

The sponsors of this bill have legitimate philosophies, and I understand their philosophies. Their philosophies are wrong.

They say government wants more of your money and that you should decide how to spend it. That's not true. They've spent the people's money on tax cuts for oil companies. We want to invest in COPS for neighborhoods. They've spent it on no-bid contracts for big companies. We want to spend it on investigators for the FBI. They spent it on protecting the profits of offshore companies. We want to invest it in protecting the safety of our neighborhoods.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, Republicans and Democrats, were united on this bill in the Appropriations Committee. Every Republican on the Appropriations Committee joined Democrats in passing this bill because it was common sense, the right investments, the right priorities. And that's why when this amendment is offered again on the floor for a vote, it will follow the same course and the same fate as every similar amendment before it. It will be defeated, not just by Democrats, but by Democrats and Republicans who understand that America would rather have their neighborhoods patrolled by more cops than have the offshore profits of companies at P.O. boxes in Bermuda protected by this small group of Members.

I yield back the balance of 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.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO) assumed the chair.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, as one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1538. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the management of medical care, personnel actions, and quality of life issues for members of the Armed Forces who are receiving medical care in an outpatient status, and for other purposes.

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

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

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

SEC. _____. Total appropriations made in this Act (other than appropriations required to be made by a provision of law) are hereby reduced by \$750,000,000.

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 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the chairman, and I'm pleased to come to the floor today and offer this amendment. And it's a little different vein and spirit than we've offered other appropriate fiscally responsible amendments for other appropriations bills, but it's similar. But I urge my colleagues to listen closely, because the nuance has changed greatly.

Before I do begin, though, I want to make certain that any Member listening, or anybody who has heard the previous discussion and the assertion that the amendments that are offered by this group of fiscally responsible individuals can't even get a majority of our own conference, that's not true. But there's a lot of untruth spoken on this floor. For a significant majority of the Members of at least the Republican side of the aisle clearly support fiscally responsible amendments. I'm hoping and praying for the day that our friends on the other side join us in that.

I do agree with my friends who spoke previously that this is about priorities. It is indeed about priorities. This amendment before us today would reduce the increase in the spending in this portion of the appropriations bills by \$750 million a year, or \$7.5 billion over 10 years. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that you remember that number, \$7.5 billion over 10 years, because it's there for a reason.

But before I get into the specific reasons of that, I want to talk a little bit about the process and the disappointment that so many of us on this side of the aisle have in this process, and so the disappointment that many folks who have to be muted on the other side have in the process.

There were grand promises of bipartisanship as we began this session of Congress earlier this year. And bipartisanship is the least that we have had on virtually every single issue. And I understand at the beginning the new majority felt that they had to move forward with many of their issues, and that's appropriate. That's appropriate. That's their due, given the results of last November.

However, what we've seen recently has buried any guise of bipartisanship. And, in fact, the last 2 weeks have been astounding and actually point to more astounding activities over the next 10 days.

The SCHIP bill, the State Children's Health Insurance Plan, which was adopted in a bipartisan way 10 years ago, is up for reauthorization; and now this new majority plans in a unilateral and anti-bipartisanship way to cut Medicare to aid State bureaucracies; cut Medicare and give that money to State bureaucracies in an anti-bipartisan way.

The flood insurance bill we've got in the committee right now that passed last year never got through the Senate but passed the House last year. It passed, over 400 individuals to 4. And now we have in our committee today an anti-bipartisan bill that belies any attempt at bipartisanship by the other side.

And then the farm bill that was alluded to by my good friend from Georgia just a little bit ago. This farm bill that's going to be on the floor apparently tomorrow or today, depending on when the majority decides to bring it, came out of committee virtually unanimously, virtually unanimously, both sides of the aisle, bipartisan. And yet over the past 24 hours what we have seen is an anti-bipartisan bill that puts in that bill a tax increase of \$7.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, you remember the \$7.5 billion that I mentioned before.

So this amendment before us today is an amendment to reduce the increase from 3.1 percent over last year's bill to 1.6 percent. So it would take that reduction in the increase and would utilize \$750 million a year, or \$7.5 billion to, attribute to the farm bill that would then make it so there wouldn't have to be any tax increases that my friends on the other side so love, but there wouldn't have to be any tax increases for that portion of the farm bill.

This is a fiscally responsible way. This is the kind of flexibility that I believe our constituents desire when they ask Congress and they ask Washington to be responsive to their needs, to respect their pocketbook, to make certain that they are able to keep more of their hard-earned money and not be subject to the kind of remarkable tax increases that we've seen by the other side of the aisle.

So I would encourage my colleagues to adopt this amendment, utilize those extra monies that the majority is so adept at finding, make it so that the farm bill needs no tax increases whatsoever.

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. The gentleman from California is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the chairman, and I'll be brief at the outset and intend to reserve our time for the conclusion of the debate.

But we're here again to really talk about what the priorities of the Nation are and the competing philosophies of the bipartisan majority and the small minority that has taken to the floor here today.

The value of the bipartisan majority is to invest in this country, to make sure that what we have been able to enjoy, the struggle and the sacrifice that our parents and their parents made, is a tradition that we continue in the sense that we want to leave an America that is stronger and that is safer than the one we inherited.

And efforts like this, to cut our investment in law enforcement, to cut our investment in trying to keep our communities safe, our police officers safe, are very shortsighted.

Now, we all believe that the budget has to be wrestled to the ground in the sense that over the last 6 years my friends in the Republican majority borrowed and spent into oblivion. We now have a massive national debt. As a result of that fiscal responsibility, we've got a problem on our hands that we need to wrestle to the ground, and we are. In the majority we have instituted pay-as-you-go rules, something that the prior majority, my friends in the GOP, were unwilling to do. That has been along the philosophy of when you're in a hole, stop digging. So we've stopped the digging.

At the same time, we can't stop investing in our country, we can't stop investing in our future, we can't stop investing in the security of our neighborhoods; and that's what this bill is about.

The cuts that my friends in the opposition are proposing here today have only one merit, and that is they're indiscriminate. They cut the top priorities along with the lower priorities, all at the same time.

My friends in the, not the minority party, because frankly, we have a great many Republicans who have joined us. All the Republicans on the Appropriations Committee support the work product. But the minority that's speaking here on the floor today isn't willing to do the hard work and to say this is a high priority; we can't afford to cut it. This is a lower priority; maybe we can trim this here. No, they're not willing to do that. They're willing to say let's cut everything equally, the essentials with the non-essentials. And let's not raise the revenue we need to support our law enforcement by ending corporate welfare. They've been unwilling to do that.

These are some of the philosophical differences we'll hear during the debate on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to reserve the balance of my time and look forward to an opportunity to address the House in a few minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm somewhat amused by my friend's

comments. It brings to mind what I have come to describe this Congress as, and that is the Orwellian democracy that we see day in and day out. The accusation is that this side of the aisle spent too much money, so that side of the aisle is going to "stop digging." Well, they're stopping digging to the tune of a 3.1 percent increase, billions of dollars of increase. So their response to don't spend that much is let's spend more. And that's where the Orwellian democracy comes in.

And the accusation from the other side that comes, that says, well, you don't want to spend this, you're going to cut this program, you're going to cut COPS, you're going to cut programs that are vital to our Nation, it's kind of like having your child come to you and say, I'd like to have an increase in my allowance. And say they were getting \$5 a week. They wanted \$10 a week, and you settled on \$7.50 a week, and then your son or your daughter says, hey, you just cut my allowance by \$2.50. That doesn't make any sense. But that's the argument. That's the argument on the other side.

So we endeavor to have fiscal responsibility. We endeavor to be responsible with the hard-earned tax money of the American worker.

I'm pleased to yield 2½ minutes to my good friend from Virginia, the chief deputy whip, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just first respond. I rise in favor of this amendment and respond to some of the remarks that were made on the other side of the aisle.

I think we can all agree that we must continue as a people to invest in our people, to invest in this country. All of us, all of us were elected by the constituents that we represent to leave an America stronger and more secure than the way we found it, stronger and more secure for our children and our grandchildren.

The problem is here, every time we get a chance, every time we turn around, we seem to be raising taxes. There is no way that we can leave an America stronger or more secure if we somehow cut off the economic engine that allows us to continue to make the investments in our people of this Nation and in our security.

There were remarks made about the national debt that we are now experiencing. Well, you know what? The national debt, frankly, is 1½ percent of GDP. And from all corners, from the economists to the former Federal Reserve Chairman to the current Federal Reserve Chairman, that 1½ percent of GDP is a lot lower than it has been recently, and it is due to the very forward-thinking economic and tax policies that we have in place which reward risk-based investment which, frankly, don't shun the notion that we should empower the families and the businesses of this country so that they can take care of themselves.

And you know what? The revenues in this Federal Government are up beyond

that which we've seen before. That's the product of the economic policies. That's our key to success and security of this country.

Now, as far as the pay-as-you-go rules that the majority has adopted, you know what that means? That means never cut spending, always raise taxes.

□ 1400

That is why we are here opposing this because, yes, this amendment allows us not to have to raise taxes to fund the expansion of the farm bill that the majority has proposed.

Again, I would just ask my colleagues to support the gentleman's amendment because the bottom line here is what we are talking about is the difference between raising taxes and raising spending or somehow getting ahold of ourselves, applying some fiscal discipline so that we can show the American people that we hear them when they say there is too much waste and spending in Washington.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It has been said a couple times here today about money in people's pockets. And I would suggest that under the leadership of the Democrats and the Republicans, who have been great, on the Appropriations Committee, we are putting money back in the pockets of average American people.

Only half of the people in my congressional district got a tax cut. Only half. And the ones that got it only got a couple hundred dollars. So when you look at the big tax cuts that supposedly went to people who live in Youngstown and Akron, Ohio, that was a couple hundred dollars, and you compare that with what we are doing with the Pell Grants, an increase of \$500 or \$600, that is going to people in my district. So we are already \$400 ahead of the tax cut that the Republicans were so generous to give.

When you look at cutting student loan interest rates in half, saving \$4,000 over the course of a loan, that is money in the pockets of people who live in most of our congressional districts.

And I am thankful for the concern for the American families, but I wish our friends on the other side, at least most of them, were around when we tried to give them a pay raise and increase the minimum wage. They are talking about taking money out of their pockets. We are trying to put money in their pockets. That is what we are trying to do here.

And as the gentleman from New York made the point a few minutes ago, we are funding 2,800 cops. We can't pass police and fire levies in my district because the cities just don't have the money, and we don't have the local economy.

The Federal Government does have a responsibility to make our streets

safer. That is what this bill does. That is what the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee have done. And that is why this amendment needs to go down. This is not the time to start cutting police officers going to our streets to make our communities safer so that we can grow our local economies.

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

I want to make just two quick points in response to my friend's argument that these are not real cuts, these are somehow imaginary cuts, and the illustration he gave of the allowance he gives his child. Two things, one factual and one philosophical.

On the factual side, my friend's across-the-board cuts will mean very real, very direct, very incontrovertible cuts, less money now than the year before in many vital programs; not every program, but many vital programs including some I will point out in my friend's home State of Georgia, things that law enforcement in Georgia and around the country care a great deal about. Real cuts. We will talk about some of them.

We can't hide behind an across-the-board amendment and say, we are not really cutting anything, because you are. Basically what you are telling your child in the allowance hypothetical is we are going to cut how much we are going to spend on your education, a real cut. We are going to cut how much we are going to spend on your health care, a real cut. Let's hope you don't get sick.

One of my friends in the opposition, in support of this same amendment, last week said, American families are just going to have to make the decision, we can't afford to have each of our kids go to college. Maybe we will have to choose one child who won't go to college. Well, philosophically the bipartisan majority of this House doesn't accept that for America. We believe every child who is bright enough to go to college ought to go to college. The fact that his parents may be rich or poor shouldn't matter. And we are willing to make the investments in our colleges to make sure that no parent has to say this child can go to college and this one can't because we are not willing to make the investment.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, once again I am amused by the comments of my good friends and colleagues on the other side.

The fact of the matter is the departments that run these programs that we are addressing right here asked for \$2.3 billion less than our good friends on the other side are proposing us to spend, which means that they believe they can accomplish the goals that have been given to them with \$2.3 billion less.

And they talk about all this wonderful caring they have for families. Well, the largest tax increase in the history

of our Nation that they passed in their budget, about \$2,700 per family, is a peculiar way of showing you are caring for the American family.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the minority whip, my good friend from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding. I am pleased to be here as a part of this debate.

I continue to hear as these debates go on that somehow these increases are not real increases, and I continue to be mystified by that. I think if my good friend from Georgia's amendment was approved, and I voted for his cutting amendment on each of these bills, if that amendment was approved, we would still have an increase in this bill of a little over 5 percent.

Now, I don't know how that calculates out to not an increase, but I am continuing to try to figure out how that is not an increase. I do know that that increase of 5 percent anywhere that I talk to Americans is an increase. And I know, more importantly, in the course of today and tomorrow that what my friend from Georgia is suggesting is that if we let this one appropriations bill grow by 5 percent, as we move on later into the discussion of the farm bill, we would have saved enough money in this 1.4 percent cut not to have a tax increase that puts the farm bill in jeopardy.

The farm bill is a bill that I voted for in the past and hope to vote for this year, but it is a bill that doesn't have to include a tax increase. But the \$7.5 billion over 10 years that the farm bill needs could be gained right here if we would save \$750 million of the increase in this bill.

I just urge my colleagues to look at what we are doing here, realize that we are jeopardizing important things by moving forward in a way that spends more money than we have to spend this year.

Most of these programs are good programs. I was a college president for 4 years. I believe in college education, in everybody having one. I don't believe that the reality is as stark as our friends on the other side would suggest. I believe a 5 percent increase used wisely would make all of these programs work effectively and for the American people, and we would be making the decisions we need to make for the other things we need to do.

I support this amendment.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 30 seconds to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is very interesting and we need to continue to point this out: We had a measure within the first 100 hours we were here to cut \$14 billion from the oil company subsidies, and my friends on the other side couldn't find the courage to vote for that, but they want to do it on the back of these COPS programs in our local neighborhoods. Ninety billion

dollars' worth of tax shelters, they didn't vote for that, but yet they want to cut COPS programs in our local communities. They had the opportunity to stop funding these huge tax cuts and subsidies to the oil companies, refused to do that for fear of alienation, and now they choose to do it on the backs of these programs.

