

Sanchez, Loretta	Solis	Visclosky
Sarbanes	Souder	Walberg
Saxton	Space	Walden (OR)
Schakowsky	Spratt	Walsh (NY)
Schiff	Stark	Walz (MN)
Schmidt	Stearns	Wamp
Schwartz	Stupak	Wasserman
Scott (GA)	Sullivan	Schultz
Scott (VA)	Sutton	Watson
Serrano	Tanner	Watt
Sessions	Tauscher	Waxman
Shadegg	Taylor	Weiner
Shea-Porter	Thompson (CA)	Welch (VT)
Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Weldon (FL)
Shuler	Tiahrt	Westmoreland
Shuster	Tiberi	Wexler
Sires	Tierney	Wilson (NM)
Skelton	Towns	Wilson (OH)
Slaughter	Turner	Wolf
Smith (NE)	Udall (CO)	Woolsey
Smith (NJ)	Udall (NM)	Wu
Smith (TX)	Upton	Wynn
Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	Yarmuth
Snyder	Velázquez	

NOT VOTING—11

Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall
Bishop (UT)	Fattah	Myrick
Clarke	Higgins	Young (AK)
Cubin	Honda	

□ 1814

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1815

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. CARDOZA). The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Ohio) assumed the chair.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1868. An act to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

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

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HARMAN

Ms. HARMAN. 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 Ms. HARMAN:

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” or “Federal Energy Management Program” designation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan amendment is offered by Mr. UPTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. INGLIS and me, and what it would do is deny funds under this appropriations bill if the ENERGY STAR and the Federal Emergency Management program standards are not met.

Mr. Chairman, it takes 18 seconds to switch one incandescent light bulb. If everyone did this, just one, we would save \$8 billion in energy costs, prevent the burning of 30 billion pounds of coal, remove 2 million carts worth of greenhouse gas emissions, and make a big dent in our climate problem.

This amendment has been accepted to every appropriations bill so far, and I would urge its adoption now.

It is now my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. I would just say that this is a bipartisan amendment. We have been asked to expedite our remarks tonight so we can finish votes later this evening.

The Federal Government is the largest purchaser of light bulbs. This will save \$30 per bulb, hundreds of millions of dollars to the taxpayers every year. It is something that has been adopted on every bill, and I would like to think that we can adopt it by voice again this evening.

Mr. OLVER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HARMAN. Reclaiming my time, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I am quite happy to accept the amendment that is being offered by you and Mr. UPTON.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection. We agree. We accept. Thank you.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. 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. PETERSON of Pennsylvania:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to establish

or collect tolls on Interstate 80 in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I will be very brief because I believe the amendment has been agreed to.

My amendment is a simple amendment that says Federal funds cannot be used to establish or collect tolls on Interstate 80 in Pennsylvania.

Mr. OLVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLVER. I am happy to accept the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. And likewise, I accept as well.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the two gentlemen. We will let the process move forward.

This was offered both on behalf of Congressmen PETERSON and ENGLISH.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

Mr. HUNTER. 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. HUNTER:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to participate in a working group pursuant to the Security and Prosperity Partnership.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment on behalf of myself and the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

And Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which goes directly to the security of this country, the homeland security of this country, and particularly the border security and the sovereignty of the Nation.

We have right now in Texas a project that is underway, a massive project to build a 12-lane highway heading north, presumably funded largely by private funds, which will head north toward Oklahoma. And the understanding that I have, looking at the statements which have been made by the Security and Prosperity Partnership, is that this is part of an overall plan to develop a corridor between Mexico and Canada transiting the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the reason for this amendment, which strikes the funds for the administration to spend money with discussion teams and working groups on this particular project, is because this is a project which cries out for congressional oversight, of which right now there is none. Now, as a representative of a border State, and having represented all the California-Mexican border at one time, my questions would be: What security matters are being discussed right now with these thousands of new trucks which will be transiting this 12-lane highway? What percent of the trucks will be checked? What transparency will be involved with respect to the driving records, and more importantly, the criminal records of the people behind the wheels of these trucks? What are the plans in place to put together a security apparatus to ensure that we have more than 1 percent or 2 percent of this vehicular trade checked?

Now, this is a working group which is proceeding, which claims that it has no plans to participate in what they call this private program to deliver this 12-lane highway straight across the middle of the United States connecting Mexico and Canada. Yet, in their own description of what they do, they claim that they undertake these working groups to facilitate multimodal corridors and alleviate bottlenecks at the border.

Alleviating bottlenecks at the border, Mr. Chairman, when you only are checking 1 to 2 percent of the cargo containers coming in right now, is a code word for less security, these so-called "fast passes," these passes in which you go through the security apparatus in a matter of seconds rather than in a matter of hours.

So I think that it's time, before they facilitate this multimodal operation, for the administration to consult Congress. It's time for our oversight.

At this point, I would like to yield to the cosponsor of this amendment, the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding and in support of the Hunter-Kaptur amendment. It is a simple limitation amendment. And frankly, one of the chief reasons I'm supporting it, in addition to all the excellent reasons Mr. HUNTER has given, is that the administration refuses to report back to Congress its negotiation on this Security and Prosperity Partnership and its impact in a number of areas, including transportation. They have been intransigent, they have been unresponsive and, frankly, they've been secretive. And this is going to have an enormous impact on public welfare across this continent, particularly in our country.

The gentleman talks about security. I support him in that. Right now we've got a situation under NAFTA where so many of our jobs and production platforms have been outsourced to Mexico. We've got all these illegal trucks coming in. They're even making their way

all the way to Ohio, up into Detroit, causing us all kinds of difficulty. We need transparency and we need disclosure about what the Security and Prosperity Partnership is all about. The Administration, even on our request, refuses to answer inquiries about the SPP.

Due to NAFTA, we just have tremendous problems with additional illegal drugs in our area coming in transported in a lot of these vehicles that are coming from the border, and in many ways we already have an unregulated flow across our continent.

So I really support the gentleman's efforts here. We need transparency. We need disclosure. We don't need to expand the difficulties we're already having as a result of what has transpired with NAFTA. And with the size of the roadways that are being talked about, and the possibility they will be privatized tollways, we need to have reporting back from this administration.

So I support the gentleman's amendment very strongly.

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

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

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

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I, frankly, am not in favor, and I must oppose this amendment because I think any superhighway between Mexico, the U.S. and Canada, and there are no funds in this bill for this mythical private road, I just don't believe that this superhighway is something that we should get into.

And furthermore, this amendment puts a stop on several transportation-related initiatives between my State, which is Michigan, my city and Canada. For example, we've been working for years to improve the crossing at the Ambassador Bridge between Detroit and Windsor. That's the busiest, it isn't the second busiest, it's the busiest U.S.-Canadian crossing in our country. This amendment would stop years of work and cooperative efforts that we've been working on.

And another example of a cooperative effort under this partnership is aviation. I've got to tell you that there are three international airports in my area, all of which fly into Canada. DOT and Canada are working together to ensure that travel between the two countries is smooth, free and safe.

□ 1830

I would say, free of any burdensome barriers. This amendment would put all of the U.S.-Canada transportation initiatives to an end. That would be detrimental to the Nation.

I think the amendment is one that is a broad brush. It tries to actually focus on one thing, but it is too broad. In fact, it contains some elements that bring about a real problem. I think that they can do much better if they ever redrafted this.

But here is the story. There is no superhighway in this bill. There is not. But there are good initiatives in this bill, ongoing initiatives, that are vital to our country.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to respond to the gentleman from Michigan and say that my district borders Canada too, across Lake Erie. The planes fly over our border, and we go up to Michigan and we take the Ambassador Bridge and so forth up into Canada. So we share those concerns. But what we don't share is our dismay at the lack of transparency that characterizes the Bush administration. What exactly are they discussing with the Government of Canada, with the Government of Mexico and other governments in the Americas?

We have a right to know. We have a right to participate. We want transparency and disclosure on the SPP. Their secretiveness about what is going on is a deep concern. Vote for the Hunter-Kaptur amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the ranking member, it seems to me, makes some very good points. I know how concerned he is about the impact that this might have, that may be unintended consequences in relation to the northern border with a prohibition of this nature. I think we need to be concerned about unintended consequences in which worthwhile activities that we might want to support might be eliminated by it.

Mr. Chairman, reluctantly I am going to vote against this amendment.

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

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. 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.

AMENDMENT 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 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 6.3 percent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, we had asked unanimous consent earlier and were given unanimous consent that these amendments would be read. I didn't hear the amendment read.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the chairman.

The amendment before you would reduce the appropriations in the bill by \$3.2 billion, as was just read by the Clerk.

Even though the majority party will call this a "cut in spending," this is not a cut. This is simply returning the level of spending in this appropriations bill to last year's level. It is level funding, spending the same dollar amount we spent last year. Again, as I have articulated on this floor several times in the appropriations process on other pieces of legislation, it is exactly what all kinds of families across this country have to do.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the work of the committee. I don't bring this amendment because I don't appreciate the work that the committee does; I bring it because our country and our government do face a real financial challenge in the future. If we don't begin to get a handle on the spending that this Congress does and that our government does, we are going to have real problems.

The best way to begin to start that, when you think about the challenges and problems that loom in front of us, with entitlements, with Social Security, with Medicaid, with Medicare, the way to start that process, to get a handle on the fiscal crisis that is looming, is to start right here and say, you know what? It is probably not too much to ask for the Congress and for the Government of the United States to spend the same amount that they spent last year. That is why I bring this amendment forward.

I would also point out this: Inevitably, when you continue to increase spending and increase spending and increase spending, it always leads to greater taxes. People talk all the time about tax-and-spend politicians. In truth it is just the opposite. It is spend and tax. Spending drives the equation, and that is why we have to focus on spending if we don't want to raise taxes on the American people, which we surely don't want to do.

Yet the other party is talking about doing exactly that. All you have to do is look at recent press clippings where they talked about raising the tobacco

tax to deal with the SCHIP program. They have talked about raising taxes on the top marginal bracket to begin to address the AMT. Both are bad ideas for families, bad ideas for our economy, and not the direction we want to proceed.

Again, I bring this amendment forward because I think it is something that we have to begin to focus on as we look at the financial situation that is just around the corner for this country. All kinds of families, all kinds of taxpayers, all kinds of business owners have to live on last year's spending. It is not too much to ask our government to do the same. It is not too much to ask that our government do exactly what families all across this country have to do.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment is an amendment that reduces the overall funding in this legislation by \$3.2 billion, which is the amount of the budget as passed for the 2007 fiscal year by way of the continuing resolution that was passed back in February. In this process we have had a large number of holes in the legislation that had been presented to us by the President for this year, and in his budget was \$2.8 billion under the bill that we had presented here this evening.

In the process there are several items which are very similar and some which are quite different in reaching where we are in this legislation. In particular, the section 8 funding under HUD, we felt that we had to increase the funding for section 8, both for the Tenant-Based Housing Assistance program and for the Project-Based Housing Assistance program, by a substantial sum of money. That is done specifically because there was a change in the CR of the authorizations there for funding vouchers, and in order to make certain that every person had their vouchers and no one was going to lose rental assistance, it was necessary then to add about \$1 billion into tenant-based and project-based assistance in order to meet that and fill that need. That is one of the items.

We had also to very substantially increase the programs in transportation in order to reach the guarantees necessary for meeting SAFETEA-LU, which, of course, the President doesn't really care about.

So those items, which I think everybody in this Congress agrees with, have had to be increased and require that we not reduce the funding under the legislation to the level that has been suggested.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), the Republican Conference Chair.

Mr. PUTNAM. I thank my friend for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, let's take a little status report here. This is the eighth appropriations bill that has moved across this floor, which is commendable, since none have moved across the Senate floor. But it is easier to move legislation when there is no bottom line, when there are no constraints, when you can just put any amount of money into the spending bills. This bill marks the eighth step in the progression towards a \$1 trillion fiscal train wreck that is coming this fall because of the inability of the Democratic Congress to adhere to fiscal restraint.

There is a \$23 billion difference between what the Democratic Congress would fund and where the President's request is, something that has been dismissed in their letter to the President as "a mere 1 percent." Well, only in the fantasy land of Washington is \$23 billion pocket change.

□ 1845

It is vitally important that we restore fiscal accountability to Washington, and it begins with amendments like this one offered by my friend from Ohio that says let's just hold what we had last year. This bill proposes to spend almost 7 percent more than last year and almost 6 percent above what the President requested.

But what's the difference between that 1 percent? You say it is 7 and 6 percent. That is the difference between \$2.8 billion and \$3.2 billion. The difference between what this Congress would spend and what the President would spend is larger than most States' budgets that meet all of the needs of that State. This is the first step in this bill's process towards restoring the kind of commonsense fiscal accountability that Americans are starving for.

And when we get down into the weeds of these numbers, people just cloud up because it is so hard to comprehend that a mere 1 percent translates into tens of billions of dollars. But mark my words, ladies and gentlemen, the fiscal train wreck is coming this fall because of the inability of this Democratic-led House to restrain itself from spending billions more than are necessary to meet the needs of this government.

And what that will mean undoubtedly as part of their budget blueprint is higher taxes, taxes that will cripple our economy, taxes that will undo the record low unemployment rate, undo a 14,000 point Dow, undo record homeownership.

Mark my words, a trillion-dollar train wreck is coming if you don't adopt amendments like these.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID DAVIS).

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my

friend from Ohio for yielding and for his leadership.

I come from the mountains of east Tennessee. We have a lot of common sense in those mountains. We understand when you spend \$3.2 billion, that's a lot of money. We have men and women all around America right now sitting around their kitchen tables trying to decide just exactly how they are going to feed their children, how they are going to take care of their families, how they are going to pay the tuition and buy that next tank of gas.

We talked about in the last election that we are going to be providing a change here in Washington. I believe the freshmen Republicans that came into Congress with me this year are here to offer that change. The way we offer that change is quit spending as much as has been spent in the past. We can do that.

When we have an economy growing about 3 percent and this bill is going to grow by 6 or 7 percent, people understand you can't grow government at twice the rate of the American family's income. It just can't be done. We need to make sure that we use some commonsense when we put these budgets together. We can't spend more money than the American people can earn.

I think the American people did send us here to Washington to rein in that spending, get a handle on our fiscal House. I think this amendment by my friend from Ohio will go a long way towards doing that. This is not about a cut. This is simply about holding the line on spending.

The American people can understand if they have \$100 this year and somebody wants to grow it to \$200 next year but you can't afford it, and you say, "I can't give you \$200, but I will let you keep your \$100," if you kept that at \$100, that is not a cut. That is staying the same. That is what this amendment does. This simply says we are not going to grow that \$3.2 billion.

I thank the gentleman for his amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has 12½ minutes. The gentleman from New York has 17 minutes.

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire, does the gentleman from New York have any additional speakers on the amendment?

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that I have the right to close, and I am reserving to close.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, is he intending to close with a 17½ minute speech?

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SALI), a friend and freshman colleague.

Mr. SALI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, as I have walked around the halls of the office buildings for the House. I have noticed the signs that talk about the truth needing to be told regarding the majority's budget that was passed, the claim that while there is no tax increase in that budget, and technically that is true, Mr. Chairman. There is no language in that budget bill that says taxes are raised on anyone in any manner. There is no claim there are additional taxes. That language is not in that budget.

But the effect of that budget, Mr. Chairman, will be increased taxes. Why do I say that? Well, because the majority has been very vocal throughout the last year, through the last campaign season, that by golly, one of the things we need to do is get our spending under control, get this deficit problem under control.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the problem is not taxes at this point. The problem today, though, is the spending, because if the spending continues at the rate we are going, that the majority is proceeding, one of two things has got to happen: Either we have to increase deficit spending or we have to increase taxes to pay for it.

I would just point out that about \$1 in \$5 for the budget last year was deficit spending, so how does the majority intend to avoid deficit spending at the same rate that they criticized last year? And, in fact, how will they avoid increasing that deficit spending by spending more this year unless they intend to increase taxes. At some point that choice has got to be made.

Mr. Chairman, it starts with the spending. If we support this amendment, that will be a start in the right direction.

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, because the Democrats are so mesmerized by our presentation, we will continue. It is the first time I have known them to be speechless, but we will continue, and so I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Ohio for his leadership on this bill, and I am happy to come and lend my comments to the discussion.

Last year the Democrats got elected partly on the basis of their promise to cut spending. They made a big to-do about the fact that we were increasing spending. Republicans had done that. This is not cutting spending; this is holding the line on spending.

The eight appropriations bills that have passed the House so far are \$34 billion above last year's spending levels. That is not fulfilling the promises that they made to help hold the line and even cut spending. As my colleagues have said, this inevitably is going to lead to the largest tax increase in the history of this country.

Furthermore, in terms of this bill in particular, I have searched the Constitution and I see no role for the Federal Government in most of what is going to be funded in this bill. But the Democrats have never met a request for spending that they didn't like, and so they are going on willy-nilly increasing spending, putting the American taxpayer at risk, and increasing the deficit in this country; whereas, the tax cuts that were passed in 2001 and 2003 have led us to a very, very strong economy which we know is benefiting the American people right now.

Furthermore, none of the promises that they made about slowing the exploding growth of Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid that would result in deficit reduction have been dealt with in this Congress.

We have simply got to come to grips with the fact that we cannot tax the American people to the level at which they are being taxed and the level to which the Democrats want them to be taxed. We have to hold the line on spending, and I support this amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for posing this amendment.

The reason we are here today, Mr. Chairman, is because this is over-budget. Take a look at this bill right here. It is \$2.8 billion above the President's request and includes a \$3.1 billion boost for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. There are also some phony gimmicks in this spending bill.

As noted, the bill provides phony offsets for spending increases by rescinding budget authority with no outlay savings. So what you are doing, you are actually canceling something that doesn't really exist to show paper savings so you can spend it somewhere else. Now, this is an old trick that has been done on both sides of the aisle over the years, but it still doesn't make it right.

The problem we have with this bill, as the preceding bills and the following appropriations bills, is it is \$34 billion above last year's spending level just for what we have passed so far. That is \$19 billion above the President's request. This majority's spending bills are going to be \$81 billion above last year's spending level.

When you look at the budget resolution, this bill does conform to the budget resolution. It meets 302(b). What that means in budget talk is they are conforming to their budget. But what does their budget do? Their budget leads to the largest tax increase in American history.

If you accept these spending increases, which, on average, are 9 percent spending increases for discretionary spending, three times the rate of inflation, three times the rate of

wage growth, three times the ability for families to be able to afford this expense, three times the rate that our family incomes go up at best, if you accept these spending increases, that means you are accepting the plan in the budget, and the plan in the budget is to raise taxes. Not by a little bit, by a lot.

What tax increases are they specifically calling for in the budget resolution that this is a part of? Getting rid of the marriage penalty, bringing it back altogether; reducing the child tax credit in half; raising income tax rates across the board for every single working American and every single working family; bringing the death tax back in full force; raising taxes on capital gains and dividends, which makes it easier for people to save for retirement, and that creates jobs.

So the problem we have here, Mr. Chairman, is not a revenue problem. We have had double-digit revenue increases coming to the Federal Government for the past 3 years in a row.

□ 1900

The deficit just went down this year again by 18 percent because of faster revenue growth. So we don't have the problem with the money coming in. We don't need to raise taxes. Plenty of money is coming in to the coffers of Washington.

The problem we have is spending. We are just spending too much money too quickly. If we want to balance the budget without raising taxes, we have to control spending. That's the lesson we've learned.

Now, what does this bill do? This bill irresponsibly increases spending too fast. Are there important functions that are in this bill? Yes. Are there important things that the government needs to do, roads and bridges and transportation? Yes.

The problem I have with this bill is it doesn't have fiscal discipline. It doesn't contain a budget cap that makes sure we won't raise taxes.

So, by subscribing to the budget increases, the spending increases in the bill and the appropriations bills before it and the ones that are yet to come, it puts us on that glide path, on that trajectory to having the largest tax increase in American history. We don't want those taxes to be increased, and we sure don't want to support budgets that put us on the path to making it a sure thing, and that, Mr. Chairman, is why I think we should vote against this.

I think we should also have better budgeting. I don't think we should be rescinding phony budget authority to then use it for outlays. So, if we get rid of the gimmicks, this thing wouldn't even comport with the budget resolution itself.

So with that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 17 minutes.

The gentleman from Ohio has 4½ minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that there is no tax increase in this bill. The other side, Mr. Chairman, they went from saying that there is a tax increase to that this may put us on a trajectory to a tax increase, could be, possibly.

There is no tax increase in this bill. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, just a few comments before we use the remaining few minutes of our time as well.

Think about this. The ranking member of the Budget Committee pointed out the facts, what's in this bill, the numbers, the budget, and what's going on. But it's always important to come back and focus on how that translates into the lives of the American people and American families.

I think it's important just to remember and think about the typical family across this country. They go to work each day. They go to church on Sunday. They make their house payment. They make their car payment. Maybe they're paying their kids' private school. They're saving for college. They may be saving for a family vacation. They don't get an automatic 7 percent, in this particular bill \$3.2 billion, increase. They don't get that. They have to budget. They have to learn to live on less many times.

And that's all this amendment says is, you know what, let's just spend exactly what we spent last year, because if we don't. And we keep on this spending train that we're on, there will be tax increases. And then that family I just described, it's going to be tougher for them to pay for that vacation, pay for their kids' school, pay for the shoes for soccer practice and Little League and pay for all those things that families have to pay for. That's why this is important.

It begins to put us on the path to deal with the problems that are certainly going to be there if we don't start getting a handle on spending. That's why I bring the amendment forward. That's what all our speakers have talked about, because it's that important that we begin to do the right thing here.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio have any further speakers?

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, do I have the right to close?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. You do.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the chairman.

Has the gentleman yielded back his time?

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. The question from the Chair was do we have additional speakers. My response was no.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. I have the right to close.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has the right to close.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Is the gentleman from New York the only speaker?

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I am the final speaker, and I have the right to close.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Then I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, this is like a soap opera. It doesn't matter when the American people tune it in, turn it on, it's the same script, the same characters, the same plot, the dialogue.

Every week this small group of Members tries to offer these amendments, and every week they're defeated, defeated by the members of their own caucus.

This appropriations bill was passed by the Appropriations Committee on a bipartisan basis. Democrats and Republicans supported this bill because it has the right investments for the American family.

They support the notion that we should make sure that we have children in car seats that are safe. The gentleman's amendment would cut funding for car seat safety for our children.

They support the notion that we should make sure that our highways are safe. The gentleman's amendment would cut funding for highway safety.

They support the notion, Republicans and Democrats alike, that when you go to the airport, there should be enough inspectors to make sure that your plane is safe. The gentleman's amendment would cut the number of inspectors for airlines and increase delays at airports.

Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee alike agreed with the notion that elderly people who worked hard, raised their families, paid their dues should have a chance, a better chance, to get decent housing. The gentleman's amendment would cut that chance of decent housing for the elderly.

And Republicans and Democrats alike, who share commonsense values and compassion, also agree that if you're disabled, you should have a chance to get some decent housing. The gentleman's amendment would cut the chance of getting decent housing if you are disabled.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman talked about the common family and the values that they have. Let me suggest to the gentleman one thing, and then I will close.

This isn't really about the argument that the gentleman uses that we should cut spending. With all due respect, the gentleman was nowhere around when we spent and spent and spent and borrowed and borrowed and borrowed for special interests. I will talk about the typical American family.

This morning on the front page of the newspaper there was a story about how

huge tax breaks that some on the other side supported for the largest multinational corporations on Earth, that were promised to create jobs, did the opposite. Two years ago, according to the newspaper, when companies received a big tax break to bring home their offshore profits, the President and Congress justified it as a one-time tax amnesty that would create American jobs, but the companies did not create many jobs in return. Instead, since 2005, the American drug industry has laid off tens of thousands of workers in this country.

