollen
Hill Napolitano Velázquez
Hinojosa Neal (MA) Visclosky
Hirono Oberstar Walsh (NY)
Hobson Obey Walz (MN)
Hodes Olver Wasserman
Holden Ortiz Schultz Waters
Holt Pascrell Watson
Honda Pastor Watt
Hooley Payne Waxman
Hoyer Perlmutter Weiner
Hulshof Peterson (MN) Welch (VT)
Insee Peterson (PA) Weldon (FL)
Israel Pickering Weller
Jackson (IL) Platts Wexler
Jackson-Lee Pomeroy Wilson (NM)
(TX) Porter Wilson (OH)
Jefferson Price (NC) Wolf
Johnson (GA) Pryce (OH) Woolsey
Johnson (IL) Rahall Wu
Johnson, E. B. Ramstad Wynn
Jones (OH) Rangel Yarmuth
Kagen Regula Young (AK)
Kanjorski Rehberg Young (FL)

NAYS—140

Aderholt Brown (SC) Davis, Tom
Akin Brown-Waite, Deal (GA)
Alexander Ginny Diaz-Balart, L.
Bachmann Burgess Diaz-Balart, M.
Bachus Burton (IN) Doolittle
Baker Buyer Drake
Barrett (SC) Camp (MI) Dreier
Bartlett (MD) Campbell (CA) Duncan
Barton (TX) Cannon Fallin
Bean Cantor Feeney
Bilbray Carter Flake
Bishop (UT) Chabot Forbes
Blackburn Coble Fossella
Blunt Cole (OK) Foxx
Boehner Conaway Franks (AZ)
Bonner Crenshaw Frelinghuysen
Boozman Culberson Gallegly
Boustany Davis (KY) Garrett (NJ)
Brady (TX) Davis, David Gillmor

Gingrey	Lungren, Daniel	Rohrabacher
Gohmert	E.	Ros-Lehtinen
Goode	Mack	Roskam
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Royce
Granger	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Hall (TX)	McCarthy (CA)	Sali
Hastert	McCaul (TX)	Schmidt
Hastings (WA)	McCotter	Sensenbrenner
Heller	McCrery	Sessions
Hensarling	McHenry	Shadegg
Herger	McMorris	Shinkus
Hoekstra	Rodgers	Shuster
Hunter	Mica	Smith (NE)
Inglis (SC)	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)
Issa	Moran (KS)	Souder
Johnson, Sam	Musgrave	Stearns
Jones (NC)	Myrick	Sullivan
Jordan	Neugebauer	Terry
King (IA)	Nunes	Thornberry
King (NY)	Pearce	Tiahrt
Kingston	Pence	Tiberi
Kline (MN)	Petri	Walberg
Knollenberg	Pitts	Walden (OR)
Kuhl (NY)	Poe	Wamp
Lamborn	Price (GA)	Westmoreland
Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Whitfield
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Wicker
Linder	Reynolds	Wilson (SC)
Lucas	Rogers (KY)	

NOT VOTING—15

Bono	Filner	McKeon
Brown, Corrine	Harman	Miller, Gary
Calvert	Jindal	Miller, George
Cubin	Lofgren, Zoe	Paul
Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall	Tancredo

□ 1817

Mr. HOBSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 686, I was on official business outside the national Capitol region in my capacity as Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will be necessarily absent from voting today as I will be on official business in my district, hosting a Cabinet Secretary.

Had I been present to vote, I would have voted "aye" on the amendment offered by Representatives LEWIS, WELCH and WELLER to prevent CMS from making deep cuts in hospital payments for one year.

As a former Board Member of Planned Parenthood Los Angeles, I would have voted "no" on Representative PENCE's amendment to prohibit funds for Planned Parenthood.

I would have also voted for the bill's final passage.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3074, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. SLAUGHTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-242) on the resolution (H. Res. 558) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3074) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related

agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2116

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2116, the Freight Rail Infrastructure Capacity Expansion Act of 2007.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend the majority leader for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning business and noon for legislative business, with votes rolled until 6:30 p.m. In addition to several bills under suspension of the rules, and a list of these bills, of course, will be announced by the end of the week, we expect to begin consideration of the fiscal year 2008 Transportation-HUD appropriations bill.

Let me reiterate that because that will require a vote on the rule, there will be a substantive, and perhaps more substantive, votes on Monday. So Members cannot be assured that there will not be controversies on the floor on Monday night. Usually we do only suspension bills.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour business and 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. In addition to completing consideration of the Transportation-HUD bill, we have one additional fiscal year 2008 appropriations bill, the Commerce-Justice-Science, as well as the farm program reauthorization.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

I notice there is no listing at this point of an Iraq bill on next week's schedule. I also notice that FISA modernization has not been scheduled. I wonder if the gentleman has any information about the potential for either of those two issues to be on the schedule for next week.

Mr. HOYER. FISA legislation, as the gentleman knows, is being worked on by the Intelligence Committee now. I don't have a specific answer for you. I am hopeful that we will perhaps be able to address some very important issues before we leave here.

On the other, I think it is possible that we will have some legislation

dealing with Iraq, but that decision has not been made. Obviously, there is still ongoing discussion both in the Senate and in this body on that subject. But whether there will be legislation next week is still in discussion.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that and, of course, just to ask when that decision is made, the quicker we could be told what that decision is and get a sense of the schedule on that issue, the better.

Also, I have one question the gentleman might have information on. In the conference on the 9/11 bill earlier this week, it appeared that the protection that the House had added for liability in what was called the John Doe action, where if you suggest someone you think is pursuing a dangerous course of action, you turn them in, then you are personally held liable, we had some protections added to our bill on that. I am told that the chairman of the conference, a member of the other body, has now said that he believes those protections would be germane, and if they are germane, we would hope that we would continue to see an argument in favor of that. But I wonder if the leader has any information on that.

Mr. HOYER. I tell my friend that I do not have any immediate information on that particular issue. I know the issue, but where it is, I am not sure. So I don't have specific information on that.

Mr. BLUNT. Let me ask one other question about conferences, and that would be unless this proceeds into another area.

Mr. HOYER. I can say with respect to conferences, we have every intent of doing the 9/11 conference, as the gentleman knows, and passing that before we leave for the August break.

Mr. BLUNT. I would ask on conferences, in a press report this week there was a suggestion, as a matter of fact, I think it was today, that the ethics bill might come to the House under an extraordinary procedure that didn't actually involve a conference. I think the House changed its rules this year to be much more stringent on requiring a conference, and I am wondering if that report has any merit to it that the gentleman would be aware of.

Mr. HOYER. I understand press reports, but there is no decision that has been made on that.

Mr. BLUNT. I just would suggest to the gentleman that we have changed the rules in a way that, while that particular messaging between the two Houses has seldom been used, I think it is even harder to do in light of the House rules changes, and we would hope that these bills are done in conference and, of course, hope they are done in conference in accordance with the rules that this Congress has proposed for conferences.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will my friend yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. We are very, very hopeful that the lobbying disclosure conference can proceed. As the gentleman