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

A couple quick points. Of course we hear the mantra from my friends on the other side of this bill's representing a tax increase when there is no tax increase in this bill. We have now heard the same statement applied to the farm bill. There is no tax increase in the farm bill.

My friends seem to think that the corporate welfare that we provide, if you cut corporate welfare, that somehow we are increasing taxes on average Americans; if we do away with offshore tax savings, that we are somehow doing away with the income of ordinary Americans. But I think ordinary Americans would rather have the investment in our law enforcement. They would rather have safe streets than safe shelters overseas.

And one point I wanted to make with respect to a comment that my friend from Georgia made. He said the departments here aren't even asking for the resources we are providing them. None of the agencies want the resources that they would be provided in this bill.

Maybe my friend represents a very different district than my own, but I have never had police officers from my cities of Burbank, Glendale, or Pasadena come to me and say, Congressman, we have too much money for cops. We have too many cops on the street. We don't want any of your help. Thank you, but no thank you.

Now, maybe things are quite a bit better in Georgia. Maybe there is no crime in Georgia, and maybe your police departments are saying, we don't need vests, we don't need cops, we are doing great, thank you, but no thank you.

That is not what I am hearing. What I am hearing is they have got greater responsibilities in the war on terror. They have got higher gang violence. They need the resources. They need the people on patrol. That is what I am hearing.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, at this point I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for bringing this important amendment.

Facts are stubborn things, Mr. Chairman. The CJS bill spends \$53.6 billion. This amendment would reduce that by 1.4 percent, but it would still allow for

an increase in the Commerce-Justice, and Science spending. With the passage of this amendment that is being characterized as a cut in the CJS budget, this bill still increases by nearly \$1 billion compared to last year.

And let me be clear on what we are trying to do, I think what the gentleman from Georgia is trying to do here, and that is we are trying to find a way to avoid having to raise taxes the way the Democrats are planning to do in the farm bill later today. I mean, the Democrat majority is planning to bring a \$7.5 billion tax increase to the floor of the Congress in the context of the farm bill later today, and we are just trying to take this opportunity to make a cut in a single year that, if we did it over 10 years, we wouldn't have to raise taxes.

Now, that is being characterized as the work of a small minority versus a bipartisan majority. At least they are not calling us a fringe this week.

Well, I think if the small majority is the people that want to pay for increases in spending with budget discipline, and the bipartisan majority is the one that wants to pay for increases in spending by raising taxes, I am happy to be part of the small majority that I happen to think speaks for the overwhelming majority of the American people, who want this Congress to live within its means, who want this Congress in a bipartisan way to make the tough choices to put our fiscal house in order.

I commend the gentleman from Georgia. I thank him for his vision. I urge passage of the Price amendment, because if it passes, it will lay a foundation where we will not have to raise taxes by \$7.5 billion in the farm bill later today.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this matter, but the rhetoric has gotten my attention enough that I thought I should share with the American people as well as my colleagues my early experience in public affairs.

I will never forget running for a school board, and people were talking about the Federal Government's beginning to get involved in education. I remember saying to those people, let us be very, very careful about going to Uncle Sam to finance our schools when traditionally that is the highest of State responsibilities, and they cooperate with local districts to provide for our schools and control them.

Uncle Sam then gave only 10 cents on the dollar for education, and those who gave the 10 cents wanted to tell us more and more what to do in our local school districts.

□ 1415

All these years later, I must say it's like 50 years later, we continue to want

to tell people what to do in their local schools, and we're now giving them 90 cents on the dollar. Those who are talking about free gifts for people who are providing for educational activities, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, eventually the folks who are sending their children for school, one way they will pay for that education, one way or another. For you could, in those days, I'm not sure what the figure is now, but in those days you could take every family that made \$100,000 or more, and anything above that \$100,000, tax it 100 percent, and you could run the government for 30 days.

The people are not stupid. They know, as you're playing games with them suggesting, oh, Uncle Sam has a free lunch here some way, the folks that you're talking to are having to pay the bills in the final analysis regardless, because all those rich people, you tax them 100 percent, and they will not run your government more than 30 or 60 days. And who pays for the rest of it?

Another point that is very important, in my view, the rhetoric that suggests that the Federal Government should do everything centers around the reality that the Federal Government has a responsibility to provide for the national defense, make an effort to provide security and freedom in the world, and then make sure our local government and our State governments are healthy. They are not healthy if you so discourage industry that they leave the country in order to be able to get their work done and produce the products that we need. Those rich oil companies that you're talking about, they're leaving the country. The light bulbs we were talking about earlier, they're all made in China. It's about time we recognize that Uncle Sam does not have every answer.

I'm going to vote "no" on this bill, in spite of what the gentleman from California said earlier. I have the privilege of being the ranking member on the committee, but I'm going to be voting "no" because it is about \$2 billion over the President's budget request, and the agencies around know they don't need as much money as you folks want to spend on them.

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

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. You know, Mr. Chairman, we've had a game going on in this Capitol for the last 6 years. It's called "Shift the Shaft," and nowhere is it more clear than in what has happened with law enforcement funding.

As I said yesterday, we've had a Kabuki dance going on in this Congress for years. What happens is each year the President comes up with a budget. He's looking for things he can squeeze out of the budget to make room for tax

cuts for millionaires. And so what does he do? He cuts the guts out of our assistance to local law enforcement, and then we wonder why the crime rate has gone up the last 2 years. He cuts the guts out of law enforcement, and then each year the previously Republican-controlled Congress comes in, they restore about one-third of those cuts, they say, oh, what good boys are we. Look at what we've done to help law enforcement. And at the end of that time, we're \$1.5 billion below where we were in 2001 in terms of our assistance to local law enforcement. Now, maybe that makes sense to some folks; it doesn't make sense to me, not with the explosion of meth problems all over the country, not with the explosion of drug problems.

The prior Speaker of the House had a big thing about going after drug production in Colombia. We're spending hundreds and millions of dollars in Colombia, but we're not spending nearly enough money here at home to reduce the demand for those same drugs that are being produced in Colombia, and this amendment would cut that further.

The same crowd talking is the crowd that didn't mind providing \$600 billion in borrowed money in order to finance that misbegotten war in Iraq. It's the same crowd that is willing to provide \$57 billion in tax cuts to millionaires this year, paid for with borrowed money. But then they divert the public's attention from the cause of those on-the-cuff expenditures by saying, oh, we're going to focus a 1 or a 2 percent cut on law enforcement, a 1 or 2 percent cut on the National Science Foundation so we can get people to think that that's the problem that's causing the deficit and not our profligacy for the last 2 years.

Now our friends on the Republican side of the aisle say, oh, we've got this terrible tax cut coming in the farm bill. Baloney. What we're trying to do in the farm bill is to increase support for domestic nutrition programs so that, in addition to having 44 million people in this country who are walking around without health insurance, we don't also have a lot more kids walking around who are hungry. And we're talking about paying for that not by raising taxes on middle-class Americans, but by closing the loopholes on offshore foreign corporations.

Now, I'm not at all surprised that the Republican leadership cannot tell the difference between closing tax loopholes on special interests and raising taxes on the middle class. The difference is that on this side of the aisle we can, and that's why we're voting against your amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 15 seconds to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank my friend for yielding.

I just want to clear up one thing. Let's clear the smoke out of the room here and put some facts in the discussion. The Clinton administration awarded the Halliburton contract. Mr. CHENEY only extended it. The Bush administration only extended it after trouble in the Middle East broke out.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for his defense of the Vice President and Halliburton. I'm sure the Vice President has no connection, no history with Halliburton whatsoever.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 5½ minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do want to point out that there isn't a corporation in this world that pays taxes that don't come from somewhere other than the back pockets of the American people. There isn't a single corporation in this Nation that doesn't pay taxes where that money doesn't come from individuals.

Corporations don't pay taxes; it's passed through, it goes to the individual. So to say that any increase in taxes on corporations doesn't affect the American people is ridiculous. It's ridiculous. To talk about the oil companies that have their taxes increased, all that the majority has done is driven us to greater reliance on foreign oil.

This amendment would decrease the increase of spending in this portion of the appropriations bill by 1.4 percent, \$750 million a year, \$7.5 billion over 10 years, in order to cover what the majority says is the desire and the need to have a tax increase for the farm bill.

This is the kind of fiscally responsible spending and appropriations that the American people are demanding. They aren't interested in a government that is so large that it can take away everything that they need. They believe they can make better decisions with their money than the government makes with their money.

And so we strongly urge our colleagues to adopt this amendment to avoid a tax increase on the farm bill.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for pointing out that corporations don't pay taxes. I don't think that's quite true, but that certainly is the aim of my friend from Georgia, and my friends in the majority have been working hard for that object for some time.

I am happy to yield 30 seconds to my colleague from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman.

I just want to shed some light on some of the rhetoric we've heard. Ripe from the committee report, FBI field investigative resources used for criminal investigative matters have decreased 29 percent from nearly 6,200 agents to 4,400 agents over the same period. The committee is concerned over

the decline in FBI criminal investigative resources, particularly in light of the recent announcement by the FBI that violent crime in communities across the Nation, murders, robberies, forcible rapes and aggravated assaults, rose for the second straight year.

Why would we want to cut the FBI \$90 million when crime is increasing?

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for pointing out the cuts to the FBI and other law enforcement that would be occasioned by this amendment and others that my friends are offering.

The cuts go deeper. They cross the board in terms of everything that the Justice Department does. My friend's amendment would cut funding for victims of child abuse. My friend's amendment would cut funding for the COPS program. It would cut funding for violence against women, victims of violence against women. But let's hone in on a very specific, because my friend says, well, these aren't really cuts. Let me talk about one program specifically that my friend's amendment makes a very real cut to, not artificial, not Orwellian, not imaginary, and that's bulletproof vests.

Back in 2003, the Attorney General announced the Body Armor Safety Initiative in response to the failure of bullet-resistant vests. One in particular worn by a police officer in Pennsylvania was discovered that the xylan vests, when they were old and used, weren't stopping bullets the way they were supposed to, and so the Justice Department started a program to replace these vests.

The COPS program funds an effort to provide vests for local police departments. That program has been very successful. In my friend's home State of Georgia, for example, he can pick any city, Alpharetta City, the program bought 40 new bulletproof vests for the police officers in Alpharetta City. Across Georgia, there were 1,100 of these xylan vests replaced that needed to be replaced.

In the new COPS program that we're funding here, Alpharetta City got 25 new bulletproof vests. Cherokee County got 293 bulletproof vests. Cobb County got 566 bulletproof vests. DeKalb County got another 240. Georgia, in total, just in this particular year, I think 2005, got 4,789 new bulletproof vests.

My friend's amendment makes a real cut to the number of bulletproof vests we can provide cops, not a decrease in the rate of increase, but makes a real cut. Under my friend's amendment, the cops in Georgia are going to get fewer bulletproof vests than they would get without it and than they got last year.

Now, I can't go home to my district and tell the cops of Burbank, Pasadena and Glendale that I cut their funding for their bulletproof vests, but the indiscriminate nature of this amendment means that is exactly what it would do in my district, in my friend's district in Georgia.

My friend from Colorado, who has an amendment, I'm sure, for another

across-the-board cut, Fort Collins, Colorado, they got five vests. Greeley City got 53 bulletproof vests. Longmont City got 28 bulletproof vests. Colorado, in this particular year, got 3,900 new vests. These across-the-board cuts mean fewer bulletproof vests for cops in Colorado.

My friend's amendment from Ohio, with even bigger across-the-board cuts, would be devastating in Ohio. Ohio, in this program, got 5,200 new vests. So what is that going to mean? A 6 percent cut. That means, what, several hundred fewer bulletproof vests? Well, that may not mean much to us here, but if you're one of those cops that can't get their vest replaced and that vest isn't going to work so well against one of those assault rifles or one of those other heavy-caliber munitions they're facing out there on the street, it means a heck of a lot.

And I don't know about my friend from Georgia, but I don't have the cops from my district coming to me and saying, we've got more money than we need. We don't need bulletproof vests. We don't need interoperable communications equipment. A lot of the cops out in the County of Los Angeles can't talk to each other because their communications equipment won't talk to each other. We fund that here. My friend's amendment cuts that here.

How can my friends, not on the bipartisan majority, but in the minority that has expressed themselves here today, say they're for law and order, say they're standing behind the men and women in uniform, and then make real cuts to what we provide? Or, as my chairman points out, if you don't just look at last year, compared to last year where we didn't do very well by them either, but if you look at where we were in 2001, we're going backwards, not forwards. We're not even at where we were 5 years ago.

This amendment is a mistake, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to expand on the excellent debate and the points that have been made in opposition to this amendment.

The fact is we are in a period of rising crime. In the last 2 years we have experienced a rise in crime. We are looking at an amendment that proposes an across-the-board cut.

The first thing you all need to understand about this amendment is that it is indiscriminate. It doesn't look at what programs are being cut. It doesn't talk about cutting one program more because it's a lower priority or that program less because it's a higher priority, or excluding some programs from being cut because they are a tremendously high priority.

My colleague just talked about State and local law enforcement. The previous amendment would have cut the

Justice Department by some \$681 million. This amendment cuts the Justice Department by \$335 million. Those are real dollars and real cuts to law enforcement. Those cuts translate directly to local law enforcement and the people that are actually fighting crime in the streets.

□ 1430

What the Federal Government has done to support those folks in the past is given them resources, as the gentleman just described. If you are the sheriff's department in rural America, or you are the chief of police in urban America, or if you are a local law enforcement coordinator, then you are hurt badly by this across-the-board cut amendment.

The last amendment was a \$45 million cut to State and local law enforcement. That means, as the gentleman just eloquently described, a large cut to our State and local law enforcement.