And so let's close by returning to that family. The gentleman may have a family in his district, a Jones family. Mr. Jones worked for one of those big multinational corporations that have a P.O. box in Bermuda to escape their fair share of taxes at home. Mr. Jones thought that that tax break to that big company was going to save his job. The company got the tax breaks. He got a pink slip.

Now, if that's not bad enough, the gentleman would propose that Mr. Jones, when he goes on the highway to try and find another job, that he's less safe; that Mrs. Jones, who's working at the Wal-Mart, when she straps her daughter into a car seat, that that car seat be less safe because of the cuts to those programs; if the Joneses have enough money to scrimp and save and maybe visit their parents or grandparents in another State, that they wait even longer to get on the plane, and that the plane not have the inspection as quickly as it needs to; and that if Mr. Jones' and Mrs. Jones' parents or grandparents want to have a decent roof over their heads, that they have to wait longer, in fact may not even qualify, because of the cuts in housing assistance for the elderly and the disabled.

The difference between us is that we want to invest in the American family, and the other side, not everybody on the other side, Republicans and Democrats alike, on a bipartisan basis, passed this bill to invest in the American family.

The sponsor of this amendment wants to continue giving giveaways to the richest special interests. We believe those funds are better spent with the American family.

That's what this is about, and that's why I'm so proud that Republicans and Democrats alike supported this bill in the Appropriations Committee and will defeat this amendment when it comes to the floor later.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

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. 20 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 20 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$507,767,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair, and I thank the leadership for the opportunity to bring this amendment forward.

This amendment is a very simple amendment. It's an amendment that has come to be known as the Hefley amendment, or at least came to be known as the Hefley amendment, a former Member of this body who offered an amendment to decrease appropriations bills by 1 percent in an effort to begin fiscal responsibility.

And it's my privilege to bring these amendments to the floor again in an effort to take that first step, take that first step to begin fiscal responsibility in this Chamber.

This is a good debate. It's a good debate that we have when we talk about how to spend hard-earned taxpayer money, because, Mr. Chairman, as you know, oftentimes in this Chamber, in fact, we've heard on some of these appropriations bills Members talk about their money, about my money. And it's always important that we remember whose money it is. It's not government money. It's not our money. It's the money of the hardworking American taxpayer.

So this amendment is very simple. It simply says that we ought to reduce by 1 percent the amount of money being spent in this particular appropriations bill. And to be clear, that is still a significant increase in spending over last year, but it's an attempt to begin fiscal responsibility.

One of the numbers, the numbers are that last year this portion of the appropriations bill spent \$47.5 billion. The President requested an increase to \$47.9 billion for this next fiscal year, and the committee itself brings forward a bill that will spend \$50.7 billion. That's \$3.2 billion more than last year.

So this amendment would say, well, we ought not spend \$50.7 billion. Let's see if we can't get a little fiscal responsibility and instead spend \$50.2 billion.

Again, it's not as far as many of us think we ought to go in an effort to try

to be more responsible with spending the hard-earned American taxpayers' money, but it is a step in the right direction. It is a step along the line of fiscal responsibility. It is a recognition. It would be the beginning of a recognition that this is not Congress's money, that it is the money of the hardworking American taxpayer.

On many of these bills we seem to get a few more votes each time. I'm hopeful that at some point this House will make a statement, that this House will make a statement and say, yes, we do believe that, in fact, moving forward under the banner of fiscal responsibility dictates that we respect the hard work of the American taxpayer and, in fact, accept one of these amendments as we move forward.

So with that I think it's a common-sense amendment. It's a problem-solving amendment. It's an amendment that speaks to what the American family would do when they have some fiscal challenges, and that is to overall reduce the amount of money that they spend.

So, with that, I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague Dr. PRICE for offering this amendment. Certainly the American people can relate to this amendment. It simply says that we will not spend 1 percent of the bill as currently written, 1 percent. Well, that equates to \$500 million, a substantial sum of money even in the context of the Federal budget.

What we have in Washington, D.C., is a spending problem. We don't have a problem with income to government. The government will receive about \$2.7 trillion this year on a Federal budget that actually spends \$2.9 trillion.

□ 1915

What is absolutely fascinating about this is that there are only two countries on Earth with whole economies that are larger than the Federal Government here in Washington, D.C., and that is the governments of Germany and Japan. When we talk about China and the growing threat of China's economy, well, look at the size of the Chinese economy. The whole economy of China is \$1.9 trillion. What we have here in Washington D.C. is certainly a spending problem.

What this amendment proposed by Dr. PRICE says is that we should be able to slip off just a little bit of that spending, just a little bit, show the American taxpayers that we can tighten the

belt just ever so slightly, which means, instead of eating that whole cake, which is what the Democrat leadership proposes for dessert, eating that whole cake, we are just going to take off just a little bit of the icing, just a taste of the icing, rather than eating that whole cake.

Now, certainly we can do that. Certainly the American people understand the Federal Government could save 1 percent. Every family budget across America can save 1 percent.

I urge my colleagues, even the liberal Democrats on the other side of the aisle, my friends from the other side of the aisle who said that we want to spend more and more and more. They certainly can say we will, when we are increasing spending so rapidly, what the Democrats are doing here, we could say that just 1 percent, we will take off 1 percent right off the top.

So I urge my colleagues to support this reasonable and commonsense measure that shows some level of restraint, even with bloated Democrat spending in Washington, D.C.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire whether it's the intention of the gentleman from Ohio to close when he speaks.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is my intention. I am the final speaker.

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

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, for yielding the time and for bringing up this amendment.

Each time he does, of course, I am reminded of our former colleague, our great friend, Joel Hefley from Colorado who brought this amendment up in past Congresses.

Mr. Chairman, I didn't understand, perhaps I would have to admit, the full significance and importance of what he was trying to do, and that was just to, in a very, very, very modest way, curtail the spending spree that we have here in Washington, that spending spree that our friend and colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, was just explaining.

Of course, this is a modest effort, 1 percent on one spending bill. We know that the real issue here in Washington is the explosion in entitlement spending. The gentleman from New York earlier said that there was no tax increase in this bill. Of course, we understand that. This isn't a tax bill; this is a spending bill.

But it is tied to a budget, to a budget that significantly did one thing: it brought us the largest tax increase in American history. Yes, that tax increase won't hit in a significant way in this year, but in order to make that budget balance, it was necessary to bring us the largest tax increase in American history so that by the end of the budget period, the budget could balance.

The other thing that budget had, or, more significantly, did not have, it didn't have anything to constrain entitlement spending. Well, it did. It had a small piece, a very small piece, where there was an effort to save less than \$1 billion in entitlement spending; and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle stepped up to the plate to save that less than \$1 billion and created nine new entitlement spending programs.

We do have a spending problem here, and that is followed by an enormous taxing problem. This is a spend-and-tax issue that I think the American people can understand. Their budgets aren't growing by 7 percent. The Federal Government is growing its spending by more than that. This effort by my good friend from Georgia is, indeed, a modest effort.

This is a tiny, let's save one penny, one penny on the dollar that this spending bill has. We can't seem to find a way to save that one penny, and yet we are letting entitlement spending grow by trillions of dollars.

I think the American people are going to grow increasingly aware that we have an unfunded liability in entitlement spending of trillions and trillions of dollars, well over \$50 trillion.

So this is a modest effort, but I would call on my colleagues to take this tiny step that Mr. Hefley brought us in the past and that my colleague, Mr. PRICE, has brought us here.

Let's support the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. I just wanted to respond to the gentleman who had just spoken.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota has mentioned twice in the comments that he has made, at least twice in the comments, that, again, the idea that this budget that we are dealing with has somehow inherent in it the largest tax increase in American history, twice he has made that comment.

Well, the budget that we are dealing with has no increase in taxes whatsoever related to it. I think the gentleman understands that. In fact, even the budget resolution that guides the budgeting this year for all of our bills, all of our discretionary budget legislation, that budget resolution does not have any tax increase in it either. I think the gentleman understands that as well.

We are making messages here that are really not correct. They are simply not accurate. They are simply not true.

I want to make a couple of points. I want to remind the gentleman and others from the other side who have spoken that since President Bush took office, the national debt has increased by over \$3 trillion, \$3 trillion, over 3, it's closer to \$3.3 trillion. That's 3 with 12 zeros behind it.

Some people have a difficult time understanding a three with six zeros be-

hind it. That's \$1 million. But \$3 trillion, with 12 zeros behind it is \$1 million, million dollars.

That debt increase of \$3 trillion that has occurred in the 6 years that President Bush has been in power in the Presidency, that ends up costing us, the American people, us as a Nation, \$100 billion each and every year in additional deficit, which is what has happened, an additional deficit, every year \$100 billion each year, which is some 200 times the amount of money that is being suggested ought to be cut from this one little budget that we are talking about that provides money for a whole series of very important initiatives that serve the American people.

To close, I could go on substantially on the debt, but the \$500 million that has been suggested that should be cut from this budget, this one simple budget that funds housing and transportation programs of the government, this one budget, if one compares the \$500 million, that two pieces of the budget, the \$500 million is essentially the same money that we had to put back in the budget because Amtrak would have shut down.

\$500 million is about the same amount of money as was put into that. It is about one half of the money that was put back in to make certain that not a single family, low-income family, people who are living with incomes of under 30 percent of the adjusted median income in their areas, one half of the amount of money that would allow all of those people who had vouchers and who are getting rental assistance, in that very low-income category, to maintain their vouchers for the next year.

It is also a sum of money which is somewhat less than the amount that we had to put back into the budget to bring it up to these levels, to the 2007 enacted level at \$700 million, or the Community Development Block Grant program, which provides money to virtually every community in the country, larger cities, by direct distribution from the Federal Government through Housing and Urban Development, but also to many smaller cities and communities, even quite small communities, through the money that's distributed to the States who then give it back to those communities in order to build affordable housing and build public facilities in their communities.

It is very close to the amount of money that is included in this budget and provides for the construction of elder housing, housing for the disabled and housing for distressed public housing as well.

So that is what is involved in \$500 million at this point. I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) for purposes of setting the record straight.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time. I appreciate that because I would like

to respond to the gentleman from Massachusetts on just a couple of points.

One, we had a number of discussions on zeros and what that means when we talk about the debt, nine zeros, 12 zero, six zeros, I would say there are a lot of American families that are concerned about five zeros and what the impact of the tax increase is going to have on that.

With all respect to my friend from Massachusetts, the Democrat budget does have the largest tax increase in American history. In order to make that budget balance, all of the tax relief which we have worked so hard to achieve in the last few years, and which is behind the growth and the economy, all that would go away, tax relief for married families, tax relief for every American worker who pays taxes. All that's erased in the Democrat's budget that is behind this spending bill that we are in today.

I think he helps me make the point that this is, when he talks about trillions of dollars, that this bill, that this amendment is a very modest step in curtailing that spending.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, if I may inquire as to the amount of time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 11 minutes. The gentleman from Ohio has 20 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, this budget proposal isn't a real surprise; it's business as usual for the Democrats and proves that their promises to be fiscally responsible are just empty rhetoric. If this budget, along with the other budgets that we have been approving, are approved, it signals a return to the Democrats' beloved tax-and-spend model for government. They are very happy to try to run the lives of all Americans from the Federal level.

The 2001 and 2003 tax cuts have produced a real decrease in the tax burden on North Carolina's married couples, single parents, and families. Almost every taxpayer, low-income, married, single or self-employed, will lose valuable tax cuts under the assumptions made in the Democrat budget proposal earlier this year, and that would cover the costs that are in this budget tonight.

The economy is booming. The stock market is doing great. People's 401(k) plans are increasing tremendously. But they want to stop that because they want to spend your money. They think they know better how to spend your money than you know how to spend your money.

The Federal Government doesn't have a revenue problem. Revenues increased by 14.5 percent in 2005, 11.6 percent in 2006, and they are projected to grow by an additional \$167 billion, or 7

percent, this year, according to the latest OMB estimate.

Again, the economy is booming, things are going great, but the Democrats would put a halt on that with their profligate spending. To put it another way, the Federal Government is projected to collect \$800 billion more in revenue in 2007 than was just the case 4 years ago, \$2.6 trillion in 2007 compared to \$1.8 trillion in 2003.

□ 1930

We need to slow down spending and allow the American people to keep more of their money. They know how to spend it better than Federal bureaucrats do.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And I just want to say to the gentleman from North Carolina that the absolute platinum standard for fiscal irresponsibility lies squarely on the shoulders of her party and the Presidents of her party.

The national debt for this country when President Carter left office in 1981 was less than \$1 trillion. The national debt 12 years later, in the case of President Carter, that represents the debt that had been reached over 180 years of American history. Twelve years later, the national debt when the first President Bush left office was \$4.3 trillion, more than four times as much, more than quadrupling the total national debt. That is the gold standard of fiscal irresponsibility.

And then we had 8 years of President Clinton, and the national debt went up another \$1.2 trillion, about a 25 percent increase in the national debt in the 8 years that he was President.

But then, under the present President Bush and the Congress of his party in control during those years, the national debt has gone up \$3.3 trillion more, a total of about two-thirds more, 67 or 68 percent more in debt. That is the platinum standard in debt increase and in fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my friend from Texas, the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, Mr. HENSARLING.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I must admit, every time I come to the floor and a Democrat lectures me on fiscal responsibility, I feel like I am having an Alice in Wonderland experience; and that is because the deficit is the symptom, it is spending that is the disease. And so we have Democrats come to the floor and say, well, when you Republicans were in power, you spent too much. Well, some of us Republicans agree. So what is your answer, Mr. Chairman? Well, they want to spend even more.

For the last 10 years, look at the record. Every time the Republicans offer one budget, the Democrats offer a

budget that spends even more. And then they say it is fiscally irresponsible that the national debt went up from \$5 trillion to \$8 trillion. I don't like that a bit. But, guess what? Because the Democrats' budget was stone cold silent on entitlement spending, the national debt unfunded obligations is \$50 trillion. So I will be glad to accept responsibility for \$3 trillion when my friends on the other side of the aisle accept responsibility for their \$50 trillion.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I continue to reserve my right to close.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am tempted to ask my good friend from Ohio whether it is the final right to close, or whether it is otherwise.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I will continue to reserve my right to close, unless my chairman wants more time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to my good friend from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I like us being pleasant with each other.

I think this is a fascinating debate and an important debate, and, quite frankly, I have watched it unfold over the bills earlier this year. And the reality is, in Washington, nobody has the high ground on spending.

When I and my colleagues as fiscal conservatives get up on this side and say cut spending, as we are in this amendment by a mere 1 percent, it is absolutely fair and absolutely true for my colleagues to get up on the other side, as they have done and done well, and lecture us about spending. You guys are the, to use the words a moment ago, platinum standard on spending. And in many ways they are absolutely right.

I note with chagrin that because neither Republicans nor Democrats have the high ground on spending, something has to be done, and I would suggest at some point we have to begin. Maybe it is with this amendment, maybe it is not with this amendment, maybe it is with something else. But let's talk about spending.

On our watch, on the Republicans' watch, family income grew from 1995 to 2004 by 8.2 percent. Pretty good. Not bad. We could all wish it had been better. But what did Republicans do on spending? Republicans grew Federal outlays by a staggering 25 percent. You are right, we don't have much high ground to talk about. But when, then, will we start? And who will it be that starts?

Your side of the aisle encouraged the American people by saying, JAMES CLYBURN, Democratic House chairman, said in a press release on October 10, 2006: "Democrats offer a new direction which includes fiscal responsibility."

Speaker-elect NANCY PELOSI in a press release November 16 said: "We will work together to lead the House of Representatives with a commitment to integrity, to civility, which we have

seen a little bit of tonight, and to fiscal responsibility."

And Majority Leader STENY HOYER said: "It is imperative to the future of our Nation, and I agree with him, that we come together, Democrats and Republicans, and restore fiscal responsibility."

There are some hard facts that both sides have to deal with. Those hard facts include: As we stand here debating this bill, it will increase spending by 6.7 percent over last year, this particular bill. That is nearly three times the rate of inflation. It might be less than Republicans grew the spending in some occasions; but nonetheless, if we keep growing spending at three times the rate of inflation, we will double the size of this government in a short 10 years.

I would simply suggest that neither Republicans nor Democrats can defend putting that kind of a tax burden on our economy and on our taxpayers and sustain it. And I would suggest that the respected leaders of the Democrats' party, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, acknowledged that when they said it is time to restore fiscal responsibility.

This kind of an explosion in Federal spending is simply not sustainable. Now, I have listened to my colleagues on the other side say, well, you guys spend in this area or that area. Now you want to cut here. You come in and say, we spent in an inappropriate way on, call it corporate subsidies, call it tax giveaways, whatever it is. So be it. That is fair criticism, too.

But the question I think that presents itself to all of us, Republican and Democrats alike, is: When do we reduce spending?

If you don't want to reduce spending on this bill by 1 percent or on the next amendment by one-half percent, then where are we going to cut spending? Because at the end of the day, this economy, I do not believe, will sustain, whether it is driven by Republicans or Democrats, a continued growth of three times the rate of inflation.

The average American gets by without anywhere near that kind of an increase in their spending. The average American's budget doesn't double in that short a period of time. It doesn't go up by 6.7 percent per year. And it seems to me, whether it is on your watch on this bill, on your watch on a different bill, or on our watch someday down the line, we have got to rein in government spending, or we will cripple this economy. And if you want to change the priorities and spend in different places, that is your right. You are the majority. But somebody, whether it is you or whether it is us, has got to reduce the level of spending, because it simply isn't sustainable.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes; the gentleman from Ohio has 18 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the chairman.

I think this has been a healthy presentation from this side. The muted response from the other side is understandable.

When you have instituted in your budget the largest tax increase in the history of the Nation, when you continue to increase the spending at a rate that is greater than inflation, greater than the increase in population for our Nation, then the response, I suspect, ought to be muted.

My good friend from Ohio has said he will close, and I look forward to that response. I am reminded, prior to him standing up, though, that a wise individual once said: When you don't have the facts on your side, then you ought to raise your voice, and you ought to raise it very loud. And so I ask my colleagues to pay attention to what is about to come.

I do want to recognize what my good friend from Texas said, though, and that was talk about Alice in Wonderland. I have dubbed it Orwellian democracy that we are involved in here. My friend from Massachusetts talks about the railing against the Republicans who spent too much and increased the debt. And so what is the response to that? It is to increase it even further, spend more money. They use the grand line of we are interested in investing in the American family. Well, Mr. Chairman, the American families all across this Nation know that when the majority party, when the Democrats talk about investing, what they mean is to hold on to your wallet because that means that taxes are coming; and the budget indeed includes the largest tax increase in the history of the Nation.

This bill, this bill in and of itself, a \$3.2 billion increase, 6.7 percent over last year. Why is it that we can't just decrease that by 1 percent? By 1 percent. Is that too much to ask?

Mr. Chairman, I would urge you, if you have any questions about what kinds of money we are talking about, it is H.R. 3074, you can go on line. You can find this bill on line, and you can go to any line item. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, when you do that, that if you take any specific line item and you say to yourself, is it possible that they might be able to get by with 1 percent less, 1 penny out of a dollar, \$1 out of every \$100? Again, that is what American families all across this Nation do. When they find themselves in a little bit of financial difficulty, when they find that their wallet is a little pinched, what they do is they look at their expenditures and they say, we are going to have to cut back. And that is exactly what we, the American family, want to do is to cut back.

That is what this is. This is a sincere and a commonsense attempt to try to begin fiscal responsibility here in the House of Representatives. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his fine arguments, and all of the gentlemen and ladies who have made their presentation here tonight. And I would also like to thank the Appropriations Committee for the Transportation and HUD bill. This was passed out of committee in a bipartisan way unanimously with Democrats and Republicans. So, again, we come to the floor to have a discussion with a very small group of fringe Members from the other side, Mr. Chairman, so that we can continue to get fiscal responsibility lectures from the Republican Party.

Now, getting lectures on fiscal responsibility from the Republican Party is like getting lectures on animal welfare from Michael Vick. It really doesn't have any credibility. It really doesn't have any credibility.

So we need to look at what the two different approaches here. And I am not going to be long because we have a lot of votes tonight, and we want to get the Members out of here as soon as possible.

There is a difference in philosophy, and the bottom line is this: There are certain things that individual members of our society cannot do. One of them is build a road. Another is build a bridge. And others that we have already had discussions about are going to college and being able to afford college and making sure some families have loans to go to college. And that is what we are here for. That is what we are here for. We are here to do the things that individual citizens cannot do for themselves, and that is what is included in this bill.

We have had talks about trillion-dollar train wrecks coming up, and I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona stating the fact that, yes, the party in power over the past 6 years, \$3 trillion was borrowed primarily from China, Japan, and OPEC countries.

□ 1945

And our friends on the other side had to go to the Treasury Department and ask for the debt limit to be raised so that they could go out and borrow more money. So the lectures have all been given and we've heard them, and we'll probably hear them again later this week and we'll probably hear them again next week.

One of the Members mentioned entitlement spending. It was the Republican Party, Mr. Chairman, who passed the largest increase in entitlement spending with the Medicare part D. And you want to talk about fiscal irresponsibility; they passed it without even giving the Secretary of Health and Human Services the ability to negotiate down the drug prices. That is the platinum standard for fiscal irresponsibility.

So we move forward. What would this cut do? What would this 1 percent cut?

And as the gentleman from New York stated earlier a few of the programs, I think it's important that the Members

know what exactly is going to be cut here. Safety belt performance grants, going to be cut. Occupant protection incentive grants, going to be cut. State traffic safety information system improvement grants, going to be cut. All of the investments in future growth.

In aviation, the inspectors, the budget for inspectors in aviation for this country will be cut under this amendment. There will be less inspectors inspecting the maintenance of our airplanes than there would normally be if this amendment doesn't pass.

Transportation, Housing and Urban Development programs. Airport safety grants under this amendment will be cut. There'll be less money for airports. \$6.9 billion in this bill for air traffic services. That will be cut.

Continue on. Rail, passenger rail grants, those will be cut. Improvement and safety grants, those will be cut.

This is the kicker. Housing for the elderly. That will be cut under this amendment. Housing for the elderly will be cut under this amendment.

And we don't say that these are going to be cuts just because they're going to be cuts, and we're not saying we're spending money on these programs just to spend money. This is the difference.

I think this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is very simple and it sounds good. Why can't we just cut 1 percent across the top of this budget?

There's changes going on in the world that make it a little more complex than we would normally think it is. I'll give you some examples. Traveling on our Nation's highways has grown by 94 percent from 1980 to 2005, from 1.5 trillion miles to 3 trillion miles. Of course you're going to need to spend a little bit more money if you have more people on the roads and you have more roads.

Now, the congestion has resulted in 2.3 billion extra gallons of fuel being burnt. That means \$794 per commuter. Now, there's no way a commuter can get the \$300 tax cut that they got a few years ago and go out and somehow fix the congestion problem. There's no way to do that.

We had this same discussion with brownfields. An individual citizen can't clean up a brownfield. You need the Federal investment.

And when you're talking about elderly housing, the elderly population in the United States, Mr. Chairman, is going to grow over the next 25 years by millions and millions and millions of seniors, so it's important that we make these investments.

Another program that will be cut is housing for the disabled. 49.7 million Americans live with a disability. Forty-three percent of those are women. Forty percent of men 65 and older have disabilities. If they had the money to pay for it themselves, they would pay for it and we wouldn't need to be here.

We're making these bipartisan investments, Republicans and Democrats, on the Appropriations Com-

mittee to help move the country forward. And one of the key approaches that we've had when we started this year, under the leadership of Chairman OBEY, is to figure out what the world's going to look like in 10 years so that the investments we make today will have our society ready to compete in the global economy 10 years from now, 20 years from now.

And the bottom line is, this bill here reflects the values of this country, passed by Democrats and Republicans in the committee. And those 1 percent cuts may not mean a whole lot to me, may not mean a whole lot to the chairman, but if you're an adult with a disability, elderly senior, if you're a disabled citizen of this country, if you use the aviation system.

How do you fix the aviation system by yourself? You need to do that together, and that's the investment that we make here. So I appreciate the difference in philosophy.

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. 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 OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$253,690,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, we've had an interesting discussion here tonight. I am offering an amendment that would propose to reduce the amount by one-half of 1 percent, a mere 50 cents on \$100.

As we look at this appropriations bill, this is \$3.2 billion over last year, or a 6.7 percent increase. My amendment would take it to a 6.2 percent increase.

As we think about this, I hear many things from my friends on the other side of the aisle about "investments." You can use that word euphemistically when we talk about investments, be-

cause what I'm thinking when I hear that word is tax increase on the American family.

We hear many worthy things that this money will be spent for, but there is a philosophical difference in this chamber. And as my friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, talk about us being fringe Members over here, what they're acknowledging is that we were not part of the spending problem for our party. We were the folks in the back of the room raising our hand and saying, we are spending too much money.

We do not have a revenue problem. We have a spending problem. As we've seen in recent years under different Presidents and different Congresses, when we lower the tax rate, the revenues increase. So we don't have a revenue problem. What we have is this spending problem.

But my friends on the other side of the aisle, as they spoke tonight, Mr. Chairman, they talked about the needs of disabled people and elderly people and safety and highway issues and air travel, but what we have to admit in this Chamber tonight is that there is a finite amount of money, Mr. Chairman. And it doesn't matter how worthy the spending is. There is a finite amount of money.

When individuals in this country get up in the morning, get their children ready for school and then they go off to work, they realize that they have to work a long portion of the year to pay their taxes. And every time we have another appropriation bill in front of us, we're getting to the point in this Chamber where it's nearly \$82 billion over last year's spending. And the American family knows that they're going to have to work longer in the year before they work long enough to pay their taxes, Mr. Chairman. And I think no matter how worthy the spending is, we need to exercise some fiscal discipline.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have said it half jokingly, but referred to us as fringe Members of Congress. And I have to tell you, sometimes we have to be tenacious about reminding our colleagues how we're going down a road where we're going to have that fiscal train wreck. And I am happy to offer this modest proposal tonight to cut this increase, to lower the increase from 6.7 to 6.2 percent increase and exercise the fiscal discipline that I truly believe the American families, the citizens of this country that pay these taxes want us to have.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman oppose the amendment?

Mr. SCHIFF. Yes, I do.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the chairman of the committee for his superb work on

the bill and the chairman of the full committee, as well as the subcommittee.

I'm going to reserve the balance of my time, but I do want to acknowledge what the gentlelady has said before reserving the balance of our time, and that is, there is a deep philosophical difference between the Members of the minority party who are here today and those of us speaking in opposition to the amendment. And of course there's a philosophical difference between the Members that are here on the floor today and their fellow Republicans in committee who unanimously supported this bill, those Republicans on the committee and in the House as a whole who have made every effort to work with Democrats and find common ground in dealing with the fiscal challenges that we face, but also recognizing the need to invest in America as our parents' generation did and as their parents did.

Yes, there's a philosophical difference. We're facing a constrained fiscal environment. We've got to get our budget in balance. Some here on the floor tonight we'll hear say, well, we can afford to balance that budget by taking it out of funds for the elderly or taking it out of funds for the homeless, taking it out of funds that help serve Native Americans, taking it out of funds that would make our aircraft more safe.

That's a philosophical difference, I think, with a bipartisan majority of this House that thinks that those aren't the right places to find savings, that we ought to look elsewhere. We ought to look, for example, at the generous corporate welfare payments that we make at a time when the oil industry, for example, has not only had record profits of the year or record profits of the decade, but record profits in the entire history of the oil industry. And not just the history of the oil industry, but record profits of any corporation at any time in the history of the world.

Now, that corporate welfare, my friends on the philosophical other side of this issue don't want to touch. That's sacrosanct. They won't cut those historic profits by 6 percent, or by 1 percent or even by a half of one percent because that's contrary to the philosophy. But they're more than willing to cut those who are desperately in need. And that's where we do have the divide. It's what I will be addressing when I conclude the remarks on our side of the aisle.

But at this point, I will reserve the balance of our time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to yield 4 minutes to my friend from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I recall last term in the 109th Congress in the Budget Committee where I served the gentleman from Minnesota who's no longer with us, Mr. Gutknecht, who made a point with regard to spending by this House

and Washington, D.C. You know, in that committee you could always put up charts on the wall with regard to spending, chart A on mandatory spending or B on discretionary spending or health care or other spending. You would put them all up there. And Gil one time went through all the charts and he said, now, can you put up the chart of all the people and lobbyists that come down to Washington to ask for a reduction in their program and spending? And of course they put up a blank screen. Of course, Gil's point was, no one ever comes to Washington, no lobbyist ever comes before the House or committee and says that their program should see a flatlining or a reduction in their programs. And that's really the point here tonight, and it has been all last week.

We are here to set the priorities because everyone that comes to every Member of Congress looks for us to spend more on them, and so we must set priorities because they won't do it for us. So just as the American family has to set priorities, we do. Just as the American family says, we're not going to buy a cable TV system and a Dish TV system and a satellite TV system, we're going to set priorities, pick one if we can afford it. Maybe we can't afford it at all. And when it comes to heating our house, we're not going to have electric heat and hot water heat and coal heat and gas heat. We're going to pick one, hopefully the most efficient. That's what families do. And we would hope that Congress does the exact same thing with the money. Set priorities.

And this amendment really just calls us on doing that, looking to see, not a 6.7 percent increase but a 6.2 percent increase and try to set priorities.

□ 2000

Now, the other side of the aisle says, well, we are being stingy with all these programs if we are not able to go up by a 6.7 percent increase.

I would suggest to the other side of the aisle maybe they are not looking at the right side of the ledger, the right side of the equation. Look at the families who have to pay for all these inefficient, duplicative, and unnecessary programs that they want to spend taxpayer dollars on. Look instead at the American family when it comes to education.

When it comes to education, well, if they do successfully pass the largest tax increase in U.S. history, which they are about to do, the American family is going to have to see their educational spending cut. The American family is going to have to decide whether they can send all of their children to college or not.

The other side should look at the issue of health care for the American family because what they want to do is tell the American taxpayer, you have to cut your spending on health care. Maybe you have a child that needs new braces or glasses or something like that. Well, with their tax increases, the

American family is asked to cut their spending.

How about housing? The other side of the aisle would say the same thing. Maybe it is a young family trying to start off to save enough money to buy their first house. Well, the other side of the aisle would like to raise their taxes on them so that they can put these duplicative programs through, and they will not be able to afford their housing.

Finally, most importantly, after the other side puts on all these burdens when it comes to cutting the taxpayer with regard to education or health care or housing, the biggest burden is on time. When the Democrats raise the largest tax increase in American history on the American family, what they are also doing is taking away time from the American family because now families which weren't working two jobs now have to work two jobs. Families that weren't working overtime before now have to work overtime just to pay for the extra burden that this government in Washington, under Democrat leadership, is imposing on them.

So the most basic thing we could all look for, time with our family, is being robbed, is being taxed, is being taken away from the American family just so we can implement what the Democrats see as necessary, but truthfully we have shown are not priorities, truthfully are unnecessary, duplicative, hugely increased, inefficient programs.

Let's focus again back on the American family. Let's focus again back on allowing them to have time with their family and put the burden where it should be.

I support this amendment and encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do so as well.

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my friend from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I have heard many interesting things from the other side of the aisle tonight. I am reminded that people are entitled to their own opinions, but they shouldn't be entitled to their own facts.

I hear a lot of accusations that we have amendments tonight that cut Federal spending. I kind of wish it were true. But last I looked, we had an amendment that level-funded this bill, that spent the same amount of money this year as last year. Now we had an amendment that would increase funding in this bill 5.7 percent. Now we have an amendment that would increase spending up to 6.2 percent. Now, it is less than what the gentleman from Massachusetts desires, and so I guess under his definition that if you spend less money than somebody in the universe desires, that is a cut. So I think, one, we ought to have the facts on the table.

Second of all, I have heard many Democrats bristle at the idea that

their budget resolution included the single largest tax increase in American history. Well, don't take my word for it, Mr. Chairman. The Washington Post, not exactly known as the leading conservative publication in America, wrote: "And while House Democrats say they want to preserve key parts of Bush's signature tax cuts, they project a surplus in 2012 only by assuming that all these cuts expire on schedule in 2010." Now, that is the Washington Post, which most people view as one of the more liberal newspapers in America. That's what they say.

Now, my friends from the other side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, may say we are not raising taxes; we are just letting tax cuts expire. Well, Mr. Chairman, if you have the same salary or wage next year as you had last year, but somehow your tax burden is greater, I can tell you this much: Anybody in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas is going to call that a tax increase.

Now, something that my friends from the other side of the aisle don't seem to get, because they say that we need money for housing, we need money for transportation, we need money for that, there is another budget in America that funds housing, that funds transportation. Mr. Chairman, that is the family budget. And the only budget that is being cut tonight is the American family budget, and it is being cut by Democrat colleagues.

I talk to a lot of hard-working people in my congressional district, in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, and I hear from them because more spending like what is included in this bill fuels more taxes, the largest single tax increase in American history. And I ask them, how is this tax increase going to impact your family budget?

So I hear from people like the Peterson family in Van, Texas: "If you divide the amount by 12 months of the year, this tax increase comes out to \$229.58 per month. I am a widow, full-time college student, and single mother of a growing preteen boy. This amount would be impossible to squeeze out of my already overextended monthly income . . . This monthly amount is more than half of my monthly vehicle installment . . . A tax increase of that magnitude would mean that something would have to be given up in my household."

That is the budget that is being cut here, Mr. Chairman. The Peterson family in Van, Texas, they are having their budget cut. They are having their transportation budget cut. They can't afford their monthly car payments because of this bill, which, even though they deny it, is part of the single largest tax increase in American history.

Or from the Jordan family in Forney, Texas, in my district: "All of us have been affected by large increases in the price of gas for our cars, electricity rates, cost of water, and cost of food. My husband and I both drive older ve-

hicles and turn up our thermostat to uncomfortable levels . . . This tax increase reinforces the feeling that elected leaders could care less about the struggles of families trying to avoid going into ever-increasing debt."

Well, guess what? I agree, because once again we have a bill brought to the floor by the Democrat majority that is going to cut the family budget, that is going to cut the Jordan budget in Forney, Texas. And there are family budgets all across America that are going to be cut because this bill spends too much of the people's money. It takes away from their housing priorities, it takes away from their transportation priorities to fuel the government's, Washington's, view of their priority.

And that is why you are either part of the problem, or you are part of the solution. And the gentlewoman from Colorado's amendment is part of the solution, and we should adopt it.

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Colorado has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 3½ minutes to my friend from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I stand in full support of her amendment to cut one-half of 1 percent from a \$51 billion appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago when my colleague from Georgia had an amendment that wanted to cut 1 percent, 1 percent, 1 penny on the dollar, you ruled that the voice vote was enough, that the Democratic majority had rejected my colleague from Georgia's amendment to just cut 1 penny. And now my colleague from Colorado, you won't accept that. So we are asking you would you cut 50 cents, one-half of 1 percent?

When my colleague from Georgia was talking, the gentleman from Ohio called us this "fringe group" on that side of the aisle. This "fringe group." Well, Mr. Chairman, I am a proud member of that fringe group, as well as another 104 Members on this side of the aisle that are part of that fringe group, indeed, the majority of the minority. The gentleman from Ohio, who is part of that fringe group, the 30-Some-things, the next time I say that to him, I will say I am paying him a compliment. He is too young to remember the song from the musical "Oklahoma": "The Surrey With the Fringe on Top." But it is that fringe on top of the surrey that makes that carriage so beautiful that it is going to deliver some fiscal responsibility to the great people of this country.

And how many times, Mr. Chairman, have you seen a spot on television or

the radio where they tug at your heartstrings by asking, won't you just give 1 penny to the children, or won't you just give 1 penny to the starving people in Bangladesh, or won't you just give 1 penny to the veterans, or won't you give 1 penny to this group or that group? And what we are saying on this side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, is won't you just return 50 cents to the hardworking taxpayers of this country who are sweating, slaving, and working every day trying to make ends meet?

And as the gentlewoman from Colorado pointed out, this is not a cut. This is just reducing the increase from 6.7 percent of what we spent in fiscal year 2007 to 6.2 percent. And say to my friends, the Democratic majority, who want to increase spending \$81 billion in this fiscal year, when they are complaining about an \$8.9 trillion debt, how does that make sense, if you are concerned about the debt, and you have got these signs all over the Capitol, and you want to increase spending \$81 billion?

Let's get real. Let's get real. We asked you to cut 3 percent; you won't do that. We asked you to cut 1 percent; you won't do that. You won't even give a penny back. And we ask you to give half of a penny now in the gentlewoman's amendment from Colorado. It is the compassionate thing to do.

Vote "yes" on this amendment.

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this amendment. It is an amendment that I hope all our colleagues understand. It would reduce the increase in spending not by 3 percent, not by 1 percent, but by one-half of 1 percent. Now, it is not a cut.

The word "cut" gets misused on this floor, and we have heard it misused and misused and misused and misused here tonight. No one is proposing a cut.

We just heard a long discussion about how the last amendment was going to cut spending for airport security. It was going to cut spending for housing for the elderly. It was going to cut spending for this program and that program and the other program.

Let's assume every single one of those programs is a very worthy program. There is no doubt that they are. They are indeed very worthy programs. But not a single amendment has been proposed tonight, not one amendment, not one amendment proposed by my colleagues, would cut spending. Every single amendment proposed by this side, every single amendment proposed by my colleagues over here who have said we want to change the bill a tiny amount, would increase spending, but we would reduce the increase by a tiny amount.

□ 2015

Only in Washington can a reduction in an increase be called a cut with a straight face.

This bill grows spending by 6.7 percent. Almost no American is going to get an increase in their income this year, in their salary this year of 6.7 percent. So we said wait, wait, let's reduce the increase. We're going to have an increase; every amendment is going to have an increase. Let's just reduce that increase by a tiny amount, by a 3 percent reduction in the increase, or a 1 percent reduction in the increase, or on this one, one half of one penny on the dollar. And that's too radical. And that's called a cut.

Well, let's be honest; it's not a cut. None of these are a cut. But it is time to slow the pace of growth of government spending. It is time to slow the pace of that growth because it imposes a burden on every single American. And we are simply standing here, and I'm proud to stand here, and if somebody wants to call it a "fringe group," that's their choice. But I'm proud to stand here in defense of the American taxpayer and not to slash and burn and cut. There is no cut.

What we're saying is this side has proposed spending at an increase of 6.7 percent, almost three times the increase in inflation. We're simply saying how about take off one half of one penny.

I think the lady's amendment is right, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Colorado has 1 minute; the gentleman from California has 17½ minutes.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, as I listen to this discussion tonight, I think about how varied the Members of Congress are. There are Members, I dare say, in this Congress that have never had a job, particularly a job that is menial labor.

I grew up in a home where we were poor, and at the time that was very difficult; but I look back on that and I'm happy that I learned to work. I'm happy, as a parent, that one of the values that we taught our children was to work and to work hard.

It was interesting to watch the experience of my teenagers when they had their first job outside the home. They worked really hard. And some of them had a pay schedule where they got paid after 2 weeks of work. And to see how they responded when they got their first paycheck, because they were startled about how much was taken out of their paycheck because they were anticipating a certain amount of earnings, and they didn't get all that money because they had to pay quite a bit in taxes. And I just am asking for a modest restraint here, one half of 1 percent.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. WEINER). The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. SCHIFF. Again, I thank the gentlewoman for offering the amendment to this bill, as she did to one of the prior bills, because it really does highlight the philosophical difference between the bipartisan majority of the House and the self-described "fringe" represented by the views we've heard tonight.

What is that philosophical division between the bipartisan majority and the Members that we have heard from this evening? Well, the bipartisan majority of this House believes that if we're going to ensure a stronger America, then we have to make an investment in that America. But we have to make the same kind of investment that our parents made and their parents so that we can enjoy the prosperity that we enjoy now; that we can't simply say, well, we're going to let our children and our grandchildren fend for themselves.

The bipartisan majority believes that that requires a responsible investment in our roads and our highways; a responsible investment in our aviation system; a responsible investment in our aviation security; a responsible investment in housing for the elderly, for the disabled, for those who are in need. That is a priority of the bipartisan majority. This is our philosophy.

Now, my friends expressing the minority view say, well, let's look at what the American family would do when the American family is facing budgetary pressures. So let's look at what the American family would do. My friends expressing the minority opinion tonight say they would set their priorities. Well, that's absolutely right, they would set their priorities, which means they wouldn't cut everything identically in their lives, which is just what the gentlewoman's amendment would do. It would cut everything across the board.

The American family, when they're facing a fiscal constraint, doesn't say, we're going to cut our medicine equally, we're going to cut our food equally, we're going to cut our essentials equally with how we cut cable TV, was one illustration given by my friends in the minority. No. They don't say we're going to cut the necessities the same amount we're going to cut the luxuries. They prioritize.

But my friends in the minority, with their across-the-board cuts, don't prioritize. And so they do make cuts, real cuts, not like my friend from Arizona claimed, which is, unfortunately, not correct. My friend from Arizona just claimed that nothing is really cut in the across-the-board amendment. But the reality is there are a great many things that are cut, real cuts, that don't have an increase in the bill sufficient to offset what the gentlewoman's amendment would cut.

So what are some of the real cuts the gentlewoman is proposing tonight? She

is proposing real cuts to the number of critical safety staff in aviation, safety staff that deals with the Office of Flight Standard and Aircraft Certification. They would be real cuts. Not cuts in growth, but real cuts, fewer people doing the safety inspections for our aircraft. Is that what the American family would choose to do when they're faced with a fiscal constraint? Would they choose to cut things that have the effect of making their families less safe? I don't think that's where they would look for the cuts.

What other real cuts has the gentlewoman been advocating? She's advocating real cuts in emergency response training for hazardous material transportation. That's a real cut the gentlewoman is advocating.

She is also advocating cuts in Native American housing grants. Is the gentlewoman prepared to tell the Native Americans back in her State that she favors real cuts to their housing assistance? I will be willing to yield on that question if the gentlewoman is ready to say, not hide behind an across-the-board amendment, but is ready to say to the Native Americans in her State, I support real cuts to your housing.

I will yield if the gentlewoman would like to respond to that question. Is the gentlewoman prepared to say, yes, I'm advocating tonight real cuts to the American housing in my State?

I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. What I would like to say to the citizens in the Fourth District in Colorado is that I'm very willing to take the increase from a 6.7 to a 6.2 percent increase.

Mr. SCHIFF. Well, I yielded the time to the gentlewoman, but she did not answer the question. Evidently she wasn't willing to tell the Native American population in her home State she is proposing an amendment to cut their housing tonight. She is willing to hide behind an across-the-board amendment, but is not willing to tell them directly what the effect of that amendment is.

The gentlewoman's amendment would also cut, in very real terms, homeless assistance grants.

Now, let's get back to that philosophical difference between the bipartisan majority and the minority here tonight. One of my colleagues, my colleague from New Jersey, said, well, the American family has to make tough choices. And maybe they need to make the choice that not all of their kids can go to college. Well, that's the philosophical view of the minority opinion we hear tonight. Maybe the American family needs to make the choice that not all of their kids can go to college.

Well, the philosophical view of the bipartisan majority is that every child in America that wants to go to college should have the ability to go to college, notwithstanding whether they are rich or poor. That's our philosophy. And that's why we increased support in the Labor-HHS bill which, again, the

gentlewoman wanted to cut, to help more kids go to college. That's our philosophy, that if we're going to look after the future of this country, we're going to have to invest in the future. That means investing in our kids. And that means not putting American parents in a position where they have to say this child goes to college, this child does not. That is not our philosophy. It may be the philosophy of the gentleman from New Jersey; it may be the philosophy of the minority on the floor here tonight. It is not the philosophy of the bipartisan majority of this House, nor the American people.

Now, some of my friends in the minority here tonight say, okay, 6 years of GOP rule; we ran the country into the ground financially, we admit it. But we weren't responsible, we few here on the floor tonight, because we were standing up at the time. Well, I have to say that when we could have used your voices, we didn't hear them. When we could have used your voices, for example, earlier this year to try to achieve savings in the expenditures on oil and gas, when people go to the pump and they're paying record amounts, when we wanted to try to take that and invest it in the country's future instead of investing it in oil company profits, the friends in the minority here tonight had nothing to say. None of them were on their feet saying, yes, this is the time where we must cut corporate welfare because we can't afford it. Let's cut it 1 percent across the board.

When our seniors are trying to buy medicine and can't afford it and we take action here to bring down the cost of that medicine and save the government money because we're living in a finite world, did our friends stand up and say, yes, we have to be fiscally responsible? We have to try to help those families who are working, both heads of household, and can't afford medicine, or those seniors who can't afford medicine, so we're going to stand up for them; we're going to cut those corporate subsidies and corporate welfare? No. They were silent. It's only when it comes to cutting homeless assistance, cutting assistance for the elderly, and even cutting support for additional safety inspections for aircraft that our friends in the minority here tonight are willing to stand up.

So, yes, there is great philosophical difference here tonight between the bipartisan majority that believes we have to invest in the future of this country, between the bipartisan majority that doesn't think a parent should have to decide which child can go to college and which child can't, not based on the merit of that child, not based on the academic ability of that child or the gifts of those children, but because they can't afford to send both children to college.

There is a philosophical difference between the bipartisan majority that says that is unacceptable in America, that is not the America we want to see

in our future, and the philosophical views of the minority here tonight that say that's fine with us. We won't look elsewhere. We are willing to balance the budget on the backs of our kids and their kids, the homeless, the elderly and the others. Just stay away from corporate welfare because that is un-touchable.

That is not the philosophy of the majority of this House. It will not carry the day when this amendment comes to a vote.

I urge my colleagues to join with the bipartisan majority and defeat these cuts to these vital services, and also to step up to the plate when we have the opportunities to reduce corporate welfare so that we can finance these essential services to let their voices be heard.

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

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

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. 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 gentlewoman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF  
GEORGIA

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

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

SEC. 410. None of the funds made available in this Act for the mortgage insurance programs under title II of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1707 et seq.) may be used for any housing trust fund established under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12721 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I would urge my colleagues to take a clear look at this commonsense amendment.

This is an amendment that addresses an area of the bill. The underlying bill itself, this appropriations bill, allows for money to be placed in a slush fund that would be used essentially for political purposes.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this commonsense amendment that would prohibit the FHA from diverting money to help fund a "housing trust fund." This name for this is actually

part of the Orwellian democracy that I've talked about extensively with this new majority.

□ 2030

Because it really isn't a housing trust fund. It is a fund that is wholly unnecessary and wholly political.

This amendment would shield middle-class homeowners from the new majority's desire to fund a new expansion of government-built housing; again, with completely political paybacks. HUD already has a number of programs, a number of programs, Market-to-Market, the American Dream Downpayment Initiative, which are aimed at preserving existing affordable housing and expanding affordable homeownership.