I would like to describe another area of the bill that would be cut by this amendment. To emphasize how real these cuts are, let's look at NASA. We have acknowledged that NASA is not being funded at a level that allows it to meet its missions across the board. If you are at Glenn Research Center or the Ames Research Center, and you are out there listening to this amendment, you need to understand that across-the-board cuts are going to mean significant things to your institutes. It means you are going to have fewer resources when right now you have a mission that you already lack resources to perform.

Employees at Kennedy Space Center, Marshall Space Flight Center, Goddard Space Flight Center and Johnson Space Flight Center in Texas, or who live in the communities and depend on it will be impacted by this amendment.

Science. This amendment would cut \$79.7 million out of the science account. In this bill we tried to increase the science account so they will be able to do their missions.

Aeronautics; \$9 million. And out of exploration—Johnson Space Flight Center and Kennedy Space Flight Center ought to be really tuned in to this—\$54.9 million.

A total cut for NASA, Mr. Chairman, of \$246.7 million. NASA is concerned about that. NASA says, and let me read, "The consequence of these cuts is that NASA will not be able to make as effective or safe a transition to the new systems as originally planned. There will likely be significant workforce impacts as a result. Thus these budget reductions have ripple effects over many years due to the highly integrated nature of the shuttle and exploration systems. Many shuttle employees are at risk with these across-the-board cuts."

So, Mr. Chairman, this is just another reason of why we should be against these across-the-board cuts.

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

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise and with all due respect would ask my colleagues to simply read the amendment. The amendment states, total appropriations made in this act are hereby reduced by \$750 million. That is not an across-the-board cut. That allows the agencies to determine where best they are able to absorb a decrease in the increase that they would be provided by this underlying bill. What we challenge with this 1.4 percent reduction in the increase is for each of those agencies to find 14 cents out of every \$10.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that is what families do all across this Nation every day. So our priorities are the American family. Our priorities are the American family. We take our responsibility seriously to keep it fiscally prudent and fiscally responsible.

Mr. Chairman, we believe this amendment moves us in that direction. We would urge our colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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. KING OF IOWA

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

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:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. 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.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment that I bring before the House is an amendment that I brought on at least two other appropriation bills. The section of the Code that it addresses, 274A(h)(3), is the section that defines

those who are not lawful to work in the United States. It includes two categories of people. It would be those who are unlawfully present and those who are lawfully present without work authorization.

My amendment prohibits any of the funds that are appropriated under this act from being used to employ persons who are not lawful to work in the United States.

It is a standard amendment that I brought in the past. Should the gentleman ask me to yield, I would be open to that, obviously.

Meanwhile, the point that inspires me to come to the floor more than any other is a report that was released in June of 2006 by the Office of the Inspector General of the Social Security Administration that identified that approximately 11,000 employees were likely working for the government, 7 Federal agencies, 7 State agencies, and 3 local agencies, under nonwork Social Security numbers. All the Federal Government needed to do was run their databases against each other, the Social Security Administration and the Department of Homeland Security. They could have identified these employees.

The category that I have described only includes those who are lawfully present but not authorized to work, but there is another category of those that are not lawfully present that this amendment would address, as well.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, as we understand it, is merely a restatement of current law, which already prohibits the employment of unauthorized aliens. We don't read into it that it imposes any new burden on those who are using funds appropriated under the act. It is fully consistent with current legal obligations imposed on all employers, regardless of whether or not they use such funds.

We would accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman. I concur with the analysis that he has delivered to the floor of this House, Mr. Chairman. I would encourage adoption of my 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 MRS. MUSGRAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. 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 Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

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

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$267,755,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, this discussion is becoming very familiar as we go through these appropriations bills. This bill is \$2.2 billion over the President's request. That is a percentage of 4.2 percent. It is \$1.6 billion over last year's amount with an increase of 3.1 percent over last year. My amendment would take the increase from 3.1 percent to 2.6 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I have thought a lot about this. This has especially been on my mind today as we are getting ready to vote on the farm bill in the afternoon.

When I think about raising taxes to pay for these programs, there is not anyone in here that is doubting the worthiness of the way we are spending dollars in this bill. I personally have a son-in-law that is a police officer, so when you talk to me about bulletproof vests, that is something that I think about when I think about the young man that is married to my daughter and the father of my three grandchildren. So I want to say these are worthy things that we are spending these dollars on.

But we have to realize there is not an infinite supply of money that just falls out of the sky. We have taxpayers that fund all of these programs. And while the programs are worthy, and I support an increase, I merely want to take the increase from 3.1 to 2.6 percent.

As we get ready to consider the farm bill today, during the markup of the farm bill I offered an amendment, and my amendment basically said we would have a sense of Congress that the programs in the farm bill would not be paid for by a tax increase. Unfortunately, the chairman ruled that my amendment was out of order and it was not germane.

Yesterday, while we had a discussion with the Secretary of Agriculture over the farm bill, he said that perhaps Mrs. MUSGRAVE's amendment was the most germane of all the amendments, because we are looking at an enormous tax increase to pay for the farm bill.

In the Fourth District of Colorado, we have about 2 million cattle. We are eighth in the country in total value of egg production. We have an enormous dependence upon agriculture in our district. The whole northeastern and southeastern part of the State depends on agriculture as the basis of their economy.

We were told all along during the farm bill discussion that we were not

going to have a tax increase. In fact, if I may quote the chairman, when I offered my amendment, he said, "Nobody is talking about a tax increase here." Now, today, we have the farm bill coming up on the floor, and we have a tax increase.

I had to call the Farm Bureau today, my friends at the Farm Bureau. I talked to the Farmers Union. I talked to the wheat growers, the cattlemen, corn growers, telling the folks that now the rug has been pulled out from under us on this farm bill. We had an agreement. We no longer have an agreement. We are looking at a tax increase. Rural America, not just the Fourth District of Colorado, is looking in today to see what we do with the farm bill, and I am very disappointed that now we are looking at a tax increase.

When we think about the taxpayer out there, just average Americans, they work clear up into April to pay their taxes. April 30 is "tax freedom day." I would like to have each young person that is getting ready to enter the workforce think about that. You work all through January, you work through February, you work through March, you work through April before you get to quit paying for government. When you think about it, Americans work longer to pay for government than they do for food, clothing and housing combined.

We need to show some discipline here, just a mere 0.5 percent. Again, increase the spending for these worthy needs, but take it from 3.1 to 2.6 percent.

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

□ 1445

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

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

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for yielding.

As I listen to this debate, there are a number of things that race across my mind. One of them is the constant repetition of the statement, "This is a real cut. This is a real cut." It is a real cut in a real big increase. So if you want to describe it as a real cut, you have to say a real cut in a real big increase or you're not telling the American people what is really going on here.

There are a few areas of our budget that are discretionary spending, and there are a few areas of our budget that aren't discretionary spending. Those that are on auto pilot we can't do a lot about in the appropriations process. Yet those that are discretionary spending, we can do something about. Yet

the majority seems to be determined to continue to accelerate the increases in spending in the discretionary sections of our budget. It is like you are driven to grow this government no matter the price to the taxpayers.

So I have come in a realization here in the first 6 or 7 months of this 110th Congress: You guys really believe in what you do. I didn't think so before. I thought maybe there were some people who were a little cynical, but I believe now you really believe in what you're doing. I believe you really do want to grow this government. I believe you want to raise taxes. I believe you want to take the responsibilities off of all the people all the time and take it into a maternalistic, socialist government. I now believe that. You've convinced me. And you've been constant and you've been repetitive and you have been consistent and persistent in driving this growth of government across this floor of Congress.

One day, the American people will rebel to this if they can get over their apathy. I'm for the Musgrave amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, now we have been accused of supporting a socialistic government because we want to put more cops on the street and because we want the FBI to have more resources to go after terrorists who are trying to destroy democracy. For that we are a socialist government, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think it is funny that we got the socialism talking points back out, Mr. Chairman. Dusted them from 1992 and 1993, and now they are back out. But this is exactly right, Mr. ISRAEL. This is about putting agents, cops on the street. This is about national security. This is about protecting our country.

Now, I think it is important that we get a little bit into the details on a couple of these programs that the gentlelady's amendment is going to cut and that the previous two amendments were going to cut, too, because I think it is easy for us to say you are going to cut cops and cut the FBI. It doesn't sound like a whole lot.

But as the gentleman from New York stated earlier, there has been a decrease in FBI criminal agents by 29 percent from 6,200 to 4,400 agents. So what the committee did, in all its wisdom in a bipartisan way, said we need to hire more people. For what exact programs? Well, why don't we take a look here.

National security field investigations is one of the programs that would be cut under this amendment. Now, many of our friends on the other side of the aisle say, what, is the world going to end if we cut this by 0.5 percent? Is the

world going to end if we cut this by 1 percent? Is the world going to end if we cut this by 3 percent? Let's look at exactly what you're cutting. Just in this one little program, national security field investigations, the committee wants to hire 245 positions, 150 agents, 95 support personnel to increase the level of field resources dedicated to national security investigations. This amendment will cut agents from being on the street protecting the United States of America.

Let's look at another one, surveillance. This committee wants to hire another 50 people, 50 positions under the surveillance program to provide additional resources for the FBI to conduct surveillance in support of priority national security investigations. Do you think this isn't going to affect anything? There are going to be less agents investigating. There are going to be less agents listening to the terrorists who already may be in this country. This amendment will ensure that these agents don't get in the field, they don't get hired, and that they don't listen to what the terrorists are saying and hopefully protecting the United States of America from the next terrorist plot.

This is a dangerous amendment that puts this country's security in jeopardy.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, before I reserve the balance of my time, I just remind the gentleman who accused us of being socialists that I think just about every Republican, including very conservative members of the Appropriations Committee, supported this bill. I don't believe they would appreciate being called socialists because they believe in cops on the street and more resources for the FBI. They are not socialists; neither are we. We are commonsense, mainstream Members of Congress who want to protect America's neighborhoods.

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Musgrave amendment. I think it is the wise move to make. It shows good stewardship to come in and look at this budget and say, where do we slow the growth and how do we slow the growth?

As we all know and as we have learned from so many of our States that have balanced budget amendments that have to curtail the growth of the budget, across-the-board reductions work. They work. And the reason they work is because you get to go in and manage. The Departments get to manage where they want to make those reductions. We all know you can make those half percent reductions. Mr. Chairman, they have been proven to work.

The thing that is so very interesting to me is, even if this were to pass, making a half percent reduction and

saving the taxpayers \$268 million, which is what Mrs. MUSGRAVE is seeking to do, you would still have an increase. You would still have an increase in Science, Commerce, Justice spending. That would be there.

But what we are seeking to do is rein in what the Federal Government spends. We can sit here and argue about the particulars of budgeting. We can talk about how baseline budgeting always sets us up for saying whatever is put on the table is a cut, and we can talk about how zero-based budgeting might be a better approach to how the Federal Government goes about setting its annual budget.

But one thing we know is this, that the liberal elites always want to come in and spend more. They never get enough of the taxpayers' dollar. We are seeing that this is proving to be the "hold onto your wallet" Congress. As I said last week when our friends across the aisle were calling us the "fringe," FRINGE does mean "fiscal responsibility includes no government excess."

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, while they talk about cutting the increase, criminals keep increasing. There has been a 3.6 percent increase in violent crimes. We believe at least we should keep pace with those criminals so we can put them behind bars and bring them to justice.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, we had an opportunity within the first 100 hours to cut \$14 billion from going to the oil companies. We supported it. Our friends on the other side of the aisle rejected that approach; they would rather take it out of security. So I think it is important we go back.

My friend from Tennessee said where do we slow the growth. Well, we tried to slow it from going to the oil companies and we tried to slow it from going to corporations who harbor themselves in these far-off distant lands to avoid paying taxes. Our friends choose to take it out of security.

Let's look at a couple more of these programs because sometimes the details hurt. Crimes Against Children, which is a program we have, the committee wanted to have an increase of 14 positions to provide a coordinated investigative, operational and intelligence effort to combat crimes against children and to address child abduction, predators who sexually assault children, and child prostitution. There will not be 14 positions to protect our children if this amendment passes.

How about this one, weapons of mass destruction directorate. Sounds like a pretty good idea post-9/11, and in a bipartisan way it passed out of committee. Here is what it will do. The committee wants to hire 146 positions, 29 agents, 69 support personnel, to develop the essential baseline capabilities to build a dedicated weapons of mass destruction program designed to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the

threat of weapons of mass destruction. If this amendment passes, we are going to have less agents trying to find folks who are in our country trying to unleash weapons of mass destruction.

How about the Data Intercept and Access program; 41 positions, 6 agents, 35 support to provide the technical expertise, training and necessary equipment to execute lawfully authorized electronic surveillance of data network communications facilities trying to protect us. This bill has some essential components to it.

This committee went to great lengths to make sure that they would make the proper investments. This is very well thought out. I think we would be hard-pressed to find any American who would read this and say no, you know what, we should not hire that many agents. We should give that money to the oil companies. I don't think there are many Americans who would say that.

One more before I yield back. Render Safe Mission, the RSM program; nine positions, three agents, six support personnel to address the White House directive, the White House directive, giving the FBI the mission to respond to devices involving weapons of mass destruction within the United States and its territories. Within the United States. This is not about Iraq. This is not about Afghanistan. This is about funding nine positions in this one specific field, people who are experts to keep this country safe.

I think the more we get into these programs, the more ridiculous some of these amendments seem. The American people would not support a 0.5 percent decrease in these programs, not a 1 percent decrease in these programs, not a 3 percent decrease in these programs. These are essential.

When you look at the money, Mr. Chairman, that has been wasted in Iraq on unbid, no-bid contracts, no oversight provided at all, when you look at the \$14 billion we tried to get off the oil companies, that makes sense. Get that money. Don't get it on the backs of FBI agents who are going to be operating surveillance operations here in the United States.

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding. I rise in support of her amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell a story for you and other people that might be listening about a gentleman who was a wide receiver for the Atlanta Falcons. His name was Alex Hawkins. One night he didn't come home. He had a history of maybe carousing around and staying out a little bit too late. He didn't come home one night, so he snuck in the door early the next morning, and his wife said, "Hawk, where have you been?"

He said, "Well, I got in kind of late last night and didn't want to wake you

up, and I fell asleep outside in the hammock on the porch."