The HOME Investment Partnerships Program, also administered by Housing and Urban Development, is the largest Federal block grant to State and local governments. It is dedicated exclusively to creating new affordable housing to low-income households.

The new Affordable Housing Trust Fund that is pending funding in this bill derives part of its funding from skimming money, and a lot of it, from FHA mortgage premiums and creates another mechanism which forces the Federal Government into the homebuilding business and with political nuances to it all.

As Assistant Secretary for Housing, Federal Housing Commissioner of the United States, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Brian Montgomery, pointed out at a recent hearing before the House Committee on Financial Services, FHA receipts are already credited toward HUD appropriations. As a result, any new program, any new program, like this one, takes that revenue at the expense of the previous HUD programs that I mentioned earlier. As Mr. Montgomery testified, we will be "robbing Peter to pay Paul." Now, why would we do this? Well, we would do it, I guess, because the majority party desires to have political direction over that money.

Mr. Chairman, is there any doubt that the provisions of the FHA modernization bill will create an incentive for FHA to charge higher premiums than is safe or prudent given that incentive? Pressure to hit certain revenue targets will cause a dramatic departure from today's environment where the FHA is able to work to ensure that low-income and first-time homebuyers are being charged the lowest possible premium. It will be those borrowers who pay the cost of this new housing trust fund, those least able to afford it, and likely those least able to desire any activity that smacks of the political cronyism that this slush fund would bring about.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to take a serious and prudent look at this commonsense amendment. I believe it is something that the entire House should be able to embrace. I hope they will support the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The gentleman from Georgia is attempting to renew an authorizing fight, which is only a matter of days old, on the fiscal year 2008 appropriations bill, and that is not the appropriate way to handle the question of the affordable housing trust.

Our capable authorizers, the chairman of the Financial Services Committee Mr. FRANK, and the Chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of that committee Ms. WATERS, have included an Affordable Housing Trust Fund in their FHA reform bill. That bill was passed by the House last week or 2 weeks ago. I forget which week it was.

Clearly there is a need for more affordable housing in this country. The Joint Center for Housing Studies at Harvard University has documented that from 1993 to the year 2003 alone, we have lost 1.2 million affordable units. It is also documented that we have some 8 million households in this country who have incomes below 30 percent of the adjusted median income in their area. Those households all fall within the lowest, most vulnerable category of people who are eligible for assistance under the Housing and Urban Development Department. We are only providing somewhere in the total of 2.5- to 3 million units for all of that 8 million people and households who are falling within that very low-income category. However, we don't intend to step on the turf of our authorizing committee by renewing the fight about that bill, which passed, as I said, just a few days ago, on this bill tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and urge a "no" vote.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate those comments. I understand the lack of desire on the part of the appropriators to get into the business of the authorizers, but that is the way the system works here. One committee will authorize, and then the Appropriations Committee comes along and determines whether or not there ought to be money.

What this amendment says is that this House ought to say no, we ought not put money into a slush fund, into a housing slush fund that actually takes money away from programs that are demonstrated to have had excellent results, Market-to-Market, the American Dream Downpayment Initiative, the HOME Investment Partnerships Program.

This slush fund will take money away from those programs that have been very, very helpful to individuals across this Nation, low-income individ-

uals across this Nation, who are trying to get into a home. What it will do is substitute it with a slush fund that will be used for political purposes. There is no doubt about it. So it doesn't surprise me, I guess, that the majority party would oppose this amendment.

But I would ask my colleagues on both sides, Republicans and Democrats, to clearly look at this amendment and appreciate that none of us, none of us, ought be using this kind of money, the kind of money that allows low-income Americans to get into their home and have the American dream, realize the American dream, but to do so with political slush fund money. It just isn't appropriate. It is just not right.

So I urge my colleagues to take a serious look at this amendment and support 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 Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. 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 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALBERG:

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 Department of Transportation to promulgate regulations based on race, ethnicity, or sex.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today to pose an important question to this House, and that question is this: Do we really need race, ethnic or gender-based preferences for roads?

Today I am offering an amendment to the transportation bill we are currently debating that would stipulate no funding in this bill may be used by the Department of Transportation to discriminate based on race, ethnicity or sex.

Though this policy may be motivated by good intention, I agree with Justice Clarence Thomas about the DOT's affirmative action programs where he states, "The paternalism that appears to lie at the heart of this program is at

war with the principle of inherent equality that underlies and infuses our Constitution."

Last fall in my home State, Michiganders voted overwhelmingly, 58 percent to 42 percent, in favor of amending our State constitution to outlaw racial preferences in public education, employment and contracting. Like my constituents in south-central Michigan, I oppose any and all forms of discrimination. But I also support non-discrimination, the practice or policy of refraining from discrimination.

My support of nondiscrimination compels me to state on this floor that every American deserves equal treatment when competing for business contracts, and our Federal Government should treat all applicants for such contracts on an equal basis. The Federal Government should never view any American as part of a group, but rather look at them as an individual. By granting the Department of Transportation the ability to discriminate based on race or sex, this House would essentially create affirmative action preferences for our Nation's highways.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and ensure that all American businesses competing for public works projects are given a fair, non-discriminatory opportunity.

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

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

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

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to go further on it. I think it is rather self-explanatory that we are talking here of just assuring the practice that we don't commit discrimination in the process of our hiring and contracting practices.

We in the State of Michigan labored long and hard during the last election cycle, from both sides, to indicate what value there was in making sure that under the context of our Constitution and the laws that have been put in place to enforce that Constitution, that we are each given rights to benefit from those unalienable rights, namely the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness or property. If we were to bridge that with any discriminatory practice, we take that away from one, and we can take it away from all.

For that purpose, this amendment is offered. I would appreciate the support of my colleagues.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am almost speechless with the fact that this very simple amendment has not been challenged aggressively yet. It is a straightforward amendment. As I said very clearly and sincerely, not only am I opposed to discrimination, I am also strongly supportive of non-discrimination. For that reason and

that reason alone, I ask that this amendment be adopted by my colleagues.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my esteemed colleague if he has any speakers prepared to draw attention to this amendment? Otherwise, I think that we ought to close with acceptance of this amendment.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle come together in unity on this and accept this proposal that seeks to provide that we don't have discriminatory practices that go on within our Department of Transportation.

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

□ 2045

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

Either this is not a serious amendment or it is an exceedingly serious amendment. This amendment is either totally unnecessary or it has a really nefarious purpose. We do have rules and regulations, I think, that might come under the material of the legislation that support and require certain set-asides for minority or women-owned businesses in providing among all of our contracting in transportation departments, in some of those departments, and under certain circumstances. I think those are entirely appropriate.

I don't know whether this is the sort of thing that the gentleman was trying to get at, but I think that this has some entirely unknown effects. Perhaps I should have asked the gentleman whether he had particular things in mind that he knew about because I couldn't at first think of any.

Mr. Chairman, my chairman says I should accept the amendment, and I am going to accept 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 Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) for a colloquy.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee. The chairman has been a long-time advocate in improving safety standards in our Nation's transpor-

tation system. I appreciate his willingness to include report language regarding occupant ejection and motor coach and school bus standards in this legislation.

In March, a horrific accident occurred in my district when a bus carrying the Bluffton University men's baseball team crashed on Interstate 75 in Atlanta, Georgia, en route to a tournament in Florida. Six people were killed and 29 others were injured.

That week, Dr. Jeffrey Solomone from Grady Hospital's trauma center, where most of the victims were treated in Atlanta, called my office outraged. He knew that their deaths could have been prevented if they were simply wearing seat belts. Imagine working to save young lives when you knew their injuries were caused not from impact but from being thrown from the vehicle.

Last year, two teenage girls were killed in a similar accident in Beaumont, Texas. Advocates and family members accurately highlighted that the National Transportation Safety Board recommended that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration develop a safety standard in 1999.

In 2005, the SAFETEA-LU legislation reiterated this request and called for a national standard to be developed no later than October 1, 2009. I applaud the committee for demanding a status report on these standards. Simply said, it should not take 10 years to figure out a way to save lives. How much longer must we wait until a simple regulation is developed?

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman from Georgia that this and other important safety standards are the utmost priority of the committee, as they have been all of the years I have served on, earlier, the Transportation Subcommittee and now the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee.

Occupant ejection prevention is critical to saving lives. Motor coach and school bus accidents are not necessarily commonplace, but when these tragedies occur, they shake the Nation to its core. The committee highlighted that motor vehicle crashes are a leading cause of death for young Americans, and strong safety standards are the cornerstone to protecting American lives.

I appreciate the gentleman's attention to this issue, and I remain committed, as will the committee, to ensuring that NHTSA meets this and subsequent deadlines to develop national standards that save lives in an expeditious manner.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman to make sure that we do not have to wait until the last possible moment in 2009 for changes to be made.

I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and his staff for working so hard on this legislation and making a commitment to safety and security on America's roads.

Mr. OLVER. I would just comment it should be possible to get out this kind of regulation earlier than October 1, 2009. We will see what we can do about that.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to continue the colloquy with the gentleman from Georgia on an additional subject, and I continue to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor to compliment the chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. OLVER, on preparing an excellent and well-balanced appropriation bill.

The large number of important priorities included in this bill create difficult choices, and the chairman has done an excellent job balancing the competing interests and preparing a good bill for consideration in the full House.

As the co-Chair of the House COPD Caucus, I want to speak about one item that falls under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, and that is the implementation of the 1986 Air Carrier Access Act. This act was intended to protect individuals with disabilities who fly on commercial air carriers from discriminating practices. The legislation has done a reasonably good job of protecting most passengers.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

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. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I thank the chairman for yielding.

While the legislation has done a reasonably good job of protecting most passengers with disabilities, it has had limited success in influencing air carriers to accommodate the needs of disabled individuals who require supplemental oxygen.

Currently, as an example, air carriers have the authority to allow or disallow the use of portable oxygen systems aboard their planes even when the Department of Transportation and the FAA find that the systems are safe. This leaves the use of oxygen systems supplied by the carrier. Potential layovers and delays between flights are an additional health risk and barrier to access to air flight.

In September 2005, the Department of Transportation recognized this problem and issued a notice of proposed rulemaking to clarify this situation to assist the flying public who are in need of assisted breathing devices.

Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor to commend the Department of Transportation for recognizing the problem and for issuing this proposed rule. The final rule will provide uniform standards that will allow passengers to carry

their FAA-approved devices onboard. I ask the chairman to work with me to encourage the FAA to issue a rule expeditiously.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. In answer, I thank the Congressman from Georgia for bringing this issue to my attention, to our attention. I am sure that the Department will consider all valid points of view in this process, and I stand committed to making certain that the Department issues its final rule as you've suggested in an expeditious manner in the very near term.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I thank the chairman.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:  
At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 410. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide homeownership assistance for applicants described in 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) to know if he would not speak on the matter, I am quite willing to accept the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the offer of the chairman. I wonder if he might concede to a 15-second blurb here in order to get a couple of words into the RECORD. I appreciate the incentive and the concession.

This amendment simply says none of the funds shall be used to hire people who are not legal and eligible to work within the United States. That's it. I think we have a consensus on this.

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

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

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

Mr. OLVER. This amendment is merely a restatement of current law which already prohibits the employment of unauthorized aliens. I do not read it as imposing any new burden on those who use funds appropriated under this act. Rather, it is fully consistent with the current legal obligations imposed on all homeownership assistance applicants regardless of whether or not they use such funds.

I accept the amendment and yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's 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 Iowa (Mr. KING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:  
At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 410. 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment follows through on the theme of the previous amendment, only it addresses that no homeownership assistance will be applicable to those who aren't legal to work or lawfully present in the United States. Again, it is a simple concept. It supports current law.

Mr. OLVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I am happy to yield.

Mr. OLVER. As far as I can see, the amendment is essentially the same. It is based on exactly the same citation in the U.S. Code but has a different target. But again, the amendment is merely a restatement of current law which already prohibits the employment of unauthorized aliens. So again, the rest of my previous statement applies, and I am willing to accept the amendment if the ranking member is also willing to do so.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the chairman for his comments. I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I accept the amendment as well.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2100

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to implement the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code (relating to wage rate requirements; commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that strikes the requirements for the Davis-Bacon Act within the appropriations of this bill, and the Davis-Bacon issue is something that I have lived with for at least my 28 years in the construction business as an owner and operator, and we'd add about four or five more years as an employee.

I have received Davis-Bacon wage scales. I've paid Davis-Bacon wage scales. I've managed my way through the combination of paperwork and requirements that are part of this. I'm maybe the only one in Congress who has real hands-on experience for years of dealing with the additional costs that are involved with the Federal wage scale that's Davis-Bacon.

And my numbers throughout my history of working with these projects vary from anywhere from 8 percent increase in the cost of the projects up to 35 percent increase in the cost of the projects. I round that down to a round number of 20 percent additional costs.

We're in a situation where we're arguing that we need to bring in more labor from foreign countries to do this work, and yet we're setting a Federal wage scale for this work, and we know that labor is developed by supply and demand. I am a supporter of labor being able to collectively negotiate the value of their work, but I'm not a supporter of the Federal Government telling the workers and the employers what they need to pay their employees.

I believe that if two adult individuals want to enter into a contractual agreement, they should be able to do so without interference of the Federal Government. This is not a prevailing wage in practice. It's only a prevailing wage by statute. Actually, it is union scale imposed upon wherever the money is spent.

Any construction project with \$2,000 or more in it takes the inflationary cost of a Davis-Bacon wage scale. Some places, it's actually below the prevailing wage. Other places, it distorts that prevailing wage dramatically. In almost all cases, it costs a lot of money, and for example, if it's a 20 percent increase, then if you can build five projects or 5 miles of road, this will let you build six. Why would we limit the resource and the infrastructure that we are building with this project by imposing such a draconian, top-down,

Federal management tool that not only costs a lot more money, but it makes it a lot, lot harder to manage your projects?

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The amendment would eliminate the requirement that the funding provided in this bill comply with the prevailing wage requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Let me remind my colleagues that the Davis-Bacon law was enacted about 75 years ago by a Republican Congress and a Republican administration.

The law sets minimum labor standards for workers employed in Federal contract construction and ensures that workers are paid at least the locally prevailing wage. There's no good reason for denying prevailing wage protection to workers involved in transportation. This is an issue of fairness for working men and women.

Without Davis-Bacon, the transportation construction industry, which is responsible for building our highways and transit systems, might suffer from low-bid firms that aim to undercut local wages and perform construction on the cheap.

Davis-Bacon encourages a higher quality of workmanship, and we should not do away with the law for transportation construction where we need the highest quality and the longest lasting workmanship.

I urge a rejection of this amendment.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the amount of time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise as one, again, who has worked on union shop and merit shop jobs, both as an employer and as an employee. As an employer, having been a union shop, I have paid union scale and also, of course, prevailing wage, Davis-Bacon wage scale. I've worked under a union shop, and I've worked on a merit based, and to look at the difference in the workmanship, I don't think we can apply high quality strictly to union. In fact, merit shop employees do a fantastic job with the work that they're doing, and they take pride in it, and they have to compete in the competition of the project.

My son's now in the construction business, the second generation King Construction. I know the decisions he has to make, and sometimes he will pick up a set of plans and take a look at that and figure on bidding that project and find out that it's a Davis-Bacon wage scale. He understands that

that messes up his flow of his employees, and it limits his ability to manage those employees on the job.

For example, if you're paying an excavator operator \$24 an hour and you're paying your laborer on the ground with a shovel or a grease gun let's say \$10, that man is not going to get off of that excavator and pick up that grease gun or pick up that shovel, even if it's for a half hour or an hour if he knows he's going to be paid union scale for that when he could be paid the \$24 an hour to sit on the machine. Those things work against our efficiency.

My greatest frustration with Davis-Bacon wage scale is not the wage itself. It's that it takes away my ability to manage a project and my ability to provide incentives for employees to make decisions themselves on the ground.

I have to manage them more when they're under a Davis-Bacon wage scale. I have to tell them what to do. I know people that are owners and operators of their company who get up in the morning and go out to the job at five o'clock to grease and service their machines because they can't afford to pay their operator to get out the grease gun and do it, and they'll be there at night, too, working 16 hours a day while that employee is at 8 hours a day on a Davis-Bacon wage scale.

It distorts the work we do. It distorts the skills and the complement of the skills, and it raises the cost of everything that we do in the construction business. It injects the Federal Government in the way between that relationship between an employer and employee.

Additionally, my employees have received 12 months of work, not seasonal work, health insurance benefits and vacation pay, all of that flowing because we can pay them what they're worth for a week's work as opposed to an inflated value of what they're worth for an hour's work. They make out better, we make out better, and we've got more consistent employees. That goes across this country almost universally.

So I would urge adoption of this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I urge rejection of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. 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 Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONAWAY:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . It is the sense of the House of Representatives that any reduction in the amount appropriated by this Act achieved as a result of amendments adopted by the House should be dedicated to deficit reduction.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity tonight to point out one more time one of the quirks of the rules that we operate under.

We have heard over the last 2 days many of my colleagues come to these microphones and propose reductions in spending in this particular area of the Federal budget, very eloquent, very passionate, to try to reduce this spending.

But the harsh reality is, should any of those amendments have passed or should any of the ones that we're about to vote on pass, the reality is that that spending does not, in fact, get cut out of this budget. This spending would simply be spent in conference and would not reduce the deficit or, should we ever get to that point, increase the surplus.

So my amendment would simply state the sense that instead of continuing the practice, the age-old practice of spending whatever is in 302(b) allocation, whether it's warranted or not, we would actually take an opportunity to reduce spending which I think folks on both sides of the aisle, many people on both sides of the aisle would say is arguably one of the things that we ought to be doing and studying.

This is not a revolutionary position to take, but it's one in which I think it makes sense. Most folks in Texas in District 11 would clearly understand the intent of what I'm trying to do. In fact, it would come as a shock to them to know that if we found 218 votes to adopt the 1 percent cut or the half a percent cut or the 25-basis point cut, that all of that hard work would be for naught and that that money would still get spent.

So I understand there's a point of order that lies against this. I will not push for a ruling from the Chair. I just wanted to simply take the opportunity tonight to point out to my colleagues that we need to change the rules. We need to change the way we operate in this House, and this would be one of those that we ought to seriously consider doing so that the will of the House could operate to actually change spending if that were, in fact, the case.

So, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to say this tonight, and I will not push the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . The amount otherwise provided in this Act for "Grants-in-Aid for Airports" administered by the Federal Aviation Administration of the Department of Transportation is hereby decreased by \$10,000,000 and increased by \$10,000,000.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman and I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee. Let me thank both of the individuals, the chairperson, Mr. OLVER, and the ranking member, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for their leadership. I thank you so very much.

We've worked on this issue in the past, and I think many of us are aware of the surrounding neighborhoods around large airports, and I know that as Members of Congress we have been challenged by that because we recognize that the vitality of airports certainly support the economy of our cities.

I happen to represent a very large airport in Houston, Texas, and I also represent the neighborhoods that surround it. At this time, of course, we are working on a number of noise studies in our area, and it is a continuing journey as our airport continues to expand. Sometimes it takes money but sometimes it takes policy.

We recognize that one of the advantages of modern life is the convenience of air travel. America's air transportation system is the best and safest in the world, but airports are not quiet. If you ask any resident that lives near a busy airport, you will hear many grievances about the noise level.

Although there is no way to make airports soundproof, it is possible to reduce airport noise so it is less disruptive to the lives of the families that live near some of the Nation's busiest airports who work and pay their taxes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to encourage the Federal Aviation Administration to be more

proactive in helping communities reduce, eliminate or cope with the ever increasing levels of airport noise.

Specifically, I call upon the FAA to undertake a nationwide study of airport mitigation problems and best practices at the 10 busiest airports in America and report its findings, along with recommendations to address major problems found to be existing, to the Congress within 180 days.

□ 2115

Under the airport improvement program administered by the FAA, grants are available to airports and local governments to fund noise reduction projects located in areas significantly affected by airport noise above 65 decibels over a 24-hour average, as indicated by the notation 65 dB(A) DNL. Noise mitigation grants are generally not available for areas in which the noise level may be substantial, but does not exceed 65.

Please, all of you, join me in those surrounding neighborhoods, and try to be able to resolve or to be able to accept the noise at that level. Therefore, money does not solve the problem; policy does. So we would like to ensure that we have the real information opportunity to determine the impact, substantial impacts that occurred to millions of people well below the 65 decibel level.

Information generates policy. This value is inadequate for several reasons. We find from the scientific perspective, it is not supported by research. The 65 decibel level is derived from the Schultz curve, which correlated people reporting being highly annoyed by noise with noise levels. Substantial impact occurs well before people become highly annoyed. In addition, the data used in the Schultz curve for airports show that highly annoyed occurs around 57 decibels, not 65. That comes from the Journal of Acoustical Society of America.

The EPA has identified 55 dB(A) DNL as a more appropriate noise level. The day-night average sound level is the level of noise expressed in decibels as a 24-hour average, and averages do not adequately account for the impact of aircraft noise on individuals.

Research has shown that the noise disruption as low as 55 decibels can negatively affect communities near airports. Our airports are trying. In my own district, we have had several meetings. I know that this issue is a concern, because we have addressed this question in airports and cities around the Nation, including the State of Minnesota.

It is important to stress that this amendment does not entitle any airport, local government or other eligible entity, to receive a noise mitigation grant, nor does it have any financial impact that reduces funding in noise mitigation. This amendment provides for an opportunity for focusing on the issue of noise mitigation and the difficulty of using a singular num-

ber, 65, while communities around the Nation suffer.

We are going to continue to pursue this. We have done this every year to bring attention to this problem of noise mitigation and the fact that no person who lives in and around an airport acknowledges the fact that the airport is not important, but what we are trying to emphasize is that we must provide solace for those who live surrounding airports.

I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes it takes money, but sometimes it takes policy. We recognize that one of the advantages of modern life is the convenience of air travel. America's air transportation system is the best and safest in the world, but airports are not quiet. If you ask any resident that lives near a busy airport, you will hear many grievances about the noise level.

Although there is no way to make airports soundproof, it is possible to reduce airport noise so it is less disruptive to the lives of the families that live near some of the Nation's busiest airports, work and pay their taxes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to encourage the Federal Aviation Administration to be more proactive in helping communities reduce, eliminate, or cope with ever-increasing levels of airport noise. Specifically, I call upon the FAA to undertake a nationwide study of airport noise mitigation problems and best practices at the 10 busiest airports in America and report its findings, along with recommendations to address major problems found, to the Congress within 180 days.

Mr. Chairman, under the Airport Improvement Program administered by the FAA, grants are available to airports and local governments to fund noise reduction projects located in areas significantly affected by airport noise above 65 decibels over a 24-hour average, as indicated by the notation 65 dB(A) DNL. Noise mitigation grants are generally not available for areas in which the noise level may be substantial but does not exceed the 65 dB(A) DNL. Therefore money does not solve the problem; policy does.

However, substantial impacts occur to millions of people well below the 65 decibel level. This value is inadequate for several reasons:

From a scientific perspective, it is not supported by research. The 65 decibel level is derived from the Schultz Curve which correlated people reporting being highly annoyed by noise with noise levels.

Substantial impact occurs well before people become highly annoyed. In addition, the data used in the Schultz Curve for airports shows that "highly annoyed" occurs around 57 decibels, not 65, and that comes from a Journal of the Acoustical Society of America.

The EPA has identified 55 dB(A) DNL as a more appropriate noise level. The day/night average sound level is the level of noise expressed in decibels as a 24-hour average, and averages do not adequately account for the impacts of aircraft noise on individuals.