She said, "Alex, that hammock has been gone for a year."

He looked kind of puzzled and he said, "Well, Honey, that's my story and I'm sticking to it."

That is what the other side is doing. They have a story, and they are sticking to it.

I want to give you, Mr. Chairman, a math problem. Other people who want to work this math problem can, too, but I want to give you a math problem. If you take \$53.6 billion and you multiply it times 0.025 percent, Mr. Chairman, will you get more than \$53.6 billion? I think you will. I think it will be an increase over that number. So what this amendment does, it gives an increase over last year's spending.

Now, did the FBI come in and say, We don't need any more money? I doubt it. So really and truly, if you want to take the kind of logic that the majority is taking because they can't do math very well, then the FBI could have come in and said, You know what? We want \$10 billion more. Well, I can't give you that. So in reality, they are cutting the FBI from the request that they made even though they are getting more money.

□ 1500

Now, this is fuzzy math, I know, and, Mr. Chairman, for any young people that might be listening to this, I hope you don't get confused. I know all these speeches are somewhat, Mr. Chairman, like an algebra problem, but we are asking, this is an increase? It is an increase over last year for these FBI agents and these police officers. It is not a cut. I don't know how else to explain it.

And, you know, I'm sure that Alex Hawkins knew that his wife knew that he was lying, but that was his story, and he's sticking to it. The same thing goes to the majority party.

The sad part about this, Mr. Chairman, is when we're all going to realize the truth, and many of us realize it's the truth now, it is when the taxpayers of this country and those family budgets are getting judged.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Colorado has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue the math analogy and the math equation here.

What do you get if you have a weapons of mass destruction directorate program that has 146 positions, and you cut that budget by .5 percent or 3 percent? Well, we won't get into the details, but you get less than 146 positions. That is a cut.

What do you get if you cut the Render Safe Mission program that wants to hire nine people, and you cut

that by 1 percent? You're going to get less than the nine people.

Stop cutting national security.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say I enjoyed the Hawkins story, but I think if we were going to apply that analogy here, it would be this.

A police officer goes to you in your district office and says, Congressman, there was money in the budget for my bulletproof vest.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend.

Members are advised to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I think the better analogy would be, the police officer goes to my friend and says, Congressman, there was money in the budget for my bulletproof vest. What happened to it? I don't have my vest.

And the gentleman said, well, we didn't cut the money for your vest; you're wearing it. But the officer says, I've got no vest on. And the Congressman says, that's my story, and I'm sticking to it.

It may be a good story, but it doesn't protect him from bullets.

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I'm a little confused by this debate. I'm not the most sophisticated person in the world, but if you have an increase, and then you decide to reduce the size of that increase, it's still an increase.

You know, when you cut down to the chase, look, I think this is the question. Yes ask the American people, is the Federal Government so efficient, so perfect that it cannot absorb a slight reduction in the size of the increase, because it's so efficient that every single penny is used perfectly, and, therefore, a reduction in the size of an increase, oh, is devastating because we have such a perfect Federal Government that we can't even reduce the size of the increase?

Now, again, I'm not real sophisticated, but back home, if you get an increase, or you say I want a 10 percent increase, and if you have a real job, a normal job like most Americans, and they go to their bosses and say, hey, I would like a 5 percent increase in my pay, and the boss says, I can't give you a 5 percent, I'm going to give you a 4½ percent, is that a cut in salary, or is that an increase in salary, but half a percent less than what you asked for?

And again, if we thought that the Federal Government was so good, so efficient and so perfect that it can't absorb that, then don't support this amendment. But if you think that the Federal Government may be just a little bit imperfect, they might waste

just a tiny bit of money, but maybe there's just a little bit of money that we could use elsewhere, then I would suggest, I'm not going to get into the rhetoric on the math, but again, if you think that the Federal Government could maybe absorb a little bit less of an increase, then this is a very modest decrease of the size of the increase.

I thank the chairman.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the last comments I think demonstrate that this debate is in danger of descending into something that resembles a high school debate, and we appear to be edging toward having a dictionary debate, arguing about whether something is a "cut" or an "increase".

With all due respect, in an adult world, that's not the issue. In an adult world, the question is what is the size of the problem you're trying to attack, and is our response to it sufficient?

And with all due respect to those on the other side of the aisle who are objecting to this bipartisan product, with all due respect, we think we have a serious problem that requires a serious response.

In the area of law enforcement, we have seen our support for law enforcement grants drop by \$1.6 billion since fiscal 2001. That is almost a 36 percent drop. That isn't a dictionary problem. That's a problem on the street for every community in America.

We also see at the same time we have a rise in the crime rate, which requires a response, regardless of our dictionary definition, and we also have an explosion of meth use. Have you ever seen how screwed up a kid can be after meth has gotten done with him? It's a godawful sight, and I've seen plenty of it.

So what we're trying to do is to have an adequate response, and the reason that we are having a significant increase in law enforcement funding this year is because we're trying to dig out from that hole that we've been put in since 2001 by these systematic reductions in law enforcement assistance, at the same time that the crime rate is rising.

And then the second thing we are trying to do is to recognize that we're going to have a lot more people in this society in the next 10 years. We're going to have a lot more low-paid workers all around the world from China to you name it competing with American workers for jobs, and we've got two ways to combat that. One is education, and the other is technology. And the only way we're going to stay on the cutting edge of technology is if we make much larger investments in the National Science Foundation.

Politicians in both parties fall over themselves talking about what they're going to do for the National Institutes of Health, but I don't hear many discussions about what we're going to do

to provide support for the even more basic science research that is then used by everyone else in this society to determine what kind of a future we have.

Without that investment in science, our economy lags. If our economy lags, our jobs lag. If our jobs lag, our wages lag, and that means that we wind up with a huge family income deficit. We wind up with a huge education opportunity deficit. We wind up with a huge scientific knowledge deficit, and that cripples our country's future.

And that's why we're not going to engage in this silly little debate about whether something is an "increase" or a "cut". The question is, does it have a good impact or a bad impact on America? And this amendment is being sponsored by people who know the cost of everything and the value of nothing. That's the difference between us.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I ponder much of what the gentleman has just said. I certainly know about the scourge of methamphetamine in my district. As I said before, I have a son-in-law that I love dearly that's a policeman, so, Mr. Chairman, I hope the other side is not implying that we do not have concerns about these issues, because we do.

Another thing that I know, having talked to many police officers, one thing that they would really like to see is families raising their children, moms and dads caring for their children, nurturing them and teaching them and trying to steer them away from the very destructive path of getting on things like methamphetamine and just seeing their lives spiral downward.

So you know what I'm standing up for today, Mr. Chairman? I'm standing up for the American taxpayer. And, you know, maybe we do need a dictionary, and maybe we do need a thesaurus, and maybe we need to talk about semantics, but I want to say that we are looking at a situation here where the appetite is insatiable for increased spending. It's insatiable.

There is a day of reckoning. You know those charts that my dear friends, the Blue Dogs, put outside their office now. It's not \$8.8 trillion. It's \$8.9 trillion and growing. There is a day of reckoning. Those taxpayers that have to work until April 30 to get to tax freedom day, I mean, they're thinking about this spending in this Nation.

No matter how worthy the cause, we need spending restraint. We need to get on a path of fiscal discipline, and the American people understand that. No matter how worthy the cause for the spending is, there is a limited amount of dollars that the taxpayers can afford to pay.

So I'm hoping that we will move in the right direction, and I hope that we can have support for this modest 50 cents on \$100 amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 5½ minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman has exhausted her time?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. She has. Her time has expired.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I will just make a brief point and then yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

With the deepest respect to the gentlewoman, no one is implying that there is not concern by every Member of this body for those who have drug problems, for those whose lives are being ruined by meth. But you can't just wish these problems away. Somebody's got to take responsibility for working to end those problems.

Just like you can't wish them away, you can't expect that they are going to be dealt with by cutting investments in antidrug programs or even cutting the rate of increase, if you want to use the other side's terms.

We've put \$40 million in this bill for mobile enforcement teams for antidrug programs; not mobile enforcement teams in Iraq, mobile enforcement teams right here at home to help the gentlewoman's constituents with those problems, to provide for a better future. We're investing in that future. We can't just wish these problems away. You've got to respond to them, and that's what we are trying to do.

Now, if the other side made the argument that we could cut giveaways to big oil companies and cut offshore tax corporate giveaways and cut all this corporate welfare and then cut these important criminal justice programs, then their arguments would have more credibility. Their arguments lack credibility because they're saying we can afford all these corporate giveaways, but we can't afford enforcement teams on drug abuse, we can't afford more cops on the street while crime is increasing, we can't afford counterterrorism initiatives and extra agents at the FBI while al Qaeda is planning against us.

This is just a difference in priorities, Mr. Chairman. We are strong on crime. We also understand that if you're going to be strong on crime, you can't just say it, you've got to do it, and frankly, it takes investments to do it.

That's what this bill does, and that's why every Republican on the committee supported this bill when it was in the committee, and that's why this amendment will be defeated by Republicans and Democrats alike.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I just want to go through a little bit of the details here and some of the logic and some of the facts.

There's been an increase in crime. There's been an increase in methamphetamine use. So the committee said, as Mr. OBEY stated, in reaction to that, we're trying to, we'll do the southwest border and methamphetamine enforcement program, hire eight positions, four full-time equivalents, in

order to attack a poly-drug-trafficking organization located along the southwest border by increasing DEA's intelligence gathering, detection monitoring and surveillance capabilities. Most of the methamphetamines coming into our country are made in California or in Mexico, out West, very close to the gentlewoman's district.

What this program does is it hires people to try to address this problem, and basically there's been a DEA hiring freeze.

□ 1515

We want to increase this. We want to spend money, invest in this program, one, because we will allow the DEA to hire more agents to address this issue that is growing, so you need to grow the agents that are going to address the issue.

But, two, this is going to save us money in the long run. When Mr. OBEY says the price of everything and the value of nothing, that's what we're talking about. Why wouldn't we want to make this small investment to try to prevent the long-term consequences of these young people with drug treatment, in prison, with insurance claims, this has a long-term ripple effect that will cost us 10 times the amount of money.

Finally, the gentlelady said, I hope you don't mean to say that we don't want to address this issue, or this issue isn't important to us. I think it's important to note that the President's budget, when he submitted it to the Congress of the United States, terminated this program. He cut it completely. He zeroed it out.

I hope our friends on Capitol Hill will take a walk down Pennsylvania Avenue and let the President understand the kind of importance that this program has and ultimately the amount of money that will save us.

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 NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 37 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

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

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not

required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.05 percent.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, in listening to all this discussion, I have to think that the taxpayers of America have to wonder what's going on here, that in this bill there has been a proposal to say, well, we'll let these government agencies spend 100 cents on the dollar, 100 percent of everything they had last year. Oh, it's terrible, we can't do that.

Then there was one at 102 percent of what they had last year. No, we can't do that. Then there is one at 102.5 percent of what they had last year. No, it's terrible. They can't do that.

So here's one more try. What this does is reduce the increase in spending by .05 percent. That is 5/100 of a percent. That leaves them with a whole lot of money and a lot more of an increase, almost the same increase they had last year.

Now, I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the people of America can't understand why people on other side of the aisle, the majority Democrats, would have a problem with this. I can't understand it either.

I think perhaps they don't understand what this is. Now, this amendment would save the taxpayers \$27 million. Now, that's real money, \$27 million, by which the deficit will not increase. We have a deficit, and we are robbing the Social Security surplus. It's \$27 million we would save the taxpayer.

I have five explanations, five examples I would like to give here to perhaps help my friends on the other side of the aisle understand just what this proposal is to see if there is anything, anything at all that they believe is possible to reduce spending. Is there any waste in government?

Is there anything government can do for only 103 percent of what they had last year? First of all, this does take the spending increase from 3.5 percent to basically 3.45 percent, basically the change in the interest. That's number one.

Number two, it still increases spending in these Departments by \$1.574 billion over last year, \$1.574 billion more.

Let me give a third example. This is a \$100 bill. This represents how much the government is spending on these programs now. Here's three more dollars and five cents. This bill represents this bill as it's currently written, the \$100 they had last year, three more and five more cents. Here, Mr. Chairman, is how much the government would have to get if this amendment were to pass, \$100, \$3, but not the 5 cents; 5 cents on \$103. Somehow this is going to greatly damage programs and what we are doing.

Let me give a fourth example. The gentleman from Ohio mentioned in the last debate a particular function that he said would have 245 agents under their bill as proposed. If this amendment were to pass, how many agents would there be? Well, there would still be 245 agents, but you would have to tell one of those agents that they would only work a 7-hour day instead of an 8-hour day. That is the significance of this bill.

Now my final example, if we look at the entirety of this blue donkey as a complete government program as proposed by my friends on the other side of the aisle, we have seen a proposal already to have 99 percent.

Now, when you look at them, you may say, well, gosh, they look almost the same. That's because they are almost the same. I don't know if you or others can see the change we made, but what we did was we tried to reduce about 1 percent of the total donkey surface area up in the air, but, no, that's been rejected.

So we said let's make it 99.5 percent of what you want to spend, still an increase over the last year, but of what you want to spend a little more here. There is still not much difference, I think, to most people, but, no, can't do that.

So on the last bill I proposed a quarter of a percent cut. Quarter percent. Could you get by on quarter of a percent less of an increase than what's been proposed? That was "no" also.

Now we are trying again, 5/100 of 1 percent. Let me try to do that graphically here. I do have a blue marking pen, 99.95 percent of the increase that you want, you can hardly tell the difference. But if we do this on every bill, every bit of spending over the government, we will eventually start to save money.

This is the way it works. The average American taxpayer understands that, that if I put away \$10 a week, \$10 a month, eventually I will have quite a bit of money. But I have to have the discipline to do it. That's what we are trying to say here.

We have a deficit. We are robbing the Social Security surplus. One thing that is not in dispute is that we are heading for a fiscal train wreck. Within 30 years, Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid alone will eat up 100 percent of the taxes currently received. What are we going to do? Are we going to double or triple taxes, or are we going to reform those systems, reform government and start now?