Research has shown that noise disruption as low as 55 decibels can negatively affect communities near airports. Unfortunately, communities that have a dB(A) less than 65 are precluded from applying for an Airport Improvement Program grant to reduce airport noise. We need to help them. I have even

heard from cities in Minnesota. It is all over the country.

It is important to stress that this amendment does not entitle any airport, local government or other eligible entity to receive a noise mitigation grant. Nor does it have any financial impact. This amendment does not even affect an applicant's eligibility to be considered for an airport noise reduction grant. Each applicant must demonstrate that its proposed project deserves to be funded, but no applicant can be disqualified from consideration merely because the area covered by the grant request does not have a dB(A) DNL greater than 65.

Mr. Chairman, communities coexisting with major airports is one of the great challenges of modern life. My amendment is intended to help us rise to that challenge.

I urge all members to support my amendment.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I too am concerned about the environmental impact of aviation. Noise is a very serious issue and impossible to solve to the satisfaction of all. Although new technologies and planes and air space redesign will assist in the noise problem with the number of passengers projected in the near future, noise will continue to be a problem.

I commend the gentlewoman for bringing this issue to our attention, as she has time after time. As I say, it will continue to be a problem. I am willing to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the amendment as well.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in violation of section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, with respect to workers on federally-funded transportation projects.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the two subcommittee Chairs. Might I

just for a moment thank them for a bill that is enormously challenging, transportation and housing.

I want to thank the staff for their very hard work and the commitment that this particular bill has in place as it relates to the Treasury and other agencies. Let me acknowledge the importance of hard work as well.

Mr. Chairman, we can't do without the workers that provide the engine of our economy. If we are to appreciate workers, I think it is extremely important that we do not have outside forces that would, in fact, take away from the dignity and the responsibility to the American worker; and that's what my amendment is about.

It is a very simple amendment. It is sometimes fashionable to speak ill about working Americans who are in unions. This amendment simply provides support for union workers on federally funded projects, simple without any additions to it. It is to reinforce the importance of that work and to reinforce the importance of those workers.

I believe that the engine of America is fused by American workers, and many of them are both union and non-union workers. I stand today to affirm all workers. My amendment simply asks that those Federal funds that are utilized, nothing is done in the federally funded project to undermine America's workers.

I believe that we have had a long history of the American labor movement. It was started by a group of dreamers who simply believed that we should have the best working atmosphere for America's workers. Employees represented by free and democratic unions of their own choosing participate actively in determining their wages, hours and working conditions.

Their living standards are the highest in the world. Their job rights are protected by collective bargaining. They have fringe benefits that were unheard of less than a generation ago.

I know that the support of these workers is bipartisan. I ask my colleagues to join me in a very simple amendment that ensures that these projects that are federally funded comply with the law, simply comply with the law, and do not undermine the working people of America.

I ask my colleagues to support working people, working people of America, as we issue Federal funds so that they can be protected.

My amendment is simple but makes an important contribution to the legislation. My amendment simply provides that none of the funds made available in this appropriations bill shall be used in a manner inconsistent with the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. Chairman, I know it is fashionable today to disparage, downplay, or minimize the importance of organized labor to our country. That is easy to do but it would be wrong. In the post 9-11 age, where our transportation systems and infrastructure have been demonstrated to be targets of those who would do us harm, it is more important than ever that

those who work in the transportation sectors are the best, most able, most professional, most experienced, and committed workers this nation has to offer. To do otherwise would put the security of our nation at risk.

Mr. Chairman, those who would destroy or further limit the rights of organized labor—those who would cripple collective bargaining or prevent organization of the unorganized—do a disservice to the cause of democracy.

Fifty years or so ago the American Labor Movement was little more than a group of dreamers, and look at it now. From coast to coast, in factories, stores, warehouse and business establishments of all kinds, industrial democracy is at work.

Employees, represented by free and democratic trade unions of their own choosing, participate actively in determining their wages, hours and working conditions. Their living standards are the highest in the world. Their job rights are protected by collective bargaining agreements. They have fringe benefits that were unheard of less than a generation ago.

Our labor unions are not narrow, self-seeking groups. They have raised wages, shortened hours and provided supplemental benefits. Through collective bargaining and grievance procedures, they have brought justice and democracy to the shop floor. But their work goes beyond their own jobs, and even beyond our borders.

Our unions have fought for aid to education, for better housing, for development of our national resources, and for saving the family-sized farms. They have spoken, not for narrow self-interest, but for the public interest and for the people.

Mr. Chairman, unions are as important as they ever were—because corporations are just as dedicated to their bottom line, regardless of the consequences for workers. The nature of work in America is changing. Employers are trying to shed responsibilities—for providing health insurance, good pension coverage, reasonable work hours and job safety protections, for example—while making workers' jobs and incomes less secure through downsizing, part-timing and contracting out. Working people need a voice at work to keep employers from making our jobs look like they did 100 years ago, with sweatshop conditions, unlivable wages and 70-hour workweeks.

In my hometown of Houston, I know firsthand the commitment, dedication, and professionalism of organized transit workers employed by the Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County (METRO). These workers are making the transportation system of Houston one of the best in the nation. Accordingly, I want to take this opportunity to extol their accomplishments and to express my commitment to the protection of their hard won right to engage in and enjoy the benefits of collective bargaining. I think most of my colleagues can agree that these hard won rights should not be taken away or undermined, and my amendment reaffirms this proposition.

And lest we forget, Mr. Chairman, it was the men and women of organized labor who rushed into the burning World Trade Center Towers when others were rushing out. The men and women of organized labor put their lives on the line for their fellow Americans every day. They do not ask for much. All they ask is to be treated with respect and dignity. They want what we all want: to do their jobs and to make a better life for their families.

The least we in the Congress can do, Mr. Chairman, is to go on record in support of our working men and women in the vitally important transportation industries of our country. We can and should affirm that none of the funds made available in this appropriations bill shall be used in a manner that undercuts the hard won rights of American workers that are reflected in the National Labor Relations Act and other important federal labor laws.

I urge all members to support my amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as I reflect on what the Labor Relations Act of 1935 means, it says specifically in the act that there will be no discrimination with regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment by membership in any labor organization, et cetera, and essentially says, by my recollection, that no one shall be coerced into joining a union, nor shall they be discouraged from joining a union.

It's a balanced labor relations act that's there, but the statement that was made by the gentlelady from Texas said it provides for a report for projects on federally funded projects. I don't know where that might exist in the statute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlelady from Texas for a question. I noticed in your remarks your amendment provides for a report for union workers on federally funded projects. I don't recognize where that might be in the 1935 act, and I am wondering, since I don't see it in your amendment, what the basis of that might be.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I think you might have misheard me. I think I indicated that in the past amendment I asked for a report from the FAA.

My concern here is simply a statement of affirmation that federally funded projects protect the workers that are on those projects and protect those who may be associated with the union. I don't believe that we asked for a study.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlelady from Texas. I did happen to write that quote down verbatim, I am confident.

We have a lot of debate here on the floor. Some of us offered more than one amendment. I would simply thank the gentlelady for that statement.

I, for myself, we have the law on the books, and this law is a neutral law. It's not one that promotes union labor, and it's not one that promotes non-union labor. It's one that promotes the freedom and the discretion of the employee to make that decision.

It does allow for union members to approach workers on the job. That's a protection that's in there, but it also allows the freedom for those workers to make the decision as to whether they would want to collectively bargain or not based upon a vote within that workforce.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

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

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

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

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

Mr. OLVER. I yield such time as is needed by the gentlewoman to finish the explanation of her amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I am grateful that the gentleman from Iowa raised the question, if you would, because I do want to reinforce what the amendment says.

The amendment specifically says, with respect to workers on federally funded transportation projects. So your sensitivity is clarified by the amendment.

As I indicated in my remarks, I am affirming all workers, labor and union and nonunion. It is a generic term. I want to make sure that we treat workers on federally funded projects fairly and balanced, and that they are not diminished if they are on federally funded projects. We have many individuals who work after the project is finished, and I want to make sure that they are protected as well, union and nonunion.

The amendment is simply a straightforward affirmation of the protection of workers on federally funded transportation projects.

With that in mind, I would ask my colleagues to affirm the importance of protecting workers on federally funded transportation projects, under section A of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935.

With that, I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I would hope that my colleagues would see this as an affirming amendment of all American workers.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlelady from Texas for that clarification. I listened carefully to the presentation, and the clarification comes now that it is union and nonunion workers protected equally alike, on balance, between union and merit shop employees.

The advocacy here is for current law. Now, as we have made this clarification into this record, I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my opposition to the amendment and congratulate the gentlelady from Texas. I appreciate her patience.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2130

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments

that I would like to subsequently withdraw. I would like them taken en bloc.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

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 prohibit transportation workers from having walkie talkies, two-way radios, or any other handheld communication device.

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to limit the use of any available technology in the development of modular or manufactured temporary disaster housing.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the en bloc amendments.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. It is my intent to withdraw both of these amendments, and I will just briefly describe my intent to continue to work with authorizers on these two very vital points.

We have firsthand experience with the tragedy of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and many of the constituents in my congressional district are alumni of trailers, the same trailers that have proved to be dangerous and unhelpful and unuseful. I hope that we will continue to work with the relevant agencies to look at alternative technology for housing so that in our future disasters, we can be able to work effectively. There has been effective legislation moving on this issue, and I know that the many constituents that are impacted by poor housing will welcome this Congress continuing to work on that particular issue.

I move quickly to the question of security and safety on the question of transportation workers who drive a number of transportation vehicles throughout America. In many instances, in my own hometown of Houston, these very transportation workers, particularly bus drivers, do not have the necessary safety equipment such as walkie-talkies, such as two-way radios, such as other handheld communication devices. I will look forward to working with the appropriate committees to address the question of these particular workers who are begging for relief. A recent tragedy in Houston with an assault on a bus driver brought this particular issue to a head. We look forward to working with the various committee Chairs on trying to bring some

response to those transportation workers across America driving transportation vehicles.

I ask for unanimous consent to withdraw the two amendments that have been placed pending on the record, to withdraw both amendments.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the en bloc amendments are withdrawn.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, earlier today during the consideration of H.R. 3074, this body considered an amendment from Mr. FRANK and Mr. RANGEL, providing that no funds in this act may be used to implement the community service requirement of public housing residents. At that time I accepted the amendment, as did the ranking member Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and the amendment was adopted by a voice vote. At the behest of the Republican leadership, I intend to ask unanimous consent to vacate that vote and have a recorded vote.

At this point I yield time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) to explain what this amendment did, since at that earlier time I had wheedled him out of his time by accepting the amendment in the first place, and he needs to explain the amendment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will not object to the unanimous consent request. It will forestall a 15-minute vote and make it a 2-minute vote. And I appreciate the cooperative spirit from the gentleman of Michigan on this as throughout he has been cooperative. I understand other decisions get made, but I did just ask the indulgence of the House because people shouldn't be voting on something with no explanation.

There was implemented in 1998 in legislation, and I think it was part of an appropriations bill then, a requirement that everybody who lives in public housing who is not otherwise fully employed work 8 hours a month in community service. It is not highly regarded by the people who run public housing. It costs money to do this. Understand, when a similar amendment was proposed for the section 8 vouchers, it was defeated, it authorized the Housing Authority to hire someone to administer it. This is not work that is terribly useful.

The way the amendment is written, if you were working, and you are fired or your job ends because of trade or other problems as some people in public housing and you are unemployed, you then have to do 8 hours a month of make-work. So it is a make-work requirement does nobody any good, it is based on the assumption that you can't trust those lazy people in public housing across the board, and it costs

money to administer. So that is why the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who has long been a proponent of it, and myself have offered this amendment.

I thank the gentleman for a chance to explain it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the adoption by voice vote of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) be vacated, to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

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

Amendment No. 22 by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. HENSARLING of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. HUNTER of California.

An amendment by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.

Amendment No. 20 by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

An amendment by Mrs. MUSGRAVE of Colorado.

An amendment by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.

An amendment by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY

MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 97, noes 327, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 705]

AYES—97

Akin	Gingrey	Nunes
Bachmann	Gohmert	Pearce
Barrett (SC)	Gordon	Pence
Barrow	Graves	Petri
Bartlett (MD)	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Hastert	Platts
Bilbray	Heller	Poe
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Herger	Putnam
Boehner	Hunter	Ramstad
Burgess	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Jindal	Roskam
Camp (MI)	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Cannon	Keller	Sali
Cantor	King (IA)	Schmidt
Carter	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Kline (MN)	Sessions
Coble	Lamborn	Shadegg
Conaway	Linder	Shimkus
Cooper	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (NE)
Davis, David	E.	Stearns
Deal (GA)	Mack	Sullivan
Duncan	Marchant	Tancredo
Feeney	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Flake	McCaul (TX)	Thornberry
Fortenberry	McHenry	Walberg
Fossella	Mica	Wamp
Fox	Miller (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Musgrave	Westmoreland
Gallegly	Myrick	Wilson (SC)
Garrett (NJ)	Neugebauer	

NOES—327

Abercrombie	Cramer	Hall (NY)
Ackerman	Crenshaw	Hare
Aderholt	Crowley	Harman
Alexander	Cuellar	Hastings (FL)
Allen	Culberson	Hastings (WA)
Altmire	Cummings	Hayes
Andrews	Davis (AL)	Herseth Sandlin
Arcuri	Davis (CA)	Higgins
Baca	Davis (IL)	Hill
Baird	Davis (KY)	Hinchee
Baker	Davis, Lincoln	Hinojosa
Baldwin	Davis, Tom	Hirono
Bean	DeFazio	Hobson
Becerra	DeGette	Hodes
Berkley	Delahunt	Hoeakstra
Berman	DeLauro	Holden
Berry	Dent	Holt
Biggart	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hooley
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoyer
Bishop (NY)	Dicks	Hulshof
Blumenauer	Dingell	Inslee
Blunt	Doggett	Israel
Bonner	Donnelly	Jackson (IL)
Bono	Doolittle	Jackson-Lee
Boozman	Doyle	(TX)
Bordallo	Drake	Jefferson
Boren	Dreier	Johnson (GA)
Boswell	Edwards	Johnson (IL)
Boucher	Ehlers	Johnson, E. B.
Boustany	Ellison	Jones (NC)
Boyd (FL)	Ellsworth	Jones (OH)
Boyd (KS)	Emanuel	Kagen
Brady (PA)	Emerson	Kanjorski
Brady (TX)	Engel	Kaptur
Braley (IA)	English (PA)	Kennedy
Brown (SC)	Eshoo	Kildee
Brown, Corrine	Etheridge	Kilpatrick
Brown-Waite,	Everett	Kind
Ginny	Faleomavaega	King (NY)
Buchanan	Fallin	Kirk
Butterfield	Farr	Klein (FL)
Calvert	Fattah	Knollenberg
Capito	Ferguson	Kucinich
Capps	Filner	Kuhl (NY)
Capuano	Forbes	Lampson
Cardoza	Fortuno	Langevin
Carnahan	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Carney	Frelinghuysen	Larsen (WA)
Carson	Gerlach	Larson (CT)
Castle	Giffords	Latham
Castor	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Chandler	Gillibrand	Lee
Christensen	Gillmor	Levin
Clay	Gonzalez	Lewis (CA)
Cleaver	Goode	Lewis (GA)
Clyburn	Goodlatte	Lewis (KY)
Cohen	Granger	Lipinski
Cole (OK)	Green, Al	LoBiondo
Costa	Green, Gene	Loebsock
Costello	Grijalva	Lofgren, Zoe
Courtney	Gutierrez	Lowe

Lucas Payne Smith (TX)  
 Lynch Perlmutter Smith (WA)  
 Mahoney (FL) Peterson (MN)  
 Maloney (NY) Peterson (PA)  
 Manzullo Pickering  
 Markey Pomeroy  
 Matheson Porter  
 Matsui Price (NC)  
 McCarthy (NY) Pryce (OH)  
 McCollum (MN) Rahall  
 McCotter Rangel  
 McCrery Regula  
 McDermott Rehberg  
 McGovern Reichert  
 McHugh Renzi  
 McIntyre Reyes  
 McKeon Reynolds  
 McMorris Rodriguez  
 Rodgers Rogers (AL)  
 McNerney Rogers (KY)  
 McNulty Ros-Lehtinen  
 Meek (FL) Ross  
 Meeks (NY) Rothman  
 Melancon Roybal-Allard  
 Michaud Ruppertsberger  
 Miller (MI) Rush  
 Miller (NC) Ryan (OH)  
 Miller, Gary Salazar  
 Miller, George Sánchez, Linda  
 Mitchell T.  
 Mollohan Sanchez, Loretta  
 Moore (KS) Sarbanes  
 Moore (WI) Saxton  
 Moran (KS) Schakowsky  
 Murphy (CT) Schiff  
 Murphy, Patrick Schwartz  
 Murphy, Tim Scott (GA)  
 Murtha Scott (VA)  
 Nadler Serrano  
 Napolitano Sestak  
 Neal (MA) Shays  
 Norton Shea-Porter  
 Oberstar Sherman  
 Obey Shuler  
 Olver Shuster  
 Ortiz Simpson  
 Pallone Sires  
 Pascrell Skelton  
 Pastor Slaughter  
 Paul Smith (NJ)

[Roll No. 706]  
 AYES—86  
 Akin Foxx  
 Bachmann Franks (AZ)  
 Barrett (SC) Garrett (NJ)  
 Bartlett (MD) Gingrey  
 Barton (TX) Goode  
 Bilbray Graves  
 Blackburn Hall (TX)  
 Boehner Heller  
 Boozman Hensarling  
 Buchanan Herger  
 Burton (IN) Issa  
 Buyer Jindal  
 Camp (MI) Jones (NC)  
 Campbell (CA) Jordan  
 Cannon Keller  
 Cantor King (IA)  
 Coble Kingston  
 Cole (OK) Kline (MN)  
 Conaway Lamborn  
 Cooper Linder  
 Davis, David Lucas  
 Deal (GA) Lungren, Daniel  
 E. Sullivan  
 Dreier Mack  
 Duncan Marchant  
 Fallon McCarthy (CA)  
 Feeney McHenry  
 Flake Miller (FL)  
 Fossella Moran (KS)

McCaull (TX) Pryce (OH)  
 McCollum (MN) Putnam  
 McCotter Rahall  
 McCrery Ramstad  
 McDermott Rangel  
 McGovern Regula  
 McHugh Rehberg  
 McIntyre Reichert  
 McKeon Renzi  
 McMorris Reyes  
 Rodgers Reynolds  
 McNerney Rodriguez  
 McNulty Rogers (AL)  
 Meek (FL) Rogers (KY)  
 Meeks (NY) Ros-Lehtinen  
 Melancon Roskam  
 Mica Ross  
 Michaud Rothman  
 Miller (MI) Roybal-Allard  
 Miller (NC) Ruppertsberger  
 Miller, Gary Rush  
 Miller, George Ryan (OH)  
 Mitchell Salazar  
 Mollohan Sánchez, Linda  
 Moore (KS) T.  
 Moore (WI) Sanchez, Loretta  
 Moran (VA) Sarbanes  
 Murphy (CT) Saxton  
 Murphy, Patrick Schakowsky  
 Murphy, Tim Schiff  
 Murtha Schmidt  
 Nadler Schwartz  
 Napolitano Scott (GA)  
 Neal (MA) Scott (VA)  
 Norton Serrano  
 Nunes Sestak  
 Oberstar Shays  
 Obey Shea-Porter  
 Olver Sherman  
 Ortiz Shimkus  
 Pallone Shuler  
 Pascrell Shuster  
 Pastor Simpson  
 Payne Sires  
 Perlmutter Skelton  
 Peterson (MN) Slaughter  
 Pickering Smith (NE)  
 Pomeroy Smith (NJ)  
 Porter Smith (WA)  
 Price (NC) Snyder

Solis Souder  
 Space Space  
 Spratt Spratt  
 Stark Stark  
 Stupak Stupak  
 Sutton Sutton  
 Tanner Tanner  
 Tauscher Tauscher  
 Taylor Taylor  
 Terry Terry  
 Thompson (CA) Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS) Thompson (MS)  
 Tiahrt Tiahrt  
 Tiberi Tiberi  
 Tierney Tierney  
 Towns Towns  
 Turner Turner  
 Udall (CO) Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM) Udall (NM)  
 Upton Upton  
 Van Hollen Van Hollen  
 Velázquez Velázquez  
 Vislosky Vislosky  
 Walden (OR) Walden (OR)  
 Walsh (NY) Walsh (NY)  
 Walz (MN) Walz (MN)  
 Wamp Wamp  
 Wasserman Wasserman  
 Schultz Schultz  
 Waters Waters  
 Watson Watson  
 Watt Watt  
 Waxman Waxman  
 Weiner Weiner  
 Welch (VT) Welch (VT)  
 Weller Weller  
 Wexler Wexler  
 Whitfield Whitfield  
 Wicker Wicker  
 Wilson (NM) Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (OH) Wilson (OH)  
 Wolf Wolf  
 Woolsey Woolsey  
 Wynn Wynn  
 Yarmuth Yarmuth  
 Young (FL) Young (FL)

NOES—338

Abercrombie Cuellar  
 Ackerman Culberson  
 Aderholt Cummings  
 Alexander Davis (AL)  
 Allen Davis (CA)  
 Altmire Davis (IL)  
 Andrews Davis (KY)  
 Arcuri Davis, Lincoln  
 Baca Davis, Tom  
 Baird DeFazio  
 Baker DeGette  
 Baldwin Delahunt  
 Barrow DeLauro  
 Bean Dent  
 Becerra Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Berkley Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Berry Dicks  
 Biggert Dingell  
 Bilirakis Doggett  
 Bishop (GA) Donnelly  
 Bishop (NY) Doyle  
 Blumenauer Drake  
 Bonner Edwards  
 Bono Ehlers  
 Bordallo Ellison  
 Boren Ellsworth  
 Boswell Emanuel  
 Boucher Emerson  
 Boustany Engel  
 Boyd (FL) English (PA)  
 Boyda (KS) Eshoo  
 Brady (PA) Etheridge  
 Brady (TX) Everett  
 Braley (IA) Faleomavaega  
 Brown (SC) Farr  
 Brown, Corrine Fattah  
 Brown-Waite, Filner  
 Ginny Forbes  
 Burgess Fortenberry  
 Butterfield Fortuño  
 Calvert Frank (MA)  
 Capito Frelinghuysen  
 Capps Gallegly  
 Capuano Gerlach  
 Cardoza Giffords  
 Carnahan Gilchrest  
 Carney Gillibrand  
 Carson Gillmor  
 Carter Gohmert  
 Castle Gonzalez  
 Castor Goodlatte  
 Chabot Gordon  
 Chandler Granger  
 Christensen Green, Al  
 Clay Green, Gene  
 Cleaver Grijalva  
 Clyburn Gutierrez  
 Cohen Hall (NY)  
 Costa Hare  
 Costello Harman  
 Courtney Hastert  
 Cramer Hastings (FL)  
 Crenshaw Hastings (WA)  
 Crowley Hayes

Herseth Sandlin  
 Higgins  
 Hill  
 Hinchey  
 Hinojosa  
 Hirono  
 Hobson  
 Hodes  
 Hoekstra  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Hooley  
 Hoyer  
 Hulshof  
 Hunter  
 Inglis (SC)  
 Inslee  
 Israel  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson-Lee (TX)  
 Jefferson  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones (OH)  
 Kagen  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick  
 Kind  
 King (NY)  
 Kirk  
 Klein (FL)  
 Knollenberg  
 Kucinich  
 Kuhl (NY)  
 Lampson  
 Langevin  
 Lantos  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lewis (KY)  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loebsock  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lynch  
 Mahoney (FL)  
 Maloney (NY)  
 Manzullo  
 Markey  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (NY)