Yes, it's 30 years from now, but if we don't start on it now, the problem will be closer and bigger and closer and bigger. We see that if the other side is not willing to do this, what will they do, other than increase taxes?

Now, we see tax increases going on now. We have seen a budget that includes either the largest or the second largest tax increase in American history, and right now we are seeing tax increases proposed by the Democrat

majority on minority groups, on smokers, they are a small minority group. Then just this evening we will probably have one on foreign companies who are setting up businesses and creating jobs in America.

Now the other side I know says, oh, no, that's not a tax increase. I would like to read you a letter here. This is a letter from BART GORDON, who is a Congressman from the Sixth District of Tennessee, a Democrat, to the chairman of Ways and Means, and he says: "Concerns have been raised by Bridgestone America, a company with facilities in my district, about the impact the proposed Farm Bill offset would have on them. Bridgestone is concerned that the 30 percent withholding tax imposed by the proposal would have a broad and negative impact on its legitimate international business operations.

"I understand the importance of ensuring that multi-national companies are not able to abuse tax loopholes to avoid paying taxes, but we must also be careful not to punish legitimate business practices and discourage foreign companies from insourcing operations in the United States. Concerns have also been raised about the effect this withholding tax will have on our international treaties."

That, Mr. Chairman, is a Democrat, not a Republican, talking about this tax, this withholding tax. It's a potential impact on jobs in America and the potential impact on trade agreements we have with other countries that will affect the ability of American companies to do business overseas.

Now, it's quite a contrast, because that's what they are proposing. The majority keeps proposing tax increase after tax increase after tax increase, and they will start on minority groups, and they will move to everyone, because they can't get it done without everyone. All we're asking here, all we're asking here is 5/100 of a percent, one nickel on \$100, a slightly less increase so we can begin the process of spending less, not taxing more.

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

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

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

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from California.

Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here listening for a while to the debate on this bill, and I have been struck by several issues that have come up that I think need to be mentioned. Some have been mentioned before, but some new ones.

I am often asked by school groups what's the difference between Democrats and Republicans? I say to them

the very quick definition is Democrats think they know how to spend your money better than you know how to spend your money. Republicans think that the less government we have, the better off we are; and the more money you are allowed to keep, the better off this country will be. I think that this debate certainly exemplifies that.

I agree with some of my colleagues who said before, the appetite of the Democrats is absolutely insatiable for increased spending. They never met a program they didn't love to spend money for. They would take every dime. They will take every dime, every penny from the American people that they can possibly take and spend it on programs they think are important.

They talk about investing government money. The government never invested any money. It spends money. The private sector invests money and gets results.

I would challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Show me the results of these spendings that you do, and then maybe you can argue a little bit about an investment.

The other thing that I am struck by is how much last year in this same debate that the Democrats said the free-spending President Bush, busting the budget, doing all this spending; and now they are coming here and defend programs that the President zeroed out because they were ineffective, and they want to put the money back in.

□ 1530

That is the height of hypocrisy. There is a limited amount of money that Americans have, but the Democrats don't know that. They want to take it all. And it is true that the budget they passed earlier this year contains the largest or second largest tax increase in America, and that to pay for their programs they are going to have to have more tax increase.

This amendment would save a small amount of money, \$27 million, but it is a step in the right direction. We have got to start reigning in spending, and those of us who have come here in the last few years understand that, those Republicans do, and we want to see the Federal Government more responsive to the American taxpayer, less profligate, and more interested in saving our freedom, not in taking it away by taking away our money and reducing our choices.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, it warms my heart to know that the gentlewoman in her district visits schools and talks to local schoolchildren, and emphasizes those values of civility and tolerance and mutual understanding in our classrooms, and doesn't try to separate people by Democrats and Republicans.

I hope that the next time the gentlewoman goes into those schools and talks to those schoolchildren, and they ask her, Mr. Chairman, "What are you doing to keep us safe from al Qaeda and the terrorists who are planning against

us," that she will say to them, "My proudest moment, young children, is that I cut the FBI budget by 0.05 percent, while approving tax cuts of \$14 billion to the biggest oil companies on Earth."

I think those children would rather be investing in the FBI to keep them safe than be giving away those billions and billions of dollars in tax cuts to the biggest oil companies in the America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. May I inquire, Mr. Chairman, as to how much time is remaining on both sides?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. McGOVERN). The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this has obviously been a spirited debate by men and women on both sides of the aisle who I respect. But I do think if the American people are watching this debate, and I hope they are, we need to dispose of one issue very clearly, and that is there is indeed a dictionary over on that part of the floor, and every amendment that was brought here today is either going to increase spending in this account or level funding. But according to the logic of our friends on the other side of the aisle, if you fund something at a lesser quantity than somebody else wants it, then you have a Draconian cut. Well, if they are increasing this bill 3.1 percent, that is a cut below 3.5 percent. It is a cut below 4 percent.

If all these programs are so good, why did you cut them? Why didn't you increase it 6 percent? Why didn't you increase it 8 percent? So let's dispose of that argument right now.

Again, the only budget that is being cut here, Mr. Chairman, is the family budget. And the family budget is being cut as part of this single largest tax increase in American history contained in the Democrat's budget resolution, which I know they tried to run away from. Now, they said earlier that: We know the cost of everything and the value of nothing. Maybe they need to know the value of hard-earned paychecks in American families.

So they need to think about the Zapata family in Kaufman, Texas, because when they put their tax increase on them, let me tell you what the Zapatas have to say. "If taxes on my family are increased that much, this could seriously affect my life. My mortgage is adjustable and will most likely go up. If the taxes go up, it would be devastating, and I could face foreclosure."

They don't know the value of the paycheck to the Brooker family in Wills Point. "No increase in taxes. My family is one breath away from losing our home as it is."

Those are the budgets that are being cut today, Mr. Chairman, not only by the single largest tax increase in American history, but they are about to bring a tax increase to try to fund their farm bill by taxing jobs. They are saying somehow foreign companies are evil when they come to America and they invest and create jobs, in my district among other districts.

So there is a real choice here: Increase the family budget, or increase the Federal budget. We come down on the side of the family budget.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank my colleague from Texas for reading a letter from constituents out in the State of Texas. But I wonder how that family in Texas would feel if that family were asked: Do you think that we should continue to allow oil companies to earn the greatest profits in the history of any industry, in the history of the world? Or, do you think we ought to take some of those oil revenues and devote them to putting more cops on the street? I think that family would say, "You know, I would be willing to pay a little less at the pump or have the oil company earn a little less at the pump if it meant pumping a little more of that money into the FBI to keep me safe, or if it meant another bulletproof vest for a police officer." I think that family would say the record profits of that industry, that we had a chance to actually take some of those resources and plow it into this country, invest in this country, I think that family in Texas would say, "That means more to me than making sure that these companies enjoy corporate welfare and astounding profits."

Now, my friend says this is only a \$31 million cut. How much difference could that really make? But my friend isn't willing to say where he would cut the money. He wants to spread it around. But he used the example of the FBI. Let's say we devoted this entire cut to the FBI, and it simply means that you would have one FBI agent working a few less hours. Instead of working maybe an 8-hour day, 5 8-hour days, they would work 4 8-hour days and a 7-hour day. Well, I don't know how much they are paying FBI agents in my friend's part of the State; I am from a different part of California. I don't think they pay them all that much. I think if you cut \$31 million out of the FBI, you are cutting a lot of positions out of the FBI.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. SCHIFF. My colleagues have already had 15 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Just to answer your question.

Mr. SCHIFF. I am not yielding my time. My colleague had 15 minutes to try to make his point.

So I don't think cutting \$31 million out of the FBI makes sense. And this gets back to the question that our Chairman posed: What is the need? And are we devoting the resources that meet that need?

The need that I am hearing, the need that our Homeland Security Committee is hearing, the need that the 9/11 Commission recognized is the need to make greater investments in the safety of our country. That is the need that we are recognizing in this bill.

Do we need those extra FBI agents? Yes, I think we do. Do we need those extra cops on the beat? Yes, I think they do. I wish my friends in the opposition who fight so hard for our friends in the gun industry would fight half as hard for our cops to have the best that they need here in this debate on the House floor today.

I think we need to make these investments in our future. I think we need to make these investments in our American family. And, I think that my colleagues in the minority here, not in the minority party, because, again, this bill enjoys the support of the bipartisan majority. But the minority viewpoint that is expressed here today, I think they need to ask: What would these families choose, if we give them the real choice, not between whether they invest in the FBI or they don't invest in the FBI, but whether they invest in the FBI by ending corporate welfare for oil companies? I think the answer would be yes. I think the answer would be absolutely. And I think the answer would be, we want to invest in the country, make it stronger, make it safer, give our children a chance to grow up in safer neighborhoods.

That is the answer I think that letter writer and others around the country would give and have given, and that is why I urge this amendment to be defeated.

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

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

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

I just wanted to clarify that my colleagues' arguments from California were very fine arguments, except they don't apply to this amendment. This amendment does make a 0.0005 or 5 basis points, one-five-hundredths of a percent reduction in the growth of each program equally across the board. So it is 5 cents on \$100 of everything.

I appreciate the argument. It is clear that our friends on the other side of the aisle believe that government cannot survive on this, but they believe that all kinds of people, companies, entities can survive on a whole lot less than that with the taxes they want to increase. It is a very clear distinction,

Mr. Chairman, between 5 cents on \$100 across the board on every program, which I think would be fine, versus all of the various tax proposals, increase proposals, that you have both on various minorities, like smokers and foreign companies, and in your budget on basically every taxpayer in America.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Again, I would just point out that my friend hasn't shown any willingness to trim the profits of his friends in the oil industry by 0.0000005, which would amount to probably about the same \$31 million we are talking about here. He is only willing to take that \$30 million out of our law enforcement efforts across the board, but not out of oil industry profits. And that is the difference in philosophy, I think, between my colleague and myself.

MR. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, during this debate we have seen all sorts of charts and heard about all sorts of numbers and saw a display of dollars. Here are the statistics that count, Mr. Chairman:

The past 2 years, violent crimes in America are up 3.6 percent. Federal law enforcement grants have declined 46 percent. So, under their leadership, Mr. Chairman, Federal support for local law enforcement has already been cut 46 percent; now we are saying we should cut it another five-hundredths of a percent.

FBI counterterrorism casework is up 100 percent. Meanwhile, FBI investigative resources are down 29 percent.

So what we have here, Mr. Chairman, is more criminals on the streets, and an attempt to reduce investments in cops on the streets. What we have here, Mr. Chairman, is a bigger caseload of potential terrorists, and the FBI being told, "Shave your budgets." That is how far some ideologues will go, Mr. Chairman.

I can't imagine any American watching these proceedings, and then hearing the news, learning about the National Intelligence Estimate, which says that al Qaeda is proliferating and regenerating, and saying, "Now is the time to cut the FBI budget," or, "Now is the time even to reduce increased investments in the FBI."

Al Qaeda is not cutting the rate of their increase, Mr. Chairman. Terrorists are not cutting the rate of their increases, Mr. Chairman. This is not the time to begin cutting these budgets.

The other side is talking about specific reductions in the number of FBI agents on counterterrorism cases. They are talking about a specific reduction in the number of deployments of cops on the street; crime going up, Federal law enforcement grants going down. There is a correlation between the two. And now we add insult to injury by saying, let's cut it another 0.05 percent, or one-five-hundredths of a percent.

I want to close, Mr. Chairman, by reminding the Chairman and the Amer-

ican people through the Chairman that this debate really isn't about one-five-hundredths of a percent; it is about what priorities make sense to the American people: \$14 billion tax cuts to the biggest oil companies on Earth, or 2,800 cops on the street; \$90 billion in tax shelters for offshore companies that register their headquarters in Bermuda to avoid paying their fair share of taxes here, or more cops on the street?

□ 1545

The gentleman talked about a family in his district. I don't know of any family in my district that gets to sit at their table, their kitchen table with their accountant and be given the advice that they should register themselves at a P.O. box in Bermuda to avoid paying their fair share of taxes in the United States. You know what they want for their tax dollars? Cops on the street, FBI agents protecting them. That's what they want. They don't have the right to just go off to Bermuda, register themselves at a P.O. box and not pay taxes.

We understand that every tax dollar has to be jealously safeguarded, and that's what we do in this bill. The difference between us is not one-five-hundredth of a percent. The difference between us is \$90 billion. They would rather spend that \$90 billion on those offshore companies with P.O. boxes in Bermuda. We would rather spend a fraction of that making sure that there are cops on the street, that kids are protected from meth, that women don't have to deal with domestic violence, that they can be prosecuted, that the FBI has counter-terrorist agents, that they have investigative resources. Because as I said before, all the statistics bear it out, crime is increasing. Terrorists are proliferating. They are not cutting their budgets. They are not cutting their numbers. They are not even cutting their rate of increase. And we should not turn our backs and allow them this advantage, their advantage in the name of a one-five-hundredth of a percent cut in this budget.

This isn't substance. This is politics. And if it weren't so serious, it would be silly.

We want cops on the street and counter-terrorist agents with the FBI. That's what the American people want. That's why every Republican on the Appropriations Committee supported this bill. And that is why, at the end of this debate, we go back to where we were at the beginning of this debate.

This is a small group of Members, a fringe group of Members who say 3 percent's not enough, 2 percent's not enough, 1 percent's not enough. We're going to go to one-five-hundredth of a percent to make our case.

Every single one of those amendments has been defeated on every single one of these bills because Republicans and Democrats in the mainstream know better. We understand the priorities of the American people. And

that is why this amendment will face the same fate as all the other amendments before them. It will be defeated.

And Mr. Chairman, let me make one other point. With all due respect to my friends, they have spent more taxpayer dollars prolonging this debate offering amendment after amendment after amendment, keeping this House in session when every single one of these amendments was defeated, than the one-five-hundredth of a percent cut that they're offering today.

I would suggest to the other side that they could save taxpayers a lot more money by doing these amendments once, getting them over with, let them get defeated as they always have, and let this Congress go on with the business of the American people and putting cops on the street and investing resources in the FBI to keep them safe.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is 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.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. 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, in the immortal words of Doc Holiday in Tombstone, "Our hypocrisy knows no bounds." Both sides equally applied.

The arguments earlier that half of a percent cut, 5 basis points of a cut, as if that's some sort of a draconian decision to be made, the truth of the matter is the committee, the subcommittee had a fixed amount of money to work with, and they chose to make some trade-offs. They chose to

fund more here and less here, more here and less there. But none of those decisions that they made were couched in the terms of some sort of mean spiritedness.

And at the risk of prolonging the debate, which I think is an important debate for us to have, I'm going to offer up an amendment that I know has a point of order which stands against that.

Before I do that though, I'd like to quote something from Justice George Sutherland. A lot of us heard earlier about the way tax planning is done, used, misused, and it was used in the pejorative; that only big oil companies or other companies could use the code that we currently have in place, that you and I and our colleagues put in place, to affect their tax affairs and that families don't get to do that. Well, I would argue based on this quote: "The legal right," and that's a right, "of a taxpayer to decrease the amount of what otherwise would be his or her taxes, or altogether avoid them by means which the law permits, cannot be doubted." *Gregory v. Helvering*, Justice George Sutherland.

So as we listen to this debate about how much we ought to spend, let's understand that we put in place this code, and if we don't like the way that's done, then there are forums to debate that, and we ought to have that debate. But let's not denigrate people who are using the code we put in place to lower their tax liability and call that some sort of a pejorative.

This is the classic argument that you cannot throw enough money at any subject to fix it. And that's what we heard from the other side; that the more money you throw at it, the more you're going to fix the problem. And I don't necessarily agree with that.

My colleagues on the other side used the word "take" in reference to revenues from oil companies, and that's exactly what they would intend to do. They would take those revenues and spend them the way they would like to. Legitimate way of doing government.

I'll also argue that in the next 2 weeks we may have some sort of a conversation about an energy bill, and during that time frame we will argue vociferously that there's enough in reinvestment in domestic sources of energy, and those revenues taken from these mean, ugly oil companies would otherwise go back into that reinvestment into energy.

So, as I mentioned, our hypocrisy knows no bounds.

My amendment is simple. All of this great work that's been done, and bad work according to our colleagues on the other side, or wasteful work according to our colleagues on the other side, to try to reduce spending in the bill is for naught.

In addition to the ringing defeats that my colleagues endure, were they to be successful, the rules of this House do not allow those cuts to actually be implemented. If my colleague had ac-

tually won the argument that we could trim 5 cents out of \$100 out of this budget, whichever budget, that money would still get spent. The money that stays within the 302(b) allocation, which is code for inside the beltway stuff, but then would simply not get spent. And so we've spent hours and hours and hours down here debating, trying to reduce the spending in a particular bill.

The harsh reality is that were we to win some of those amendments, it would simply be a piratic victory, because that money would still get spent.

My amendment, sense of Congress, would say were we to win one of those arguments, that money, the reduction in spending would actually go against the deficit, or, heaven forbid, that we would ever be in a surplus circumstance, that money would increase the surplus.

So this is something I'm trying to point out on each one of our bills, that we've got a goofy set of rules that only you and I understand, only you and I appreciate, and maybe only appropriators embrace, that does not allow all of this hard debate and work to really mean anything at the end of the day.

And so while I challenge my colleague's characterization of our use of this debate time as wasteful in some way, I think it's important for the American people to understand as they go about managing their affairs that we couch the terms of managing our affairs, their affairs through us, in those kinds of terms.

So, Mr. Chairman, I understand that a point of order lies against this, and I will not prolong the debate much further. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

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

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 employees from a Federal department or agency at any single conference occurring outside the United States.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield a moment to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Hoyer Meek (FL) Scott (GA)
 Hulshof Meeks (NY) Scott (VA)
 Inslee Melancon Serrano
 Israel Miller (MI) Sestak
 Jackson (IL) Miller (NC) Shays
 Jackson-Lee Miller, Gary Shea-Porter
 (TX) Miller, George Sherman
 Jefferson Mitchell Shuler
 Johnson, E. B. Mollohan Simpson
 Johnson, Sam Moore (KS) Sires
 Jones (NC) Moore (WI) Skelton
 Jones (OH) Moran (KS) Slaughter
 Kagen Moran (VA) Smith (NE)
 Kanjorski Murphy (CT) Smith (NJ)
 Kaptur Murphy, Patrick Smith (TX)
 Kennedy Murphy, Tim Smith (WA)
 Kildee Murtha Snyder
 Kilpatrick Nadler Solis
 Kind Napolitano Souder
 King (NY) Neal (MA) Space
 Kingston Norton Spratt
 Kirk Oberstar Aderholt Fortenberry Myrick
 Klein (FL) Obey Stark Akin Fossella Neugebauer
 Knollenberg Olver Altmine Franks (AZ) Oberstar
 Kucinich Ortiz Bachmann Gallegly Paul
 Kuhl (NY) Pallone Tanner Garrett (NJ) Pearce
 Lampson Pascrell Tauscher Baker Gerlach
 Langevin Pastor Taylor Barrett (SC) Gilchrest
 Lantos Payne Thompson (CA) Bartlett (MD) Gillmor
 Larsen (WA) Perlmutter Thompson (MS) Barton (TX) Gingrey
 Larson (CT) Peterson (MN) Tiahrt Berry
 Latham Peterson (PA) Tiberi Gohmert Pickering
 LaTourette Pickering Tierney Biggert Goode
 Lee Pomeroy Towns Bilbray Goodlatte
 Levin Price (NC) Turner Bilirakis Gordon
 Lewis (CA) Pryce (OH) Udal (CO) Bishop (UT) Granger
 Lewis (GA) Putnam Udal (NM) Blackburn Graves
 Lewis (KY) Radanovich Upton Blunt Hall (TX) Price (GA)
 Lipinski Rahall Van Hollen Boerner Hasterd
 LoBiondo Rangel Velázquez Bonner Hastings (WA)
 Loebssack Regula Visclosky Bono Hayes
 Lofgren, Zoe Rehberg Walberg Bordallo
 Lowey Reichert Walden (OR) Boren Herger
 Lucas Renzi Walsh (NY) Boucher Hill
 Lungren, Daniel Reyes Walz (MN) Boustany Hobson
 E. Reynolds Wamp Boyd (FL) Hoekstra
 Lynch Rodriguez Wasserman Boyd (KS) Hulshof
 Mahoney (FL) Rogers (AL) Schultz Broun (GA) Inglis (SC)
 Maloney (NY) Rogers (KY) Waters Brown (SC)
 Manzullo Rogers (MI) Watson Brown-Whaite, Ginny
 Merchant Ros-Lehtinen Watt Buchanan Johnson, Sam
 Markey Roskam Waxman Burton (IN)
 Matheson Ross Weiner Buyer
 Matsui Rothman Welch (VT) Calvert
 McCarthy (NY) Roybal-Allard Weldon (FL) Camp (MI)
 McCollum (MN) Ruppersberger Wexler Whitfield
 McCotter Rush Campbell (CA) Kingston
 McCrery Ryan (OH) Wicker Cannon Kline (MN)
 McDermott Salazar Wilson (NM) Cantor Knollenberg
 McGovern Sánchez, Linda Capito Kuhl (NY)
 McHugh T. Wilson (OH) Carnahan Lamborn
 McIntyre Sanchez, Loretta Wolf Carney Latham
 McKeon Sarbanes Woolsey Chabot LaTourette
 McMorris Saxton Wu Clay Shuster
 Rodgers Schakowsky Wynn Coble Lewis (KY)
 McNerney Schiff Yarmuth Cole (OK)
 McNulty Schwartz Young (FL) Conaway Lipinski
 Costello Cramer Jordan
 Baird Cubin King (IA) Crenshaw
 Brady (TX) Davis, David King (IA) Cuellar
 Burgess Davis, Jo Ann LaHood
 Cantor Fortuno Michaud
 Carter Fossella Musgrave
 Castor Garrett (NJ) Paul
 Christensen Hunter Young (AK)
 Clarke Johnson (GA)

NOT VOTING—23

Baird Cubin Jordan
 Brady (TX) Davis, David King (IA)
 Burgess Davis, Jo Ann LaHood
 Cantor Fortuno Michaud
 Carter Fossella Musgrave
 Castor Garrett (NJ) Paul
 Christensen Hunter Young (AK)
 Clarke Johnson (GA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).
 Members are advised 1 minute remains
 in this vote.

□ 1632

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

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) on
 which further proceedings were post-
 poned and on which the noes prevailed
 by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.
 The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has
 been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 215, noes 205,
 not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 737]

AYES—215

Aderholt Fortenberry Myrick
 Akin Fossella Neugebauer
 Alexander Foxx Nunes
 Altmine Franks (AZ) Oberstar
 Bachmann Gallegly Paul
 Baker Garrett (NJ) Pearce
 Barrett (SC) Gilchrest Peterson (MN)
 Bartlett (MD) Gillmor Peterson (PA)
 Barton (TX) Gingrey Petri
 Berry Gohmert Pickering
 Biggert Goode Pitts
 Bilbray Goodlatte Platts
 Bilirakis Gordon Poe
 Bishop (UT) Granger Porter
 Blackburn Graves Price (GA)
 Blunt Hall (TX) Pryce (OH)
 Bohner Hasterd Putnam
 Bonner Hastings (WA) Radanovich
 Bono Hayes Ramstad
 Boodman Heller Regula
 Bordallo Hensarling Rehberg
 Boren Herger Reichert
 Boucher Hill Renzi
 Boustany Hobson Reynolds
 Boyd (FL) Hoekstra Rogers (AL)
 Boyd (KS) Hulshof Rogers (KY)
 Broun (GA) Inglis (SC) Rogers (MI)
 Brown (SC) Issa Rohrabacher
 Brown-Whaite, Jindal Ros-Lehtinen
 Bunnin King (IL) Johnson, Sam
 Watt Buchanan Jones (NC)
 Buchanan Johnson, Sam
 Burton (IN) Jones (NC)
 Burton (IN) Jones (NC)
 Buyer Keller Ryan (WI)
 Calvert Kind Sali
 Camp (MI) King (NY) Schmidt
 Campbell (CA) Kingston Scott (VA)
 Cannon Kline (MN) Sensenbrenner
 Cantor Knollenberg Sessions
 Capito Kuhl (NY) Shadegg
 Capito Kuhl (NY) Sessions
 Carnahan Lamborn Shimkus
 Carney Latham Shuler
 Chabot LaTourette Shuster
 Clay Lewis (CA) Simpson
 Coble Lewis (KY) Skelton
 Cole (OK) Linder Smith (NE)
 Conaway Lipinski Smith (TX)
 Costello Cramer Souder
 Cramer Jordan Stearns
 Crenshaw E. Stupak
 Cuellar Mack Sullivan
 Culberson Mahoney (FL) Tancredo
 Davis (KY) Davis, Lincoln Marchant
 Davis, Tom Marshall Tanner
 Deal (GA) Matheson Thornberry
 Dent McCarthy (CA) Tiahrt
 Diaz-Balart, L. McCaul (TX) Tiberi
 Diaz-Balart, M. McCotter Turner
 Donnelly McCrery Upton
 Doolittle McHenry Walberg
 Drake McHugh Walden (OR)
 Dreier McIntyre Walsh (NY)
 Duncan McKeon Wamp
 Ehlers McMorris Weldon (FL)
 Ellsworth Rodgers Weller
 Emerson Melancon Westmoreland
 English (PA) Mica Whitfield
 Everett Miller (FL) Wicker
 Fallin Miller (MI) Wilson (NM)
 Feeney Miller, Gary Wilson (OH)
 Flake Moran (KS) Wilson (SC)
 Forbes Murphy, Tim Young (FL)

NOES—205

Abercrombie Arcuri Barrow
 Ackerman Baca Bean
 Allen Baird Becerra
 Andrews Baldwin Berkley

Berman Bishop (GA) Holt
 Bishop (NY) Honda
 Blumenauer Hooley
 Boswell Hoyer
 Brady (PA) Inslee
 Braley (IA) Israel
 Brown, Corrine Jackson (IL)
 Butterfield Jackson-Lee
 Capps (TX) Jefferson
 Capuano Cardoza Johnson, E. B.
 Carson Jones (OH)
 Castle Kagen
 Chandler Kanjorski
 Christensen Kaptur
 Cleaver Kennedy
 Clyburn Kildee
 Cohen Kirk
 Conyers Kilpatrick
 Cooper Klem (FL)
 Costa Kucinich
 Courtney Lampson
 Cummings Langevin
 Lantos Lantos
 Larsen (WA) Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT) Lee
 DeFazio Sherman
 DeGette Lewis (GA)
 Delahunt Sires
 DeLauro LoBiondo Slaughter
 Dicks Loebssack Smith (NJ)
 Dingell Lofgren, Zoe Smith (WA)
 Doggett Lowey Snyder
 Porter Lynch Solis
 Doyle Maloney (NY)
 Edwards Markey
 Ellison Matsui
 Emanuel McCarthy (NY)
 Engel McCollum (MN)
 Eshoo McDermott
 Etheridge McGovern
 Faleomavaega McNearney
 Farr McNulty
 Fattah Tierney
 Ferguson Towns
 Filner Udall (CO)
 Rogers (AL) Udall (NM)
 Miller, George Van Hollen
 Frank (MA) Velázquez
 Frelinghuysen Visclosky
 Gillibrand Moore (KS)
 Gonzalez Moore (WI)
 Green, Al Moran (VA)
 Green, Gene Murphy (CT)
 Grijalva Murphy, Patrick
 Gutierrez Murtha
 Hall (NY) Watson
 Nadler Watt
 Hare Waxman
 Harman Weiner
 Hastings (FL) Norton
 Herseth Sandlin Welch (VT)
 Higgins Obey
 Hinchee Wexler
 Hinojosa Ortiz
 Hiroko Pallone
 Pascrell Woolsey
 Hodes Pastor
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Brady (TX) Davis, David King (IA)
 Burgess Davis, Jo Ann LaHood
 Carter Fortuño Michaud
 Castor Hunter Musgrave
 Clarke Johnson (GA) Young (AK)
 Cubin Jordan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).
 Members are advised 45 seconds remain
 in this vote.