NOT VOTING—12

Bachus  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Clarke  
 Conyers

NOT VOTING—12

□ 2205

Messrs. HINCHEY, PASCRELL and TANNER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 86, noes 338, not voting 12, as follows:

NOT VOTING—12

Bachus  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Blunt  
 Clarke

□ 2210

Mrs. SCHMIDT changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote. Members are urged to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 362, noes 63, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 707]

AYES—362

Abercrombie Aderholt  
 Ackerman Akin  
 Alexander  
 Allen

Altmire	Everett	Marchant	Sestak	Sutton	Waters	[Roll No. 708]	
Andrews	Faleomavaega	Matheson	Shadegg	Tancredo	Watson		
Arcuri	Fallin	Matsui	Shea-Porter	Tanner	Watt	AYES—133	
Baca	Fattah	McCarthy (CA)	Sherman	Taylor	Waxman	Akin	Gallely
Bachmann	Feeney	McCarthy (NY)	Shimkus	Terry	Weiner	Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)
Baird	Ferguson	McCaul (TX)	Shuler	Thompson (CA)	Welch (VT)	Barrett (SC)	Gingrey
Baker	Forbes	McCollum (MN)	Shuster	Thompson (MS)	Weldon (FL)	Bartlett (MD)	Goode
Baldwin	Fortenberry	McCotter	Simpson	Thornberry	Westmoreland	Barton (TX)	Goodlatte
Barrett (SC)	Fox	McGovern	Sires	Tiahrt	Wexler	Biggart	Granger
Barrow	Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Skelton	Tiberi	Whitfield	Bilirakis	Graves
Bartlett (MD)	Frelinghuysen	McHugh	Slaughter	Tierney	Wicker	Blackburn	Hall (TX)
Barton (TX)	Gallely	McIntyre	Smith (NE)	Turner	Wilson (NM)	Blunt	Hastert
Becerra	Garrett (NJ)	McKeon	Smith (NJ)	Udall (CO)	Wilson (OH)	Boehner	Hastings (WA)
Berkley	Gerlach	McMorris	Smith (TX)	Upton	Wilson (SC)	Bonner	Hayes
Berry	Giffords	Rodgers	Solis	Velázquez	Wolf	Bono	Heller
Biggart	Gilchrest	McNerney	Souder	Visclosky	Woolsey	Boozman	Hensarling
Bilbray	Gillibrand	McNulty	Space	Walberg	Wu	Brady (TX)	Herger
Bilirakis	Gillmor	Meek (FL)	Spratt	Walden (OR)	Wynn	Brown (SC)	Hoekstra
Bishop (GA)	Gingrey	Melancon	Stearns	Walsh (NY)	Yarmuth	Brown-Waite,	Hulshof
Bishop (NY)	Gohmert	Mica	Stupak	Walz (MN)	Young (FL)	Ginny	Hunter
Blackburn	Goode	Michaud	Sullivan	Wamp		Burgess	Inglis (SC)
Boehner	Goodlatte	Miller (FL)				Burton (IN)	Issa
Bonner	Gordon	Miller (MI)				Buyer	Jindal
Bono	Granger	Miller (NC)	Bean	Fortuño	Meeks (NY)	Camp (MI)	Johnson, Sam
Boozman	Graves	Miller, Gary	Berman	Fossella	Neal (MA)	Campbell (CA)	Jones (NC)
Bordallo	Green, Al	Miller, George	Blumenauer	Frank (MA)	Oliver	Cannon	Jordan
Boren	Green, Gene	Mitchell	Blunt	Gonzalez	Price (NC)	Cantor	Keller
Boswell	Grijalva	Mollohan	Cannon	Harman	Rangel	Carter	Kingston
Boucher	Hall (NY)	Moore (KS)	Capps	Herger	Reichert	Chabot	Kline (MN)
Boustany	Hall (TX)	Moore (WI)	Conyers	Hoyer	Reynolds	Coble	Lamborn
Boyd (FL)	Hare	Moran (KS)	Cooper	Inslee	Ros-Lehtinen	Cole (OK)	Lewis (KY)
Boya (KS)	Hastert	Moran (VA)	Crowley	Israel	Ros-Lehtinen	Conaway	Linder
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Murphy (CT)	Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Rush	Culberson	Lucas
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Murphy, Patrick	Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda	Davis (KY)	Lungren, Daniel
Braley (IA)	Hayes	Murphy, Tim	Delahunt	Kind	T.	Davis, David	E.
Brown (SC)	Heller	Murtha	Diaz-Balart, L.	King (NY)	Shays	Deal (GA)	Mack
Brown, Corrine	Hensarling	Musgrave	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kline (MN)	Smith (WA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo
Brown-Waite,	Herseth Sandlin	Myrick	Dicks	Knollenberg	Snyder	Drake	Marchant
Ginny	Higgins	Nadler	Dreier	Larsen (WA)	Tauscher	Dreier	McCarthy (CA)
Buchanan	Hill	Napolitano	Ehlers	Lofgren, Zoe	Towns	Duncan	McCaul (TX)
Burgess	Hinchee	Neugebauer	Emanuel	Lungren, Daniel	Udall (NM)	Everett	McCotter
Burton (IN)	Hinojosa	Norton	Engel	E.	Van Hollen	Fallin	McCrary
Butterfield	Hirono	Nunes	Farr	Markey	Wasserman	Feeney	McHenry
Buyer	Hobson	Oberstar	Fliner	McCrery	Schultz	Flake	McKeon
Calvert	Hodes	Obey	Flake	McDermott	Weller	Forbes	McMorris
Camp (MI)	Hoekstra	Ortiz				Fortuño	Rodgers
Campbell (CA)	Holden	Pallone				Fossella	Miller (FL)
Cantor	Holt	Pascarell	Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall	Fox	Miller, Gary
Capito	Hooley	Pastor	Bishop (UT)	Gutierrez	Stark	Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)
Capuano	Hulshof	Paul	Clarke	Honda	Young (AK)		
Cardoza	Hunter	Payne	Cubin	LaHood			
Carnahan	Inglis (SC)	Pearce					
Carney	Issa	Pence					
Carson	Jackson (IL)	Perlmutter					
Carter	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)					
Castle	(TX)	Peterson (PA)					
Castor	Jefferson	Petri					
Chabot	Jindal	Pickering					
Chandler	Johnson (GA)	Pitts					
Christensen	Johnson (IL)	Platts					
Clay	Johnson, Sam	Poe					
Cleaver	Jones (NC)	Pomeroy					
Clyburn	Jones (OH)	Porter					
Coble	Jordan	Price (GA)					
Cohen	Kagen	Pryce (OH)					
Cole (OK)	Kanjorski	Putnam					
Conaway	Kaptur	Radanovich					
Costa	Keller	Rahall					
Costello	Kildee	Ramstad					
Courtney	Kilpatrick	Regula					
Cramer	King (IA)	Rehberg					
Crenshaw	Kingston	Renzi					
Culberson	Kirk	Reyes					
Cummings	Klein (FL)	Rodriguez					
Davis (AL)	Kucinich	Rogers (AL)					
Davis (IL)	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (KY)					
Davis (KY)	Lamborn	Rogers (MI)					
Davis, David	Lampson	Rohrabacher					
Davis, Lincoln	Langevin	Roskam					
Davis, Tom	Lantos	Ross					
Deal (GA)	Larson (CT)	Rothman					
DeFazio	Latham	Roybal-Allard					
DeGette	LaTourette	Royce					
DeLauro	Lee	Ryan (OH)					
Dent	Levin	Ryan (WI)					
Dingell	Lewis (CA)	Salazar					
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Sali					
Donnelly	Lewis (KY)	Sanchez, Loretta					
Doolittle	Linder	Sarbanes					
Drake	Doyle	Saxton					
Duncan	LoBiondo	Schakowsky					
Edwards	Loeback	Schiff					
Ellison	Lowey	Schmidt					
Ellsworth	Lucas	Schwartz					
Emerson	Lynch	Scott (GA)					
English (PA)	Mack	Scott (VA)					
Eshoo	Mahoney (FL)	Sensenbrenner					
Etheridge	Maloney (NY)	Serrano					
	Manzullo	Sessions					

## NOES—63

## NOT VOTING—11

## NOES—292

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members have 1 minute remaining to cast their vote.

□ 2215

Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Ms. WATSON, Ms. DEGETTE, and Messrs. WEINER, HINOJOSA, and LANTOS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

The Acting 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote. Members are urged to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 292, not voting 11, as follows:

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Giffords
Ackerman	Cohen	Gilchrest
Aderholt	Conyers	Gillibrand
Alexander	Cooper	Gillmor
Allen	Costa	Gohmert
Altmire	Costello	Gonzalez
Andrews	Courtney	Gordon
Arcuri	Cramer	Green, Al
Baca	Crenshaw	Green, Gene
Baird	Crowley	Grijalva
Baker	Cuellar	Gutierrez
Baldwin	Cummings	Hall (NY)
Barrow	Davis (AL)	Hare
Bean	Davis (CA)	Harman
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Berkley	Davis, Lincoln	Herseth Sandlin
Berman	Davis, Tom	Higgins
Berry	DeFazio	Hill
Bilbray	DeGette	Hinchee
Bishop (GA)	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Bishop (NY)	DeLauro	Hirono
Blumenauer	Dent	Hobson
Bordallo	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hodes
Boren	Dicks	Holden
Boswell	Dingell	Holt
Boucher	Doggett	Hooley
Boustany	Donnelly	Hoyer
Boyd (FL)	Doolittle	Inslee
Boya (KS)	Doyle	Israel
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Jackson (IL)
Braley (IA)	Ehlers	Jackson-Lee
Brown, Corrine	Ellison	(TX)
Buchanan	Ellsworth	Jefferson
Butterfield	Emanuel	Johnson (GA)
Calvert	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Capito	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	English (PA)	Jones (OH)
Capuano	Eshoo	Kagen
Cardoza	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Carnahan	Faleomavaega	Kaptur
Carney	Farr	Kennedy
Carson	Fattah	Kildee
Castle	Ferguson	Kilpatrick
Castor	Filner	King
Chandler	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Christensen	Frank (MA)	Kirk
Clay	Frelinghuysen	Klein (FL)
Cleaver	Gerlach	Knollenberg

Kucinich	Neal (MA)	Sires	Blunt	Gingrey	Paul	Kucinich	Napolitano	Shea-Porter
Kuhl (NY)	Norton	Skelton	Boehner	Gohmert	Pearce	Kuhl (NY)	Neal (MA)	Sherman
Lampson	Oberman	Slaughter	Bonner	Goode	Pence	Langevin	Norton	Sires
Langevin	Obey	Smith (NJ)	Bono	Goodlatte	Petri	Lantos	Oberstar	Skelton
Lantos	Oliver	Smith (WA)	Boozman	Granger	Pitts	Larsen (WA)	Obey	Slaughter
Larsen (WA)	Ortiz	Snyder	Brady (TX)	Graves	Platts	Larson (CT)	Olver	Smith (NJ)
Larson (CT)	Pallone	Solis	Brown (SC)	Hall (TX)	Poe	Latham	Ortiz	Smith (WA)
Latham	Pascrell	Souder	Brown-Waite,	Hastert	Price (GA)	Lee	Pallone	Snyder
LaTourette	Pastor	Space	Ginny	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)	Levin	Pascrell	Solis
Lee	Payne	Spratt	Buchanan	Hayes	Putnam	Lewis (CA)	Pastor	Space
Levin	Perlmutter	Stark	Burgess	Heller	Radanovich	Lewis (GA)	Payne	Spratt
Lewis (CA)	Peterson (MN)	Stupak	Burton (IN)	Hensarling	Ramstad	Lipinski	Perlmutter	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (PA)	Sutton	Buyer	Herger	Regula	LoBiondo	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
Lipinski	Petri	Tanner	Calvert	Hoekstra	Rehberg	Loeb sack	Peterson (PA)	Sutton
LoBiondo	Platts	Tauscher	Camp (MI)	Hulshof	Reynolds	Lofgren, Zoe	Pickering	Tauscher
Loeb sack	Pomeroy	Thompson (CA)	Campbell (CA)	Hunter	Rogers (AL)	Lowey	Pomeroy	Thompson (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe	Porter	Thompson (MS)	Cannon	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (KY)	Lynch	Porter	Thompson (MS)
Lowey	Pryce (OH)	Tierney	Cantor	Issa	Rogers (MI)	Mahoney (FL)	Price (NC)	Tierney
Lynch	Rahall	Towns	Capito	Jindal	Rohrabacher	Maloney (NY)	Rahall	Towns
Mahoney (FL)	Ramstad	Turner	Carter	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen	Markey	Rangel	Turner
Maloney (NY)	Rangel	Udall (CO)	Castle	Jones (NC)	Roskam	Matsui	Reichert	Turner
Markey	Regula	Udall (NM)	Chabot	Jordan	Royce	McCarthy (NY)	Renzi	Udall (CO)
Matheson	Reichert	Upton	Coble	Keller	Ryan (WI)	McCollum (MN)	Reyes	Udall (NM)
Matsui	Renzi	Van Hollen	Cole (OK)	King (IA)	Sali	McDermott	Rodriguez	Van Hollen
McCarthy (NY)	Reyes	Velázquez	Conaway	Kingston	Schmidt	McGovern	Ross	Velázquez
McCollum (MN)	Rodriguez	Visclosky	Crenshaw	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner	McHugh	Rothman	Visclosky
McDermott	Rogers (AL)	Walden (OR)	Culberson	Lamborn	Sessions	McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Walsh (NY)
McGovern	Ross	Walsh (NY)	Davis (KY)	Lampson	Shadegg	McNerney	Ruppersberger	Walz (MN)
McHugh	Rothman	Walz (MN)	Davis, David	LaTourette	Shimkus	McNulty	Rush	Wasserman
McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman	Davis, Tom	Lewis (KY)	Shuler	Meek (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Schultz
McNerney	Ruppersberger	Rush	Deal (GA)	Linder	Shuster	Meeks (NY)	Salazar	Waters
McNulty	Rush	Schultz	Dent	Lucas	Simpson	Melancon	Sánchez, Linda	Watson
Meek (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Waters	Diaz-Balart, L.	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (NE)	Michaud	T.	Watt
Meeks (NY)	Salazar	Watson	Diaz-Balart, M.	E.	Smith (TX)	Miller (NC)	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Melancon	Sánchez, Linda	Watt	Donnelly	Mack	Souder	Miller, George	Sarbanes	Weiner
Mica	T.	Waxman	Drake	Manullo	Stearns	Mollohan	Saxton	Welch (VT)
Michaud	Sanchez, Loretta	Weiner	Dreier	Marchant	Sullivan	Moore (KS)	Schakowsky	Wexler
Miller (MI)	Sarbanes	Welch (VT)	Duncan	Matheson	Tancredo	Moore (WI)	Schiff	Wilson (OH)
Miller (NC)	Saxton	Weller	Ellsworth	McCarthy (CA)	Tanner	Moran (VA)	Schwartz	Wolf
Miller, George	Schakowsky	Wexler	English (PA)	McCaul (TX)	Taylor	Murphy (CT)	Scott (GA)	Woolsey
Mitchell	Schiff	Whitfield	Everett	McCotter	Terry	Murphy, Patrick	Scott (VA)	Wu
Mollohan	Schwartz	Wicker	Fallin	McCrery	Thornberry	Murphy, Tim	Serrano	Wynn
Moore (KS)	Scott (GA)	Wilson (NM)	Feeney	McHenry	Tiaht	Murtha	Sestak	Yarmuth
Moore (WI)	Scott (VA)	Wilson (OH)	Flake	McKeon	Tiberi	Nadler	Shays	
Moran (VA)	Serrano	Wolf	Forbes	McMorris	Upton			
Murphy (CT)	Sestak	Woolsey	Fortenberry	Rodgers	Walberg			
Murphy, Patrick	Shays	Wu	Fortuño	Mica	Walden (OR)	Bachus	Cubin	LaHood
Murphy, Tim	Shea-Porter	Wynn	Fossella	Miller (FL)	Wamp	Bishop (UT)	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall
Murtha	Sherman	Yarmuth	Fox	Miller (MI)	Weldon (FL)	Clarke	Honda	Young (AK)
Nadler	Shuler	Young (FL)	Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Weller			
Napolitano	Simpson		Frelinghuysen	Mitchell	Westmoreland			
			Gallegly	Moran (KS)	Whitfield			
			Garrett (NJ)	Musgrave	Wicker			
			Gerlach	Myrick	Wilson (NM)			
			Giffords	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)			
			Gillmor	Nunes	Young (FL)			

NOT VOTING—11

Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall
Bishop (UT)	Honda	Price (NC)
Clarke	King (IA)	Young (AK)
Cubin	LaHood	

□ 2219

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 250, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 709]

AYES—177

Akin	Barrett (SC)	Biggart
Altmore	Bartlett (MD)	Bilbray
Bachmann	Barton (TX)	Bilirakis
Baker	Bean	Blackburn

NOES—250

Abercrombie	Cohen	Green, Al
Ackerman	Conyers	Green, Gene
Aderholt	Cooper	Grijalva
Alexander	Costa	Gutierrez
Allen	Costello	Hall (NY)
Andrews	Courtney	Hare
Arcuri	Cramer	Harman
Baca	Crowley	Hastings (FL)
Baird	Cuellar	Herseth Sandlin
Baldwin	Cummings	Higgins
Barrow	Davis (AL)	Hill
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Hinchey
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Hinojosa
Berman	Davis, Lincoln	Hirono
Berry	DeFazio	Hobson
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Hodes
Bishop (NY)	Delahunt	Holden
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Holt
Bordallo	Dicks	Hooley
Boren	Dingell	Hoyer
Boswell	Doggett	Inslee
Boucher	Doolittle	Israel
Boustany	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Boyd (FL)	Edwards	Jackson-Lee
Boyd (KS)	Ehlers	(TX)
Brady (PA)	Ellison	Jefferson
Braley (IA)	Emanuel	Johnson (GA)
Brown, Corrine	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Butterfield	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	Eshoo	Jones (OH)
Capuano	Etheridge	Kagen
Cardoza	Falcomavaega	Kanjorski
Carnahan	Farr	Kaptur
Carney	Fattah	Kennedy
Carson	Ferguson	Kildee
Castor	Finer	Kilpatrick
Chandler	Frank (MA)	Kind
Christensen	Gilchrest	King (NY)
Clay	Gillibrand	Kirk
Cleaver	Gonzalez	Klein (FL)
Clyburn	Gordon	Knollenberg

NOT VOTING—9

Bishop (UT)	Cubin	LaHood
Clarke	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall
	Honda	Young (AK)

□ 2224

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

The Acting 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 229, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 710]

AYES—198

Aderholt	Blackburn	Burton (IN)
Akin	Blunt	Buyer
Alexander	Boehner	Calvert
Altmore	Bonner	Camp (MI)
Bachmann	Bono	Campbell (CA)
Baker	Boozman	Cannon
Barrett (SC)	Boustany	Cantor
Bartlett (MD)	Brady (TX)	Capito
Barton (TX)	Brown (SC)	Carter
Bean	Brown-Waite,	Castle
Biggart	Ginny	Chabot
Bilbray	Buchanan	Coble
Bilirakis	Burgess	Cole (OK)

Conaway	Inglis (SC)	Platts	Matsui	Pomeroy	Solis	Hastert	McCrery	Ros-Lehtinen
Cooper	Issa	Poe	McCarthy (NY)	Porter	Space	Hastings (WA)	McHenry	Roskam
Crenshaw	Jindal	Price (GA)	McCollum (MN)	Porter	Spratt	Hayes	McKeon	Royce
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Pryce (OH)	McDermott	Rahall	Stark	Hensarling	McMorris	Ryan (WI)
Davis (KY)	Jones (NC)	Putnam	McGovern	Rangel	Stupak	Herger	Rodgers	Sali
Davis, David	Jordan	Radanovich	McHugh	Regula	Sutton	Hoekstra	Mica	Schmidt
Davis, Tom	Keller	Ramstad	McIntyre	Reichert	Tauscher	Hulshof	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Deal (GA)	King (IA)	Rehberg	McNulty	Renzi	Thompson (CA)	Inglis (SC)	Moran (KS)	Sessions
Dent	King (NY)	Reynolds	Meek (FL)	Reyes	Thompson (MS)	Issa	Musgrave	Shadegg
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston	Rogers (AL)	Meeks (NY)	Rodriguez	Tierney	Jordan	Myrick	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Rogers (KY)	Michaud	Ross	Towns	Keller	Neugebauer	Shuster
Donnelly	Kline (MN)	Rogers (MI)	Miller (NC)	Rothman	Turner	King (IA)	Paul	Smith (NE)
Drake	Lamborn	Rohrabacher	Miller, George	Roybal-Allard	Udall (CO)	Kingston	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Dreier	Lampson	Ros-Lehtinen	Mollohan	Ruppersberger	Udall (NM)	Kline (MN)	Pence	Stearns
Duncan	LaTourette	Roskam	Moore (KS)	Rush	Van Hollen	Knollenberg	Petri	Sullivan
Ellsworth	Lewis (CA)	Royce	Moore (WI)	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez	Kuhl (NY)	Pickering	Tancredo
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Ryan (WI)	Moran (VA)	Salazar	Visclosky	Lamborn	Pitts	Thornberry
English (PA)	Linder	Sali	Murphy (CT)	Sánchez, Linda	Walsh (NY)	Lewis (CA)	Poe	Tiahrt
Everett	LoBiondo	Saxton	Murphy, Patrick	T. Sanchez, Loretta	Walz (MN)	Lewis (KY)	Price (GA)	Tiberi
Fallin	Lucas	Schmidt	Murphy, Tim	Sarbanes	Wasserman	Linder	Putnam	Tolson
Feeney	Lungren, Daniel	Sensenbrenner	Murtha	Schakowsky	Schultz	Lucas	Radanovich	Walberg
Flake	E.	Sessions	Nadler	Schiff	Schwartz	Lungren, Daniel	Regula	Wamp
Forbes	Mack	Shadegg	Napolitano	Schiff	Scott (VA)	E.	Rehberg	Weldon (FL)
Fortenberry	Mahoney (FL)	Shays	Norton	Schwartz	Scott (VA)	Mack	Reichert	Westmoreland
Fortuño	Manzullo	Shimkus	Norton	Scott (GA)	Watt	Manzullo	Reynolds	Wicker
Fossella	Marchant	Shuler	Oberstar	Scott (VA)	Waxman	Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Matheson	Shuster	Obey	Serrano	Weiner	McCaul (TX)	Rogers (KY)	Wolf
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)	Simpson	Oliver	Sestak	Welch (VT)	McCotter	Rohrabacher	
Frelinghuysen	McCaul (TX)	Smith (NE)	Ortiz	Shea-Porter	Wexler			
Gallely	McCotter	Smith (NJ)	Pallone	Sherman	Wilson (OH)			
Garrett (NJ)	McCrery	Smith (TX)	Pascarell	Snyder	Woolsey			
Gerlach	McHenry	Souder	Pastor	Skelton	Wu	Abercrombie	Doggett	Klein (FL)
Giffords	McKeon	Stearns	Payne	Slaughter	Wynn	Ackerman	Donnelly	Kucinich
Gilchrest	McMorris	Sullivan	Perlmutter	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth	Allen	Doyle	Lampson
Gillibrand	Rodgers	Tancredo	Peterson (MN)	Snyder		Altmire	Edwards	Langevin
Gillmor	McNerney	Tanner				Andrews	Ellison	Lantos
Gingrey	Melancon	Taylor				Arcuri	Ellsworth	Larsen (WA)
Gohmert	Mica	Terry	Bachus	Cubin	LaHood	Baca	Emanuel	Larson (CT)
Goode	Miller (FL)	Thornberry	Bishop (UT)	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall	Baird	Emerson	Latham
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Tiahrt	Clarke	Honda	Young (AK)	Baldwin	Engel	LaTourette
Granger	Miller, Gary	Tiberi				Barrow	English (PA)	Lee
Graves	Mitchell	Upton				Bartlett (MD)	Eshoo	Levin
Hall (TX)	Moran (KS)	Walberg				Bean	Etheridge	Lewis (GA)
Hastert	Musgrave	Walden (OR)				Becerra	Faleomavaega	Lipinski
Hastings (WA)	Myrick	Wamp				Berkley	Farr	LoBiondo
Hayes	Neugebauer	Weldon (FL)				Berman	Fattah	Loeb
Heller	Nunes	Weller				Berry	Ferguson	Lofgren, Zoe
Hensarling	Paul	Westmoreland				Bishop (GA)	Filner	Lowe
Herger	Pearce	Whitfield				Bishop (NY)	Frank (MA)	Lynch
Hill	Pence	Wicker				Blumenaue	Frelinghuysen	Mahoney (FL)
Hobson	Peterson (PA)	Wilson (NM)				Bordallo	Gerlach	Maloney (NY)
Hoekstra	Petri	Wilson (SC)				Boren	Giffords	Markey
Hulshof	Pickering	Wolf				Boswell	Gilchrest	Matheson
Hunter	Pitts	Young (FL)				Boucher	Gillibrand	Matsui
						Boustany	Gonzalez	McCarthy (CA)
						Boyd (FL)	Gordon	McCarthy (NY)
						Boyd (KS)	Green, Al	McCollum (MN)
						Brady (PA)	Green, Gene	McDermott
						Brady (TX)	Grijalva	McGovern
						Braley (IA)	Gutierrez	McHugh
						Brown, Corrine	Hall (NY)	McIntyre
						Butterfield	Hare	McNerney
						Calvert	Harman	McNulty
						Capito	Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)
						Capps	Heller	Meeks (NY)
						Capuano	Herseht Sandlin	Melancon
						Cardoza	Higgins	Michaud
						Carnahan	Hill	Miller (MI)
						Carney	Hinche	Miller (NC)
						Carson	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
						Carter	Hirono	Miller, George
						Castle	Hobson	Mitchell
						Castor	Hodes	Mollohan
						Chandler	Holden	Moore (KS)
						Christensen	Holt	Moore (WI)
						Clay	Hooley	Moran (VA)
						Cleaver	Hoyer	Murphy (CT)
						Clyburn	Hunter	Murphy, Patrick
						Cohen	Inslie	Murphy, Tim
						Conyers	Israel	Murtha
						Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Nadler
						Costa	Jackson-Lee	Napolitano
						Costello	(TX)	Neal (MA)
						Courtney	Jefferson	Norton
						Cramer	Jindal	Nunes
						Crowley	Johnson (GA)	Oberstar
						Cuellar	Johnson (IL)	Obey
						Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Oliver
						Davis (AL)	Johnson, Sam	Ortiz
						Davis (CA)	Jones (NC)	Pallone
						Davis (IL)	Jones (OH)	Pascarell
						Davis, Lincoln	Kagen	Pastor
						Davis, Tom	Kanjorski	Payne
						DeFazio	Kaptur	Perlmutter
						DeGette	Kennedy	Peterson (MN)
						Delahunt	Kildee	Peterson (PA)
						DeLauro	Kilpatrick	Platts
						Dent	Kind	Pomeroy
						Dicks	King (NY)	Porter
						Dingell	Kirk	Price (NC)