□ 1638

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and
 Mr. LEWIS of California changed their
 vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON)
 on which further proceedings were post-
 poned and on which the ayes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 404, noes 16, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 738]

AYES—404

Abercrombie	Costello	Harman
Ackerman	Courtney	Hastert
Aderholt	Cramer	Hastings (FL)
Akin	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)
Alexander	Crowley	Hayes
Allen	Cuellar	Heller
Altmore	Culberson	Hensarling
Andrews	Cummings	Herger
Arcuri	Davis (AL)	Herseth Sandlin
Baca	Davis (CA)	Higgins
Bachmann	Davis (IL)	Hill
Bachus	Davis (KY)	Hinchey
Baird	Davis, Lincoln	Hinojosa
Baker	Davis, Tom	Hirono
Baldwin	Deal (GA)	Hobson
Barrett (SC)	DeFazio	Hodes
Barrow	DeGette	Hoekstra
Bartlett (MD)	Delahunt	Holden
Barton (TX)	DeLauro	Holt
Bean	Dent	Honda
Becerra	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hooley
Berkley	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoyer
Berman	Dicks	Hulshof
Berry	Dingell	Inglis (SC)
Biggert	Doggett	Israel
Bilbray	Donnelly	Issa
Bilirakis	Doolittle	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Doyle	Jackson-Lee
Bishop (NY)	Drake	(TX)
Bishop (UT)	Dreier	Jefferson
Blumenauer	Duncan	Jindal
Blunt	Edwards	Johnson (IL)
Boehner	Ehlers	Johnson, E. B.
Bonner	Ellison	Jones (OH)
Bono	Ellsworth	Kagen
Boozman	Emanuel	Kanjorski
Bordallo	Emerson	Kaptur
Boren	Engel	Keller
Boswell	English (PA)	Kennedy
Boucher	Eshoo	Kildee
Boustany	Etheridge	Kilpatrick
Boyd (FL)	Everett	Kind
Boysd (KS)	Faleomavaega	King (NY)
Brady (PA)	Fallin	Kingston
Braley (IA)	Farr	Kirk
Brown (GA)	Fattah	Klein (FL)
Brown (SC)	Feeney	Kline (MN)
Brown, Corrine	Ferguson	Knollenberg
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Filner	Kucinich
Buchanan	Flake	Kuhl (NY)
Burton (IN)	Forbes	Lamborn
Butterfield	Fortenberry	Lampson
Buyer	Fossella	Langevin
Calvert	Fox	Lantos
Camp (MI)	Frank (MA)	Larsen (WA)
Campbell (CA)	Franks (AZ)	Larson (CT)
Cantor	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Capito	Gallegly	LaTourette
Capps	Garrett (NJ)	Lee
Capuano	Gerlach	Levin
Cardoza	Giffords	Lewis (GA)
Carnahan	Gilcrest	Lewis (KY)
Carney	Gillibrand	Lipinski
Carson	Gillmor	LoBiondo
Castle	Gingrey	Loebssack
Chabot	Gohmert	Lofgren, Zoe
Chandler	Gonzalez	Lowey
Christensen	Goode	Lucas
Clay	Goodlatte	Lungren, Daniel
Cleaver	Gordon	E.
Clyburn	Granger	Lynch
Coble	Graves	Mack
Cohen	Green, Al	Mahoney (FL)
Cole (OK)	Green, Gene	Maloney (NY)
Conaway	Grijalva	Manzullo
Conyers	Gutierrez	Marchant
Cooper	Hall (NY)	Markey
Costa	Hall (TX)	Marshall
	Hare	Matheson

NOESY-16

NOT VOTING—17

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN
The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).
Members are advised 30 seconds remain
in this vote.

1642
Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. WELCH
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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 138, noes 282, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 739]

AYES—138

Akin	Gallegly	Musgrave
Alexander	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Bachmann	Gingrey	Neugebauer
Bachus	Gohmert	Nunes
Baker	Goode	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Pearce
Bartlett (MD)	Granger	Pence
Barton (TX)	Graves	Petri
Biggert	Hall (TX)	Pickering
Bilbray	Hastert	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Poe
Blackburn	Hayes	Price (GA)
Blunt	Heller	Putnam
Boehner	Hensarling	Radanovich
Bonner	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Bono	Hulshof	Rogers (KY)
Boozman	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Broun (GA)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Brown (SC)	Jindal	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Burton (IN)	Jones (NC)	Royce
Buyer	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Camp (MI)	Kingston	Sali
Campbell (CA)	Kline (MN)	Schmidt
Cantor	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Lewis (KY)	Sessions
Coble	Linder	Shadegg
Cole (OK)	Lucas	Shimkus
Conaway	Lungren, Daniel E.	Shuster
Crenshaw	Mack	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Mahoney (FL)	Smith (TX)
Davis (KY)	Manzullo	Stearns
Davis, Tom	Marchant	Sullivan
Deal (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Tancredo
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCaull (TX)	Taylor
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCotter	Terry
Drake	McCrery	Thornberry
Dreier	McHenry	Tiaht
Duncan	McKeon	Tiberi
Everett	McMorris	Turner
Fallin	Rodgers	Walberg
Feeney	Mica	Wamp
Flake	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Fossella	Miller, Gary	Wicker
Foxx	Moran (KS)	Wilson (SC)

Dingell	Lampson	Rodriguez
Doggett	Langevin	Ross
Doolittle	Lantos	Rothman
Doyle	Larsen (WA)	Royal-Allard
Edwards	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Ehlers	Lee	Rush
Ellison	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Emanuel	Lewis (CA)	Salazar
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Eshoo	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta
Etheridge	Loebssack	Sarbanes
Faleomavaega	Lofgren, Zoe	Schakowsky
Farr	Lowey	Schiff
Fattah	Lynch	Schwartz
Ferguson	Maloney (NY)	Scott (GA)
Filner	Markey	Scott (VA)
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Serrano
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (NY)	Sestak
Gonzalez	McCullom (MN)	Shea-Porter
Gordon	McDermott	Sherman
Green, Al	McGovern	Simpson
Green, Gene	McHugh	Sires
Grijalva	McIntyre	Skelton
Gutierrez	McNerney	Slaughter
Hall (NY)	McNulty	Smith (WA)
Hare	Meek (FL)	Snyder
Harman	Meeks (NY)	Solis
Hastings (FL)	Melancion	Space
Hereth Sandlin	Miller (NC)	Spratt
Higgins	Miller, George	Stark
Hinchey	Mollohan	Stupak
Hinojosa	Moore (KS)	Sutton
Hirono	Moore (WI)	Tauscher
Hobson	Moran (VA)	Thompson (CA)
Hodes	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Holden	Murphy, Patrick	Tierney
Holt	Murphy, Tim	Towns
Honda	Murtha	Udall (CO)
Hooley	Nadler	Udall (NM)
Hoyer	Napolitano	Van Hollen
Inslee	Neal (MA)	Velázquez
Israel	Norton	Visclosky
Jackson (IL)	Oberstar	Schultz
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Obey	Waters
Jefferson	Olver	Watson
Johnson, E. B. Jones (OH)	Ortiz	Watson
Kagen	Pallone	Wasserman
Kanjorski	Pascrill	Watt
Kaptur	Pastor	Waxman
Kennedy	Payne	Weiner
Kildee	Perlmutter	Welch (VT)
Kilpatrick	Peterson (MN)	Weldon (FL)
Kind	Pomerooy	Wexler
King (NY)	Price (NC)	Wilson (OH)
Klein (FL)	Rahall	Woolsey
Knollenberg	Rangel	Wu
Kucinich	Regula	Renzi
Kuhl (NY)	Reichert	Yarmuth
	Reyes	

NOT VOTING—17

Brady (TX)	Davis, David	King (IA)
Burgess	Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood
Carter	Fortuño	Michaud
Castor	Hunter	Smith (TX)
Clarke	Johnson (GA)	Young (AK)
Cubin	Jordan	

□ 1656

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, due to a meeting with the President at the White House this afternoon, I was not present to cast my votes on rollcall votes 734 through 742. Had I been present, I would have voted *yea* on the Stearns amendment—rollcall 734, “aye” on the Flake amendment—rollcall 735, “aye” on the Flake amendment—rollcall 736, “aye” on the Pence amendment—rollcall 737, “aye” on the Upton amendment—rollcall 738, “aye” on the Jordan amendment—rollcall 739, “aye” on the Price of Georgia amendment—rollcall 740, “aye” on the Musgrave amendment—rollcall 741, and “aye” on the Campbell amendment—rollcall 742.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I was at the White House this afternoon with several of my colleagues to brief the President on our recent

trip to Iraq. As a result, I was absent from the House Floor during a series of rollcall votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcalls 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, and 742.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, with today’s passage of the fiscal year 2008 Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill I am pleased to acknowledge the inclusion, in this important legislation, of funding to begin the implementation of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program.

In 2004, the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act, legislation championed by Rep. RANDY NEUGEBAUER and myself, became law. On its road to passage, H.R. 2608 (P.L. 108-360) enjoyed widespread support in both the House and the Senate. The enactment of this legislation established the interagency National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program (NWIRP) to improve windstorm impact assessment and streamline the implementation of federal mitigation efforts to minimize loss of life and property due to severe windstorms like hurricanes and tornados.

All states and regions of the United States are vulnerable to windstorms, and we all share in the cost of repairing the several billion dollars in economic damage caused each year by these storms. Vulnerabilities also continue to grow as our communities grow, but improved windstorm impact measures have the potential to substantially reduce future losses. Sadly, up to this point few resources have been committed to research and program coordination in this area, and no funding has been appropriated to begin the implementation of the NWIRP.

While federal programs cannot eliminate the occurrence or dangers of future windstorms, the programs authorized as part of the NWIRP, if properly funded, will help policymakers, private industry, and individual homeowners adopt strategies for reducing risks to human life and economic loss. The NWIRP also provides an important new opportunity to initiate badly needed research to understand how wind affects structures, to enhance windstorm damage collection and analysis, and to develop and encourage the implementation of mitigation techniques.

The language included in the House version of the fiscal year 2008 Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill will direct much needed funding to the National Science Foundation, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the National Institutes of Standards and Technology that will allow each agency to begin the implementation of each distinct component of the NWIRP for which it is responsible. Again, I am very pleased with the inclusion of this funding in the House version and strongly encourage its inclusion in any conference agreement on this legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this vitally important appropriations bill that addresses a wide range of our nation’s critical needs. H.R. 3093, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2008 provides local communities with the help they need to keep our streets safe; makes significant increases into scientific research to keep our Nation’s economic preeminence in the world; and bans civil rights and privatization abuses furthered by the Bush administration.

Last year, the FBI reported that violent crime had its biggest increase in over a dec-

ade. Under Republican control from 2001 to 2006, funding for state and local law enforcement grants was cut from \$4.4 billion to \$2.5 billion—a 43 percent decrease. This bill reverses those trends, making major investments into restoring state and local law enforcement grants. It appropriates \$725 million for Community Oriented Policing Services (the COPS program)—\$693 million over the President’s request and \$183 million above 2007—to support local law enforcement agencies, including \$100 million for the “COPS on the Beat” hiring program, not funded since 2005. The Congressional Research Service estimates that 2,800 new police officers can be put on America’s streets with these funds. The President’s budget would have cut these grants by 94 percent.

H.R. 3093 also funds the Office on Violence Against Women at \$430 million, \$60 million above the President’s request and \$48 million above 2007, to reduce violence against women, and to strengthen services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. It provides \$1.3 billion for the Office of Justice Programs for grants to state and local organizations to fund activities like crime prevention, the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, Drug Courts and Byrne Grants. It also appropriates \$400 million for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention for state and local grants to address the problems surrounding juvenile offenders, including \$100 million for a competitive youth mentoring grants program.

To keep our Nation’s economic preeminence in the world we need to stay on the cutting edge of science and technology. To that end, H.R. 3093 makes significant investments in scientific research at the country’s top agencies devoted to science. It provides \$28 billion, \$2 billion above 2007 and \$1 billion above the President’s request, for science and science education as part of the Innovation Agenda to keep America competitive in the global market. The bill also tackles the enormous challenge of global climate change, with \$1.86 billion for research and development projects to study what is happening, what could happen, and what we can do about it.

The bill also funds other essential federal programs including the Legal Services Corporation, for civil legal assistance to people who are unable to afford it, allowing an additional 31,000 low-income client cases to be concluded. The program was funded at \$400 million in 1995 and has been cut repeatedly since. A 2005 study found that for every eligible person served, another was turned away due to lack of resources. This bill provides \$377 million for that program, \$28 million above 2007 and \$66 million above the President’s request. H.R. 3093 also appropriates \$333 million for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, to reduce the backlog of pending cases—projected to increase 70 percent from 2006 to 2008 under the President’s request—and requires that all complaint calls be handled by EEOC employees, cancelling the outsourcing of this service.

Finally, the Commerce, Justice and Science Appropriations bill prohibits administration policies that have infringed on our civil rights and curbs privatization policies that have led to waste, fraud and abuse. H.R. 3093 bars the FBI from authorizing National Security Letters in contravention of the law, a practice that we

have examined in the Judiciary Committee. The Justice Department's Inspector General has found multiple instances of FBI abuses and misuses of its authority in issuing these letters. The bill also prohibits the privatization of work performed by employees of the Bureau of Prisons or of Federal Prison Industries, Inc. It also allows federal employees the same appeals rights as contractors after decisions are made on public-private competitions.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support this bill because it gets us back on the right track after six years of misguided cuts whose disastrous effects are now becoming apparent with the FBI's latest crime statistics. This legislation deals literally with life and death issues that need to be given adequate resources. H.R. 3093 will put more police on our streets, aid crime victims, help juvenile offenders get their lives back on track, and provide critical legal services to those who can't afford it. It also makes vitally important investments in our Nation's economic future by encouraging scientific research. Finally, it protects us from government and contractor abuses. The New Direction Congress is once again working to align the priorities of the Federal Government with the needs of the American people.