## NOES—283

## NOES—229

Abercrombie	Cramer	Hinojosa	Bachus	Cubin	LaHood
Ackerman	Crowley	Hirono	Bishop (UT)	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall
Allen	Cuellar	Hodes	Clarke	Honda	Young (AK)
Andrews	Cummings	Holden			
Arcuri	Davis (AL)	Holt			
Baca	Davis (CA)	Hooley			
Baird	Davis (IL)	Hoyer			
Baldwin	Davis, Lincoln	Inslie			
Barrow	DeFazio	Israel			
Becerra	DeGette	Jackson (IL)			
Berkley	Delahunt	Jackson-Lee			
Berman	DeLauro	(TX)			
Berry	Dicks	Jefferson			
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Johnson (GA)			
Bishop (NY)	Doggett	Johnson (IL)			
Blumenaue	Doolittle	Johnson, E. B.			
Bordallo	Doyle	Jones (OH)			
Boren	Edwards	Kagen			
Boswell	Ehlers	Kanjorski			
Boucher	Ellison	Kaptur			
Boyd (FL)	Emanuel	Kennedy			
Boyd (KS)	Engel	Kildee			
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Kilpatrick			
Braley (IA)	Etheridge	Kind			
Brown, Corrine	Faleomavaega	Klein (FL)			
Butterfield	Farr	Knollenberg			
Capps	Fattah	Kucinich			
Capuano	Ferguson	Kuhl (NY)			
Cardoza	Filner	Langevin			
Carnahan	Frank (MA)	Lantos			
Carney	Gonzalez	Larsen (WA)			
Carson	Gordon	Larson (CT)			
Castor	Green, Al	Latham			
Chandler	Green, Gene	Lee			
Christensen	Grijalva	Levin			
Clay	Gutierrez	Lewis (GA)			
Cleaver	Hall (NY)	Lipinski			
Clyburn	Hare	Loeb			
Cohen	Harman	Lofgren, Zoe			
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	Lowe			
Costa	Herseht Sandlin	Lynch			
Costello	Higgins	Maloney (NY)			
Courtney	Hinche	Markey			

## NOT VOTING—9

□ 2228

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 142, noes 283, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 711]

AYES—142

Aderholt	Burton (IN)	Ehlers
Akin	Buyer	Everett
Alexander	Camp (MI)	Fallin
Bachmann	Campbell (CA)	Feeney
Baker	Cannon	Flake
Barrett (SC)	Cantor	Forbes
Barton (TX)	Chabot	Fortenberry
Biggert	Coble	Fortuño
Bilbray	Cole (OK)	Fossella
Bilirakis	Conaway	Fox
Blackburn	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Blunt	Culberson	Gallely
Boehner	Davis (KY)	Garrett (NJ)
Bonner	Davis, David	Gillmor
Bono	Deal (GA)	Gingrey
Boozman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Gohmert
Brown (SC)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Goode
Brown-Waite,	Doolittle	Goodlatte
Ginny	Drake	Granger
Buchanan	Dreier	Graves
Burgess	Duncan	Hall (TX)

Pryce (OH) Shays Udall (CO) Lucas Paul Shadegg Scott (GA) Spratt Visclosky  
 Rahall Shea-Porter Udall (NM) Lungren, Daniel Pearce Scott (VA) Stark Walden (OR)  
 Ramstad Sherman Upton E. Pearce Serrano Stupak Walz (MN)  
 Rangel Shuler Van Hollen Mack Peterson (PA) Smith (TX) Soudier Sestak Sutton Wasserman  
 Renzi Simpson Velázquez Pickering Souder Shays Tanner Schultz  
 Reyes Sires Visclosky Marchant Pitts Stearns Sherman Tauscher Waters  
 Rodriguez Skelton Walden (OR) McCarthy (CA) Platts Sullivan Tancredo Terry Shuler Taylor  
 Rogers (MI) Slaughter Walz (MN) McCaul (TX) Poe Shuster Thompson (CA) Watt  
 Ross Smith (NJ) McHenry Pryce (OH) Price (GA) Thornberry Thompson (MS) Waxman  
 Rothman Smith (WA) McKeon Putnam Rogers (MI) Tiahrt Tierney Tiberi Weiner  
 Roybal-Allard Snyder Solis Ramstad Wamp Weldon (FL) Westmoreland Whitfield Wicker Wilson (NM) Wilson (SC) Wolf Young (FL)

Waters  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Welch (VT)  
 Weller  
 Wexler  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (OH)  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Ymn  
 Yarmuth  
 Young (FL)

McCrery  
 McKeon  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Moran (KS)  
 Royce  
 Musgrave  
 Myrick  
 Neugebauer  
 Nunes  
 Emerson  
 Ackerman  
 English (PA)  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Faleomavaega  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Ferguson  
 Filner  
 Fossella  
 Frank (MA)  
 Gerlach  
 Giffords  
 Gilchrest  
 Gillibrand  
 Gillmor  
 Gonzalez  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Blumenauer  
 Blunt  
 Bordonaro  
 Boren  
 Boswell  
 Boucher  
 Boyd (FL)  
 Boyda (KS)  
 Brady (PA)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brown, Corrine  
 Brown-Waite,  
 Ginny  
 Butterfield  
 Capito  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardoza  
 Carnahan  
 Carney  
 Carson  
 Castle  
 Castor  
 Chandler  
 Christensen  
 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  
 Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Donnelly  
 Doyle  
 Lamborn  
 Edwards  
 Elgison  
 Ellsworth  
 Emanuel

Young (FL)  
 Mahoney (FL)  
 Maloney (NY)  
 Markey  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCollum (MN)  
 McCotter  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McHugh  
 McIntyre  
 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  
 Olver  
 Ortiz  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor  
 Payne  
 Perlmutter  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Petri  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Price (NC)  
 Radanovich  
 Rahall  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renzi  
 Reyes  
 Reynolds  
 Rodriguez  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Salazar  
 Sanchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Saxton  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schwartz  
 Capps

NOES—278

NOT VOTING—10

NOES—278

NOT VOTING—11

Bachus Davis, Jo Ann Walsh (NY)  
 Bishop (UT) Honda Whitfield  
 Clarke LaHood Young (AK)  
 Cubin Marshall

□ 2231

So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA  
 The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
 The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 148, noes 278, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 712]

AYES—148

Aderholt Cole (OK) Goodlatte  
 Akin Conaway Granger  
 Bachmann Crenshaw Graves  
 Baker Culberson Hall (TX)  
 Barrett (SC) Davis (KY) Hastert  
 Bartlett (MD) Davis, David Hastings (WA)  
 Barton (TX) Davis, Tom Hayes  
 Bilbray Deal (GA) Heller  
 Bilirakis Dent Hensarling  
 Blackburn Doolittle Heger  
 Boehner Drake Hoekstra  
 Bonner Dreier Hulshof  
 Bono Duncan Hunter  
 Boozman Ehlers Inglis (SC)  
 Boustany Everrett Issa  
 Brady (TX) Fallin Jindal  
 Brown (SC) Feeney Johnson, Sam  
 Buchanan Flake Jones (NC)  
 Burgess Forbes Jordan  
 Burton (IN) Fortenberry Keller  
 Buyer Fortuño King (IA)  
 Calvert Foxx Kingston  
 Camp (MI) Franks (AZ) Kline (MN)  
 Campbell (CA) Frelinghuysen Knollenberg  
 Cannon Gallegly Lamborn  
 Cantor Garrett (NJ) Latham  
 Carter Gingrey Lewis (CA)  
 Chabot Gohmert Lewis (KY)  
 Coble Goode Linder

Abercrombie Emerson  
 Ackerman Engel  
 English (PA) English (PA)  
 Eshoo Eshoo  
 Etheridge Etheridge  
 Faleomavaega Faleomavaega  
 Farr Farr  
 Fattah Fattah  
 Ferguson Ferguson  
 Filner Filner  
 Fossella Fossella  
 Frank (MA) Frank (MA)  
 Gerlach Gerlach  
 Giffords Giffords  
 Gilchrest Gilchrest  
 Gillibrand Gillibrand  
 Gillmor Gillmor  
 Gonzalez Gonzalez  
 Bishop (GA) Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY) Bishop (NY)  
 Blumenauer Blumenauer  
 Blunt Blunt  
 Bordonaro Bordonaro  
 Boren Boren  
 Boswell Boswell  
 Boucher Boucher  
 Boyd (FL) Boyd (FL)  
 Boyda (KS) Boyda (KS)  
 Brady (PA) Brady (PA)  
 Braley (IA) Braley (IA)  
 Brown, Corrine Brown, Corrine  
 Brown-Waite, Ginny Brown-Waite,  
 Ginny  
 Butterfield Butterfield  
 Capito Capito  
 Capps Capps  
 Capuano Capuano  
 Cardoza Cardoza  
 Carnahan Carnahan  
 Carney Carney  
 Carson Carson  
 Castle Castle  
 Castor Castor  
 Chandler Chandler  
 Christensen Christensen  
 Clay Clay  
 Cleaver Cleaver  
 Clyburn Clyburn  
 Cohen Cohen  
 Conyers Conyers  
 Cooper Cooper  
 Costa Costa  
 Costello Costello  
 Courtney Courtney  
 Cramer Cramer  
 Crowley Crowley  
 Cuellar Cuellar  
 Cummings Cummings  
 Davis (AL) Davis (AL)  
 Davis (CA) Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL) Davis (IL)  
 Davis, Lincoln Davis, Lincoln  
 DeFazio DeFazio  
 DeGette DeGette  
 Delahunt Delahunt  
 DeLauro DeLauro  
 Diaz-Balart, L. Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M. Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Dicks Dicks  
 Dingell Dingell  
 Doggett Doggett  
 Donnelly Donnelly  
 Doyle Doyle  
 Lamborn Lamborn  
 Edwards Edwards  
 Elgison Elgison  
 Ellsworth Ellsworth  
 Emanuel Emanuel

Young (FL)  
 Mahoney (FL)  
 Maloney (NY)  
 Markey  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCollum (MN)  
 McCotter  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McHugh  
 McIntyre  
 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  
 Olver  
 Ortiz  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor  
 Payne  
 Perlmutter  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Petri  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Price (NC)  
 Radanovich  
 Rahall  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renzi  
 Reyes  
 Reynolds  
 Rodriguez  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Salazar  
 Sanchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Saxton  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schwartz

NOT VOTING—10

NOT VOTING—10

□ 2235

Mr. SHUSTER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, please note that I mistakenly voted “yes” on amendment 8, the King Amendment, regarding the funding provisions and the Davis-Bacon Act. I meant to vote “no” but voted “yes.” It was too late to change the vote. Given the opportunity I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
 The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 220, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 713]

AYES—207

Abercrombie Capuano DeLauro  
 Ackerman Cardoza Dicks  
 Allen Carnahan Dingell  
 Andrews Carson Doggett  
 Arcuri Castor Donnelly  
 Baca Chandler Doyle  
 Baldwin Christensen Ellison  
 Bean Cleaver Ellsworth  
 Becerra Clyburn Emanuel  
 Berkley Cohen Engel  
 Berman Conyers Eshoo  
 Berry Cooper Etheridge  
 Bishop (GA) Costa Faleomavaega  
 Bishop (NY) Costello Farr  
 Blumenauer Courtney Fattah  
 Bordonaro Crowley Filner  
 Boswell Cummings Frank (MA)  
 Boucher Davis (CA) Gillibrand  
 Brady (PA) Davis (IL) Gonzalez  
 Braley (IA) Davis, Lincoln Green, Al  
 Brown, Corrine DeFazio Grijalva  
 Butterfield DeGette Gutierrez  
 Capps Delahunt Hall (NY)

Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Higgins  
Hinchee  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holt  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Insole  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loebsock  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lynch  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui

McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Norton  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.

## NOES—220

Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Bachmann  
Baker  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Biggert  
Billray  
Bilirakis  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
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  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David

Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English (PA)  
Everett  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fortuño  
Fossella  
Foss  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Green, Gene  
Hall (TX)  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseht Sandlin  
Hill  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Hulshof

Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Issa  
Jindal  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jordan  
Keller  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
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)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCotter  
McCreery  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer

Nunes  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)

Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sali  
Saxton  
Schmidt  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Souder  
Space  
Stearns

## NOT VOTING—9

Bachus  
Bishop (UT)  
Clarke

Cubin  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Honda

LaHood  
Marshall  
Young (AK)

□ 2239

Mr. MCINTYRE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008”.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3074, the FY08 Transportation-HUD Appropriations bill.

I want to thank Chairman OBEY, Chairman OLVER, Ranking Member KNOLLENBERG and the Appropriations Committee for their hard work on this piece of legislation.

This bill contains vital funding for the Houston METRO's North and Southeast New Starts projects. The New Starts project will allow METRO to continue funding implementation of rail and bus rapid transit portions in the North Corridor Project and the Southeast Corridor Projects that are in or service our district.

METRO will use this funding for final design, land acquisition and construction for the North Corridor Project and the Southeast Corridor Projects.

Houston is the Nation's fourth largest city and the region is becoming increasingly congested. We have a critical need for a comprehensive rapid transit system.

The funds that have been allocated for the New Starts Program will improve mobility and transportation options for my constituents and benefit the greater Houston area.

This bill also contains funding for an Economic Development Initiative for the Harris County Community and Economic Department's Community Transit Study.

This funding will allow HUD to study two areas in our district, the Northshore area and city of Galena Park, for transit improvements such as sidewalks, street lights, and transit shelters.

Unfortunately, this bill does not provide funding for several projects that I strongly support.

These projects are: the Harrisburg Grade Crossing, Texas Department of Transportation's Design and Construction of Direct Connectors from Beltway 8 to U.S. 59 North, the city of Baytown's Texas Avenue

Streetscape Program, the Brays Bayou Bike/Pedestrian Bridge at Mason Park, the Houston Zoo's Enhanced Zoo Interpretives Project, and the Houston Port Region's Economic Recovery Task Force.

While it is impossible to fund all of the projects that we request, I believe that these programs need Federal funding.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with House earmark reforms, I would like to place into the RECORD a listing of Congressionally-directed projects in my home State of Idaho that are contained within the report to the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee. I am grateful for their inclusion in this bill.

I'd like to take just a few minutes to describe why I supported these projects and why they are valuable to the Nation and its taxpayers.

The bill contains \$900,000 for the City of Rocks Back Country Byway in my Congressional District. This 16.7 mile long project is located on the popular City of Rocks Back Country Byway in Cassia County, Idaho, and provides the only direct access to the City of Rocks National Reserve. When fully completed, the project will pave a 1.0 mile gravel segment, reconstruct 15.7 miles of deficient roadway, correct deteriorated road and slope conditions, provide a wider road with shoulders and guardrail, and improve the road's alignment by reducing the number and severity of sharp curves and steep grades. These improvements will increase safety for the driving public and provide safer access for bicycle and pedestrian traffic. These improvements will also significantly reduce the amount of ongoing maintenance required to keep the route usable. This project has received Federal funding in previous years. This project was requested by the Idaho Transportation Department.

The report contains \$300,000 for the I-84, Curtis Road to Broadway IC Widening. This project would widen I-84 through east Boise, adding eastbound and westbound fourth lanes. This widening is needed to alleviate congestion and safety issues caused by the continued fast growth in the Treasure Valley. This project was requested by the Idaho Transportation Department.

The report contains \$500,000 for the Idaho Transit Coalition's program to improve bus and bus facilities all across the State of Idaho. The funding will assist Ada County Highway District's Commuterite, Boise State University, the Coeur d'Alene Tribe, the City of Ketchum, the Ketchum/Sun Valley Transit Authority, KART, the City of Moscow, the City of Pocatello, the University of Idaho, and Valley Regional Transit. The majority of these projects are identified in the “Idaho Statewide Public Transportation Needs and Benefits Study” compiled by the Idaho Transportation Department in 1996 and subsequent local studies and plans. All projects are identified in the Transportation Improvement and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan. The current request represents only a small amount of what will be needed to maintain and expand Idaho's public transportation capital system to meet the demands of the State's rapidly growing population. This project has received federal funding in previous years. The funding was requested by the Idaho Transit Coalition.

The report contains \$150,000 for the Historic Wilson Theater Restoration Project in Rupert, Idaho. The Wilson Theater was built in 1920 and is on the National Register of Historic Places. The Theater is also part of Rupert's Historic Business District. Rupert is a predominantly rural community that recently experienced the closure of its largest employer, Kraft Cheese. The restoration of this theater is one aspect of the community's effort to revitalize itself, attract new employers and generate interest in the community. The community thus far has raised over \$1 million in private donations to restore the building, and federal funds will be only a small part of overall expenses. This project was requested by the non-profit Renaissance Art Center, Inc. in Rupert, Idaho.

The report contains \$50,000 for the Custer County Economic Development Initiative in Custer County, Idaho. The vast size of Custer County presents enormous financial challenges for a county that is overwhelmingly owned by the federal government. Custer County has a very small tax base with very large costs for maintaining roads and service over a very large area. This funding will permit the county to purchase and renovate an old middle school in Challis that would become a government and business center housing the offices of the City, County, and Economic Development offices and making them ADA compliant. Additionally, funding would help to provide for improvements to a multi-government complex in the City of Stanley and the rodeo grounds in the City of Mackay. This project would relieve an enormous strain on the limited yearly budget of Custer County and allow it to more efficiently deliver services to residents and visitors alike. This project was requested by Custer County, Idaho.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide a list of Congressionally directed projects in my region and an explanation of my support for them: 1.) \$150,000 for Historic Wilson Theater Restoration Project; Rupert, Idaho; 2.) \$50,000 for Custer County Economic Development Initiative; Custer County, Idaho; 3.) \$900,000 for City of Rocks Back Country Byway, Idaho; 4.) \$500,000 for Idaho Transit Coalition buses and bus facilities; and 5.) \$300,000 for I-84, Curtis Road to Broadway IC Widening, Boise, Idaho.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the FY08 Labor/HHS & Education Appropriations bill. I want to commend the Chairman and the staff for an excellent bill which signals a new direction and reflects our priorities as a Nation.

The goal of this bill has always been to make a strong investment in our future—to take seriously our responsibility to the American public, on the issues that affect people every day from our health to our children's education to the scientific research that will find the cures of tomorrow, from protecting workers to providing the training they need to make it in today's economy. I must say that this time around, our bill does not disappoint.

To help States serve 6.8 million unemployed and 13 million jobseekers, the bill provides a \$227.4 million or 1.9 percent increase over fiscal year 2007 for employment, training, and worker protection programs. On worker protection, the bill provides a \$45.5 million increase to key programs to improving safety and health for 113 million workers.

On education, the bill provides historic increases in No Child Left Behind, 8.4 percent

above 2007, including \$1.9 billion more for Title I grants to schools. For students with disabilities, the President's budget proposed to cut IDEA Part B grants by \$291 million or 2.7 percent below the fiscal year 2007 level. In contrast, this bill provides a \$299 million or a 2.8 percent increase over last year. More importantly, this bill reverses a 2-year decline in the federal contribution toward the rising costs of special education for 6.9 million children with disabilities.

It also makes real progress toward college affordability with a significant increase in Pell Grants, allowing us to raise the maximum Pell Grant by \$390 to \$4,700 and benefiting over 5.5 million students without reducing or eliminating other student financial assistance programs.

In the area of medical research, the bill provides continued investment at the NIH and CDC for innovative programs that save lives. With a \$750 million increase over last year, NIH will be able to support another 545 new and competing research grants over last year's level and 1,262 over the President's request.

The bill also provides much-needed investments in programs that support low income people: An increase of \$500.8 million or 23.2 percent above last year for LIHEAP to secure energy assistance for approximately 1 million more low-income seniors and families than last year. \$660.4 million for the Community Services Block Grant allowing states to expand critical services, such as housing, home weatherization, parenting education, adult literacy classes, and emergency food assistance. And a down payment of \$75 million or 3.6 percent in child care assistance, the first increase in discretionary spending for this program in more than five years.

Mr. Chairman, this bill reflects a real commitment to our longstanding responsibilities and true fiscal responsibility. Each of us should support the FY08 Labor/HHS & Education bill—a bill each of us can take home and proudly share with our constituents.

We will accomplish a lot of good with this bill, but I especially want to highlight and commend Chairman OBEY, for the "Reducing the Need for Abortion Initiative" included in the bill, which parallels legislation spearheaded by Representative RYAN and myself.

With close to \$650 million in increased funding over last year and approximately \$1.4 billion for programs such as Title X, Healthy Start, teen pregnancy prevention, adoption awareness, after school programs, and child care programs for new parents attending college, just to name a few, we are promoting policies so critical to reducing the need for abortion in this country.

This bold initiative represents a considerable investment in preventing unintended pregnancies and supporting new parents. It is strong on prevention, strong on family income supports, and it makes clear that we are serious about addressing the issue of abortion head on. That, for all of us, it is a matter of conscience.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be a Member of this subcommittee, its Members, and the work we have done this year. With this bill, we make opportunity real for millions of Americans and we give people the tools they need to grow and thrive tomorrow.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the bill and, in particular, its provisions to

help families obtain affordable housing with Section 8 vouchers and to help people with HIV/AIDS to secure housing with the assistance of the HOPWA program.

I want to thank the chairman for including \$300 million in this bill for Housing Opportunities for People With AIDS, the highest funding level ever for this program; and for providing \$403 million more than current funding for the Section 8 Tenant-Based Rental Assistance program. For years, we have had to fight for every nickel of funding and offer amendments for modest increases. It is a true pleasure to be working with a Chairman who better understands the needs of the American people and who is able to dedicate resources to areas of great need.

Rising housing costs and stagnating incomes have created serious housing affordability problems for growing numbers of low-income families. Years of Republican budget cuts have seriously damaged our public housing stock and forced thousands of people onto waiting lists for assistance. The list in NY grew so long that they stopped accepting applications. They have only recently announced their intention to reopen it, and they have been inundated by qualified people seeking help. To reduce the number of low-income families with severe housing affordability problems, it is critical that Congress increase Section 8 funding and resume funding for incremental vouchers, which I am pleased this bill does. The section 8 housing voucher program provides safe affordable housing to approximately 2 million American families in urban and rural communities in every State across our country. These vouchers are often the only resource for low-income families confronted by our Nation's affordable housing crisis.

In the past, my colleague Representative VELÁZQUEZ and I, often with the support of Chairman FRANK, have offered amendments that have passed with bipartisan support to increase the Section 8 program. We were successful in passing amendments in 2003, 2005, and 2006 to increase funding so that more families would be able to obtain affordable housing. While we can always do more and clearly there are still many unmet needs, I am pleased by the increases in today's bill.

[See Roll Call 267, 109th Congress 2nd Session (243–178), Roll Call 339, 109th Congress 1st Session (225–194), Roll Call 453, 108th Congress 1st Session (217–208)].

HOPWA is the only Federal housing program that specifically provides cities and states with the resources to address the housing crisis facing people living with HIV/AIDS. Americans living with HIV/AIDS are often forced to choose between expensive drug treatments and necessities such as housing. According to the National AIDS Housing Network, rates of new HIV diagnoses among the homeless are 16 times the rate in the general population, and HIV/AIDS death rates are five to seven times higher. People with AIDS who are homeless are more likely to be uninsured, use an emergency room, and be admitted to a hospital.

Inadequate housing is not only a barrier to treatment, but also puts people with HIV/AIDS at risk of premature death from exposure to other diseases, poor nutrition, stress and lack of medical care. Tragically, at any given time, one-third to one-half of all Americans with HIV/AIDS are either homeless or in imminent danger of becoming homeless.

There is a desperate need for HIV/AIDS housing, and HOPWA answers this need. By providing suitable, reasonably-priced housing, HOPWA enables cities and states to design and provide community-based, cost-effective housing for thousands of people living with HIV/AIDS and their families. It provides maximum flexibility so that states and communities can implement strategies that respond to local housing needs and shortfalls. In addition, the administrative costs of the program are capped, ensuring the money goes directly to serving people with HIV/AIDS.

Providing supportive housing is crucial to the well-being of thousands of people living with HIV/AIDS, and is a cost-effective approach to the AIDS housing crisis. Again, I thank the chairman for supporting HOPWA and Section 8.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEINER, Acting 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. 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, he 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 558, 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. 3074, to the Committee on Appropriations to report the same promptly with an amendment to prohibit the Department of Housing and Urban Development from deriving any portion of the \$1,300,000,000 rescission included in title II of the bill from

recaptures or other reductions of funds previously appropriated for the following:

(1) the Homeless Assistance Grants Program account (including funds provided to make grants to programs which assist homeless veterans);

(2) the Housing for Persons with Disability Program account (including funds provided for grants to programs which assist disabled veterans); and

(3) the Housing for the Elderly Program account.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, title II of the bill requires HUD to rescind \$1.3 billion in the funds that the Congress provided in 2007 or prior years. Frankly, HUD cannot meet this rescission without doing great harm to the most vulnerable of our population, those low-income individuals who are elderly, low-income, disabled persons and homeless families and individuals. As much as 40 percent of the homeless population in this country, Mr. Speaker, as much as 40 percent, are veterans.

Congress has always provided the section 8 program with full funding, knowing that if not all the funds were used, they would be recaptured and rescinded and used by the Congress for other high priority programs. However, this bill states categorically that if funds for the section 8 program are more than actually get used by the Public Housing Authority, they may not be recaptured or rescinded, even though they are clearly in excess.

Let me quote the report accompanying this bill: "The Department is not permitted to recapture these reserves for the rescission."

Just where is the Department expected to go to get these funds? The answer is very simple and very unfortunate. They would, first and foremost, eliminate funding for the construction of facilities that provide assisted living for low-income elderly persons, for low-income disabled individuals and homeless shelters, as well as other permanent housing for the homeless.

□ 2245

Let me repeat, other permanent housing for the homeless, as much as 40 percent of the homeless population are veterans.

These funds are not in excess. Quite to the contrary, they are very much in use. But construction programs spend out slowly and so the funds are there waiting to be applied towards various stages of construction. Unlike the section 8 funds, these funds would never be in excess. They are simply in the pipeline, fully obligated or committed to specific projects and ready for use.

So when HUD takes these funds, it means that facilities for these vulnerable groups will be eliminated. HUD has no other choices since there are no other programs with this much money still available from 2007 or prior years.

Mr. Speaker, however you look at it, this is a very bad outcome and every measure must be taken to prevent cut-

ting programs that serve the most vulnerable, especially programs that serve the homeless veterans. My motion to recommit does just that. It protects those programs from being slashed as sacrificial lambs to a new policy that says excess voucher funds are more important than building facilities to house the elderly and disabled and homeless, especially homeless veterans.

I urge a "yes" vote on this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the former chairman of the VA-HUD Subcommittee and a tireless advocate for housing programs that serve vulnerable populations.

Mr. WALSH of New York. I am entirely familiar with the long-standing practice of Congress to fully fund the section 8 voucher program to be sure all vouchers could be used but recognizing that this rarely happened and that excess funds would be recaptured and rescinded in the next fiscal year.

I am also very familiar with the fact that HUD programs serve the most vulnerable of our populations, and that veterans are one of the most impacted by the HUD programs in general, and especially the homeless program.

I was disappointed to hear that this cycle has been broken, that this Congress has decided that keeping the funds at the public housing authorities is more important than funding facilities for low-income elderly and disabled. But that is exactly what this bill does. It imposes a rescission of a magnitude that would be in excess of the section 8 program need each year, and then precludes the recapture of those funds. The report specifically tells HUD that section 8 funds are off limits for rescission or recapture.

To put this in perspective, section 8 voucher funding is 40 percent of HUD's entire project. So HUD is now forced to take the entire amount of the \$1.3 billion from a small universe of programs.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the motion to recommit and protect the poorest in our communities.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, there are two problems with the motion to recommit, one major and one tricky. First, I will take the major one. I want to point out to the Members of the House that the adoption of the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from California will derail the bill. The motion instructs the committee to report the bill back promptly rather than forthwith. Unlike a motion to recommit with instructions to report back forthwith, a motion with other than forthwith instructions proposes to take the bill from the floor without reaching the question of passage.

Mr. Speaker, section 1002(b) of the House Manual states, "Unlike the case

of the motion to recommit with instructions to report back forthwith, the adoption of which occasions an immediate report to the floor, the adoption to a motion to recommit with instructions to report back other than forthwith sends the bill to committee whose eventual report, if any, would not be immediately before the House.”

Mr. Speaker, a vote for this motion to recommit takes the bill off the floor. A vote against the motion will allow the bill to go forward to final passage. For that reason, I urge defeat of the motion to recommit.

Secondly, the bill before us includes a rescission of \$1.3 billion, which is exactly the same size that the President proposed for the 2008 budget and which is, in fact, lower than what was rescinded last year. HUD refuses to tell specifically where it will take the rescission from, but the President obviously believes that HUD can meet the rescission. The motion purports to disallow rescission from certain accounts, but HUD has traditionally not used those accounts, so the President must have believed that he could meet the rescission without rescinding funds from those three specific accounts.

So again, this one is the tricky one, and I would say that given the trickiness of it, that we should defeat the motion to recommit and go on to passage of the bill. For both reasons, I urge the Members to vote against recommitment of the bill.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Once again we are confronted with politics, not substance. The groans you hear are those of the self-indicted. If you were serious, if you were concerned about the veterans, if you were concerned about those in need, then this would be a substantive amendment subject to consideration now, not later, not tomorrow.

My friend will ask the rhetorical parliamentary question in a few minutes that he has asked every time we have done this, and every time this process is political only.

If it were substantive, I tell the gentleman from New York, if you wanted to accomplish this objective, you may get the votes on this side, but you will not get the votes on this side to kill this bill.

We have now taken 50 hours longer on consideration of appropriation bills than we did last year with unanimous consents from Mr. OBEY. You can groan, but the people who are looking for these funds, the people who want the benefits of this bill, the people who understand the work on both sides of the aisle that has gone into fashioning this bill, the people who have seen us vote on rejecting amendment after amendment on substantive grounds that you offered, and you could have offered this amendment, of course, as well, know full well this is a political process, not a substantive process. Reject this process. Let us move on with the business of the American people.

Let's do what they sent us here to do. Let's act. Reject this motion.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that, if indeed this motion passed, this bill could be reported back to the committee it was assigned to and that bill could be reported back to the House tomorrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk read the motion. The Chair is confident that the Members understand its portent. As affirmed by the Chair on May 24, 2000, and reaffirmed as recently as July 19, 2007, unlike a motion to recommit with instructions to report forthwith, a motion with “non-forthwith” instructions proposes to take the bill from the floor without reaching the question of passage.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that having reported this bill back to the committee from which it was designated, that it could be brought back to the floor as early as tomorrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has ruled and is not in a position to interpret the gentleman's understanding.

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 noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was 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—ayes 201, noes 220, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 714]

AYES—201

Aderholt	Blunt	Calvert
Akin	Boehner	Camp (MI)
Alexander	Bonner	Campbell (CA)
Altmire	Bono	Cannon
Bachmann	Boozman	Cantor
Baker	Boustany	Capito
Barrett (SC)	Brady (TX)	Carter
Barrow	Brown (SC)	Castle
Bartlett (MD)	Brown-Waite,	Chabot
Barton (TX)	Ginny	Coble
Biggart	Buchanan	Cole (OK)
Bilbray	Burgess	Conaway
Bilirakis	Burton (IN)	Crenshaw
Blackburn	Buyer	Culberson

Davis (KY)	Keller	Pryce (OH)
Davis, David	King (NY)	Putnam
Davis, Tom	Kingston	Radanovich
Deal (GA)	Kirk	Ramstad
Dent	Kline (MN)	Regula
Diaz-Balart, L.	Knollenberg	Rehberg
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kuhl (NY)	Reichert
Doolittle	Lamborn	Renzi
Drake	Lampson	Reynolds
Dreier	Latham	Rogers (AL)
Duncan	LaTourrette	Rogers (KY)
Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (MI)
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher
English (PA)	Linder	Ros-Lehtinen
Everett	LoBiondo	Roskam
Fallin	Lucas	Royce
Feeney	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (WI)
Ferguson	E.	Sali
Flake	Mack	Saxton
Forbes	Manzullo	Schmidt
Fortenberry	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Fossella	McCarthy (CA)	Sessions
Fox	McCaul (TX)	Shadegg
Franks (AZ)	McCotter	Shays
Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Shimkus
Gallegly	McHenry	Shuler
Garrett (NJ)	McHugh	Shuster
Gerlach	McKeon	Simpson
Gilchrest	McMorris	Smith (NE)
Gillmor	Rodgers	Smith (NJ)
Gingrey	McNerney	Smith (TX)
Gohmert	Mica	Souder
Goode	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Sullivan
Granger	Miller, Gary	Tancredo
Graves	Mitchell	Terry
Hall (TX)	Moran (KS)	Thornberry
Hastert	Murphy, Patrick	Tiahrt
Hastings (WA)	Murphy, Tim	Tiberi
Hayes	Musgrave	Turner
Heller	Myrick	Upton
Hensarling	Neugebauer	Walberg
Herger	Nunes	Walden (OR)
Hobson	Paul	Walsh (NY)
Hoekstra	Pearce	Wamp
Hulshof	Pence	Weldon (FL)
Hunter	Peterson (PA)	Weller
Inglis (SC)	Petri	Westmoreland
Issa	Pickering	Whitfield
Jindal	Pitts	Wicker
Johnson (IL)	Platts	Wilson (NM)
Johnson, Sam	Poe	Wilson (SC)
Jones (NC)	Porter	Wolf
Jordan	Price (GA)	Young (FL)

NOES—220

Abercrombie	Crowley	Hinojosa
Ackerman	Cuellar	Hirono
Allen	Cummings	Hodes
Andrews	Davis (AL)	Holden
Arcuri	Davis (CA)	Holt
Baca	Davis (IL)	Hooley
Baird	Davis, Lincoln	Hoyer
Baldwin	DeFazio	Inlee
Bean	DeGette	Israel
Becerra	Delahunt	Jackson (IL)
Berkley	DeLauro	Jackson-Lee
Berman	Dicks	(TX)
Berry	Dingell	Jefferson
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Donnelly	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	Doyle	Jones (OH)
Boren	Edwards	Kagen
Boswell	Ellison	Kanjorski
Boucher	Ellsworth	Kaptur
Boyd (FL)	Emanuel	Kennedy
Boyda (KS)	Engel	Kildee
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Kilpatrick
Braleigh (IA)	Etheridge	Kind
Brown, Corrine	Farr	Klein (FL)
Butterfield	Fattah	Kucinich
Capps	Filner	Langevin
Capuano	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Cardoza	Giffords	Larsen (WA)
Carnahan	Gillibrand	Larson (CT)
Carney	Gonzalez	Lee
Carson	Gordon	Levin
Castor	Green, Al	Lewis (GA)
Chandler	Green, Gene	Lipinski
Clay	Grijalva	Loebsack
Cleaver	Gutierrez	Lofgren, Zoe
Clyburn	Hall (NY)	Lowe
Cohen	Hare	Lynch
Conyers	Harman	Mahoney (FL)
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	Maloney (NY)
Costa	Hersteth Sandlin	Markey
Costello	Higgins	Matheson
Courtney	Hill	Matsui
Cramer	Hinchev	McCarthy (NY)

McCollum (MN)	Rahall	Stark	Kanjorski	Murphy, Patrick	Sherman	Simpson	Terry	Weldon (FL)
McDermott	Rangel	Stupak	Kaptur	Murphy, Tim	Shuler	Smith (TX)	Thornberry	Westmoreland
McGovern	Reyes	Sutton	Kennedy	Murtha	Sires	Souder	Tiahrt	Whitfield
McIntyre	Rodriguez	Tanner	Kildee	Nadler	Skelton	Stearns	Tiberi	Wicker
McNulty	Ross	Tauscher	Kilpatrick	Napolitano	Sullivan	Sullivan	Walberg	Wilson (NM)
Meek (FL)	Rothman	Taylor	Kind	Neal (MA)	Smith (NE)	Tancredo	Wamp	Wilson (SC)
Meeks (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)	King (NY)	Oberstar	Smith (NJ)			
Melancon	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)	Kirk	Obey	Smith (WA)			
Michaud	Rush	Tierney	Klein (FL)	Olver	Snyder			
Miller (NC)	Ryan (OH)	Towns	Knollenberg	Ortiz	Solis			
Miller, George	Salazar	Udall (CO)	Kucinich	Pallone	Space			
Mollohan	Sanchez, Linda	Udall (NM)	Lampson	Pascrell	Spratt			
Moore (KS)	T.	Van Hollen	Langevin	Pastor	Stark			
Moore (WI)	Sanchez, Loretta	Velázquez	Lantos	Payne	Stupak			
Moran (VA)	Sarbanes	Visclosky	Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Sutton			
Murphy (CT)	Schakowsky	Walz (MN)	Larson (CT)	Peterson (MN)	Tanner			
Murtha	Schiff	Wasserman	Latham	Petri	Tauscher			
Nadler	Schwartz	Schultz	Lee	Pomeroy	Taylor			
Napolitano	Scott (GA)	Waters	Levin	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)			
Neal (MA)	Scott (VA)	Watson	Lewis (GA)	Pryce (OH)	Thompson (MS)			
Oberstar	Serrano	Watt	Lipinski	Rahall				
Obey	Sestak	Waxman	LoBiondo	Ramstad				
Olver	Shea-Porter	Weiner	Loebgren, Zoe	Rangel				
Ortiz	Sherman	Welch (VT)	Lowe	Regula				
Pallone	Sires	Wexler	Lynch	Reichert				
Pascrell	Skelton	Wilson (OH)	Mahoney (FL)	Renzi				
Pastor	Slaughter	Woolsey	Maloney (NY)	Reyes				
Payne	Smith (WA)	Wu	Markey	Rodriguez				
Perlmutter	Snyder	Wynn	Matheson	Rogers (AL)				
Peterson (MN)	Solis	Yarmuth	Matsui	Ros-Lehtinen				
Pomeroy	Space		McCarthy (NY)	Ross				
Price (NC)	Spratt		McCollum (MN)	Rothman				

## NOT VOTING—10

Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall
Bishop (UT)	Honda	Young (AK)
Clarke	King (IA)	
Cubin	LaHood	

□ 2312

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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 268, nays 153, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 715]

YEAS—268

Abercrombie	Cleaver	Frank (MA)
Ackerman	Clyburn	Gerlach
Allen	Cohen	Giffords
Altmire	Conyers	Gilchrest
Andrews	Cooper	Gillibrand
Arcuri	Costa	Gonzalez
Baca	Courtney	Gordon
Baird	Cramer	Green, Al
Baker	Crowley	Green, Gene
Baldwin	Cuellar	Grijalva
Barrow	Cummings	Gutierrez
Bean	Davis (AL)	Hall (NY)
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Hare
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Harman
Berman	Davis, Lincoln	Hastings (FL)
Berry	Davis, Tom	Hayes
Bilbray	DeFazio	Herseth Sandlin
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Higgins
Bishop (NY)	Delahunt	Hill
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Hinche
Boren	Dent	Hinojosa
Boswell	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hirono
Boucher	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hobson
Boyd (FL)	Dicks	Hodes
Boyd (KS)	Dingell	Holden
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Holt
Braley (IA)	Donnelly	Hooley
Brown, Corrine	Doolittle	Hoyer
Butterfield	Doyle	Inlee
Capito	Edwards	Israel
Capps	Ellison	Jackson (IL)
Capuano	Ellsworth	Jackson-Lee
Cardoza	Emanuel	(TX)
Carnahan	Engel	Jefferson
Carney	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Carson	Etheridge	Johnson (IL)
Castle	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Castor	Fattah	Jones (NC)
Chandler	Ferguson	Jones (OH)
Clay	Filner	Kagen

McGovern	McHugh	McIntyre	McNerney	McNulty	Meek (FL)	Melancon	Michaud	Miller (MI)	Miller (NC)	Miller, George	Mitchell	Mollohan	Moore (KS)	Moore (WI)	Moran (VA)	Murphy (CT)		
Roybal-Allard	Ruppersberger	Rush	Ryan (OH)	Salazar	Sanchez, Linda	T.	Sanchez, Loretta	Sarbanes	Saxton	Schakowsky	Schiff	Schwartz	Scott (GA)	Scott (VA)	Serrano	Sestak	Shays	Shea-Porter

## NAYS—153

Aderholt	Everett	Mack
Akin	Fallin	Manzullo
Alexander	Feeney	Marchant
Bachmann	Flake	McCarthy (CA)
Barrett (SC)	Forbes	McCaul (TX)
Bartlett (MD)	Portenberry	McCotter
Barton (TX)	Fossella	McCrery
Biggert	Fox	McHenry
Bilirakis	Franks (AZ)	McKeon
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	McMorris
Blunt	Gallely	Rodgers
Boehner	Garrett (NJ)	Mica
Bonner	Gillmor	Miller (FL)
Bono	Gingrey	Miller, Gary
Boozman	Gohmert	Moran (KS)
Boustany	Goode	Musgrave
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	Myrick
Brown (SC)	Granger	Neugebauer
Brown-Waite,	Graves	Nunes
Ginny	Hall (TX)	Paul
Buchanan	Hastert	Pearce
Burgess	Hastings (WA)	Pence
Burton (IN)	Heller	Peterson (PA)
Buyer	Hensarling	Pickering
Calvert	Herger	Pitts
Camp (MI)	Hoekstra	Platts
Campbell (CA)	Hulshof	Poe
Cannon	Hunter	Porter
Cantor	Inglis (SC)	Price (GA)
Carter	Issa	Putnam
Chabot	Jindal	Radanovich
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Rehberg
Cole (OK)	Jordan	Reynolds
Conaway	Keller	Rogers (KY)
Costello	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)
Crenshaw	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Cuberson	Kline (MN)	Roskam
Davis (KY)	Kuhl (NY)	Royce
Davis, David	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Deal (GA)	LaTourette	Sali
Drake	Lewis (CA)	Schmidt
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Sensenbrenner
Duncan	Linder	Sessions
Ehlers	Lucas	Shadegg
Emerson	Lungren, Daniel	Shimkus
English (PA)	E.	Shuster

## NOT VOTING—10

Bachus	Davis, Jo Ann	Meeks (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Honda	Young (AK)
Clarke	LaHood	
Cubin	Marshall	

□ 2318

So the bill was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### REPORT ON H.R. 3161, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. DELAURO, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-258) on the bill (H.R. 3161) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

### HONORING CAPTAIN CLYDE CAMPBELL

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, on Thursday evening, July 26, Gregg County, my home district, First District of Texas, will gather for a day of remembrance in honor of our great servicemembers who were held as prisoners of war or were missing in action.

July 26 is a special day because it will be the 63rd birthday of U.S. Air Force Captain Clyde Campbell, around whom this occasion is centered.

I, unfortunately, will be unable to attend since I will be here in Washington DC, but I send these remarks. Unfortunately, Captain Campbell will also be unable to make it on his own birthday celebration because he or his remains have not been brought home from Laos.

Clyde Campbell was born in Eagle Lake, Texas, in 1944, and graduated from Longview High School in 1962. After graduating from Texas A&M University, he answered the call to service and joined the United States Air Force. An ambitious and talented young pilot, Captain Campbell was stationed at Nakhon Phanom Royal Thai Airport Base in Thailand, ready to sacrifice his all for the Nation that he loved so dearly.

In March 1969, he took off in his Douglas A1 Skyraider on a bombing