Mrs. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3074, the FY08 Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

I want to thank the Chairman OBEY, Chairman MOLLOHAN, Ranking Member FRELINGHUYSEN, and the Appropriations Committee for their hard work on this piece of legislation.

This bill will keep our communities safe by providing increased funding for the Community Oriented Policing Services Grants Program and the Byrne Justice Assistance Grants Program.

Both of these programs assist our law enforcement agencies by providing grants for the hiring of additional police officers.

The CJS Appropriations bill also provides assistance for the Office on Violence Against Women.

The COPS program, Byrne Justice Assistance Program, and the Office on Violence Against Women would not have been severely under funded in the President's budget and I commend the committee for their work to fund these vital programs.

This bill also contains vital funding for two projects in my district: the Houston YMCA of Greater Houston's Apartment Outreach Project and the Harris County Integrated In-Car Mobile Technology Project.

The YMCA's Apartment Outreach Project will provide for staffing and supply costs for this program which combats youth crime and gang activity in Houston's apartment complexes.

The Harris County Integrated In-Car Mobile Technology Project will provide county sheriff officers with mobile data computers to link with license plate recognition technology.

Unfortunately, this bill does not provide funding for several projects that I strongly support.

These projects would have provided funding for the Harris County, TX to acquire a 10 acre tract of land for the Buffalo Bayou Partnership plan to redevelop the bayou and funding for Houston Community College to purchase equipment for training programs conducted by its Public Safety Institute.

While it is impossible to fund all of the projects that we request, I believe that these programs need federal funding.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for the National Textile Center. Textiles are an important part of our daily life and of our Nation's economy. It is imperative that we remain internationally competitive in this industry. The National Textile Center does exactly that—ensure that the fiber, textile, and apparel industries in our country have the research and innovations needed to continue to be viable and competitive.

The National Textile Center is a consortium of eight coordinated locations across the country. They have come together in a nationwide effort to promote research and education in developing new and innovative fabrics and materials. These are important collaborative centers that develop new fibers, fabrics, and manufacturing methods with broad ranging applications.

I am proud that one of the partners of the National Textile Center is the University of California Davis. Their participation in this national research consortium benefits the education, workforce development, and economy of the Sacramento region and our entire country. A key project at U.C. Davis funded by the National Textile Center is the development of new personal protection clothing to keep our first responders and military safe. We cannot turn our backs on these vital workers, whom we trust with the health and safety of our Nation.

The National Textile Center funds important interdisciplinary collaborations that translate to many other industries. Basic research funded by this important consortium has applications that will reverberate in many fields, such as biomedical applications, electronics, and nanotechnology. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting funding of the National Textile Center. We need to oppose efforts to strike funds from this important program that benefits constituents nationwide.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, as we begin debate on the FY2008 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill, I want to highlight the National Textile Center (NTC). The NTC is a 15-year-old grant program that supports research at nine member universities, including Georgia Tech, and is the main source of innovation for U.S. textile, fiber and apparel industries. In Georgia, the textile, fiber and apparel industry is the state's largest manufacturing employer with annual payroll of \$500 million. It is imperative that this industry continue to benefit from the infusion of new ideas and talent that is the basis of the programs of the National Textile Center. National Textile Center projects in Georgia have lead to improving Georgia industry processes including new approaches to carpet recycling and new environmentally friendly approaches to dyes and bleaches that lower costs, increase competitiveness, and improve the local plant environmental impact. Outside of helping the textile industry respond to rapidly changing market demands, the NTC has also inspired and trained highly skilled talent for the U.S. textile industry and created educational opportunities in science, engineering, and technology for U.S. citizens and permanent residents from K-12 through the doctoral level.

Mr. Chairman, the National Textile Center has clearly been an excellent steward of past funding provided by the Department of Commerce. With this in mind, I ask Chairman MOL-

LOHAN, Ranking Member FRELINGHUYSEN, and my colleagues in both bodies to preserve current funding and remember the importance of this program during the Conference process.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, when most of us think about law enforcement, we imagine police patrolling the streets, or we think of lawyers and judges in a courtroom. But there's another chapter to the law enforcement story. Once a criminal has been caught, tried, and convicted in federal court, the U.S. prison system is charged with detaining him—sometimes for the rest of his life.

Just as Congress talks about supporting police and protecting judges, we need to talk about supporting our prisons. In recent years we have seen the Federal inmate population grow without a corresponding increase in the number of corrections officers. This is a dangerous situation that we cannot allow to continue.

Since 1980, the population of inmates in Federal prisons has increased from 24,000 to almost 200,000—an 830 percent increase. Unfortunately, funding hasn't increased nearly that fast, and too many facilities are facing staffing shortages. Right now, Federal prisons are overcrowded by about 37 percent.

Frankly, that isn't right. We can't claim to be tough on crime and neglect our prisons. Congress has to provide enough funding to the Bureau of Prisoners to ensure the safety of our guards and the quality of our prisons.

As a member of the House Corrections Caucus, last month I authored a letter to the House Appropriations Committee requesting increased funding for the Bureau of Prisons. Together, we requested \$427 million over 2007 for the Bureau of Prison's "salaries and expenses" account and \$210 million for the "buildings and facilities" account. Unfortunately, resources are stretched thin and that amount could not be met.

In order to continue managing the increasing prison population and providing a safe work environment for our correctional officers we need to provide the BOP with the necessary funding. We must ensure that the BOP receives the funds it needs to conduct maintenance on current facilities and build the new facilities necessary to deal with overcrowding.

Congress can never remove all of the risk from the job of guarding a prison. Risk accompanies any law enforcement job. But we can provide the resources to help our guards do their jobs as safely as possible and demonstrate that we are tough on crime.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to explain the purpose of two amendments I submitted to H.R. 3093, the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Bill of 2008. While I had planned to offer these amendments, I was disappointed that just prior to offering my amendments to the bill on the House floor, was informed that the Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science was going to object to my amendments and insist on a point of order against them. After discussion with the Parliamentarian, who said the point of order would be upheld on a technicality, I decided to not offer my amendments. I am disappointed that the Democrat majority chose to object to my amendments on a technicality, particularly when you consider that technical objections were waived for a host of other provisions in

this same bill. I believe it is important to explain here and get on the record the substance of these amendments and why they are critical to securing our homeland.

My first amendment (No. 14) would have tied funding for the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program to whether recipients are complying with the federal prohibition on sanctuary policies. Sanctuary cities have been prohibited under Federal law (8 U.S.C. 1373 and 1644) for more than 10 years. Yet, there is no enforcement mechanism and no penalty for those cities that choose to disobey the law.

My amendment would have prohibited COPS funding from going to State or local governments that have sanctuary policies which prevent cooperation between local or state police and federal immigration authorities or prevent local or state police from enforcing immigration laws.

Terrorists know all about sanctuary cities and the concealment that such cities provide. The 9/11 terrorists are a case in point. Two of the 19 hijackers on September 11, 2001, ran afoul of police months and days before the attack.

Mohammed Atta was ticketed in Broward County Florida in the Spring of 2001 for driving without a license. Atta was in the U.S. on an expired Visa and was in the U.S. illegally. If the local or state police had looked into Atta's immigration status, the leader of the 9/11 attacks would have been departed 5 months before the attacks took place.

In addition, of the 48 Al Qaeda operatives who operated in the U.S. between 1993–2001, including the 9/11 hijackers, almost half were illegal aliens. Sadly, jurisdictions with sanctuary policies would not only prohibit their apprehension, it would also prohibit the police from informing federal officials of their immigration status so that they could commence deportation proceedings. Three of the Fort Dix Six—the men who tried to pull off a terrorist incident at Ft. Dix, NJ—were pulled over by local police for traffic violations. Three of these individuals had run-ins with police 75 times, but no one ever checked their immigration status. They were all in the U.S. illegally. The jurisdiction in which they were charged supposedly had a sanctuary policy ... which explains why they were never reported to federal immigration officials.

We cannot fool ourselves into thinking that terrorists do not know about these sanctuary jurisdictions... so harboring illegal aliens creates an environment where terrorists can easily hide and not be found out. I want to be clear that I do not believe that all illegal immigrants are terrorists. Very, very few illegal immigrants are terrorists. But those few who are terrorists can kill thousands of innocent Americans, as only 19 did on September 11, 2001.

Obviously, the COPS program adds to our arsenal in combating crime by increasing the number of police in our communities. But funding increased police presence while at the same time not reporting known illegal immigrants to federal authorities, as is the policy of jurisdictions with sanctuary laws, is contradictory and self-defeating. If we simply allowed our law enforcement officers to follow Federal law by requiring them to inform immigration officials of violations of immigration laws, we would likely need fewer police officers to enforce our laws.

Why would we need fewer officers? Because requiring local jurisdictions to cooperate

with the Federal agencies to quickly and efficiently deport illegal immigrants, particularly those engaged in criminal acts, would help reduce the size and capabilities of criminal gangs. A large percentage of those who populate violent criminal gangs, including MS-13, are illegal immigrants. Violent criminal gangs are making these communities unsafe. FBI Director, Robert Mueller, has even declared MS-13 as the top priority of the bureau's criminal-enterprise branch.

Even more, the gangs that are populated by illegal immigrants have increased the threat to our homeland. Honduran Security Minister, Oscar Alvarez, even stated that Al Qaeda might be trying to recruit Central American gang members to help terrorists infiltrate the US. Additionally, Salvadoran President Tony Saca echoed this theme, saying he could "not rule out a link between terrorist and Central American gang members."

My second amendment (No. 15) would have tied funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP) to whether recipient jurisdictions are complying with the federal prohibition on sanctuary policies (8 U.S.C. §§ 1373 and 1644). The amendment would have given priority in SCAAAP funding to those communities that are cooperating with federal immigration officials in deporting illegal immigrants, rather than State or local governments that have sanctuary policies and simply release criminal aliens back onto U.S. streets.

My amendment says if you expect to get federal money for incarcerating illegal immigrants you must also report them to federal immigration authorities so that they can be deported, rather than being released back on to U.S. streets. If a community cannot live by this policy, it is only right that they not get a taxpayer subsidy.

What's amazing is how much money sanctuary cities are raking in from the Federal Government. During fiscal 2005, the Justice Department distributed \$287.1 million in SCAAAP payments to 752 state, county and local jurisdictions. Seventy percent of SCAAAP funds went to just 10 jurisdictions: the states of California, New York, Texas, Florida, Arizona, Illinois and Massachusetts; New York City; and two California counties, Los Angeles and Orange.

Many of the largest recipients of SCAAAP funds are sanctuary cities that refuse to cooperate with Federal authorities on immigration enforcement. Some of the largest sanctuary cities and counties that received SCAAAP money in 2005 include New York City, Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Diego, Houston, and Seattle.

It seems as if we did not learn anything from 9/11 about the need to treat illegal immigration seriously and recognize that the failure to enforce our immigration laws can endanger our national security?

Some of America's most important cities are sanctuary even though it is prohibited under Federal law. And it is time that the Federal Government stops turning a blind eye to sanctuary cities. If a community chooses to be a sanctuary, they should no longer expect to receive the largess of taxpayers from across this country.

Once again, I am disappointed that the Democrat majority would not permit these amendments to be considered for all up or down vote. However, I will continue to work to address this serious national security concern.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this appropriations bill.

One of the most important roles of government is ensuring public safety. Over the last several years, the Federal Government simply has not been providing enough support to local and state law enforcement. The Justice Department's Uniform Crime Report statistics have now shown for 2 consecutive years measurable increases in violent crime nationwide. The Bush administration clearly has its priorities skewed, as the budget it proposed for the Community Oriented Policing Services (C.O.P.S.) program for Fiscal Year 2008 was a mere \$32 million, a reduction of over half a billion dollars from last year's level.

This bill addresses that problem by increasing C.O.P.S. program funding to \$725 million, and designating \$100 million of that amount to be used to hire an additional 2800 police officers nationwide.

There is simply no question that our country's far more robust commitment to putting cops in the streets in the 1990's help reduce violent crime over the last decade. According to the General Accountability Office "C.O.P.S. funded increases in sworn officers per capita were associated with the declines in rates of total index crimes, violent crimes, and property crimes." The same GAO study showed that between the years of 1998 and 2000, C.O.P.S. hiring grants were responsible for reducing crime by about 200,000 to 225,000 incidents—one third of which were violent. Across the state of New Jersey, approximately 4,790 officers were hired by local police departments using C.O.P.S. funds. This meant an additional 628 police officers and sheriff deputies walking the beat in the local communities of my Congressional District. Further, 33 school resource officers were hired to ensure that our children's schools are safe. The committee's increase in funding for this program for Fiscal Year 2008 is a welcome change from recent years, but I hope it will only be a down payment on much larger increases to come. Ideally, we should return to the kind of funding levels that gave us the kind of nationwide police presence we enjoyed in the last decade.

I am pleased that the committee has provided a robust increase for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants Program by more than \$80 million over the Fiscal Year 2007 level to \$600 million. These grants are vital to our local communities—they help local law enforcement organizations get the support they need to combat violent crime, particular gangs and drug-related criminal activity.

In the area of science funding, the bill provides for much needed increases in the overall budget of the National Science Foundation, and for science education funding. Recent history has shown that when the federal government invests in science programs and education, our Nation as a whole benefits.

When funding for the National Institutes of Health was doubled during the previous decade, many students recognized the opportunity and acted accordingly. Federal seed money fostered high-income, highly desirable jobs and entrepreneurial companies that lead the 21st century economy. Their innovations have made the U.S. the global leader in the life sciences and biotechnology.

Earlier this year, I led more than 80 of my colleagues in an appeal to this committee that it increase overall funding for the NSF as well

as education-specific funding. I'm pleased that the committee responded by increasing NSF funding to \$6.509 billion, \$80 million over our collective request, as well as adding \$72 million specifically for science education funding. I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBEY, and the subcommittee chairman, Mr. MOLLOHAN, for demonstrating a commitment to make meaningful investments in the NSF's physical sciences and engineering programs.

Finally, the Commerce Department portion of this bill provides badly needed additional funding to address perhaps the greatest threat to our collective future—global climate change.

The committee has added \$171 million over the President's request to help fund a number of key climate change initiatives, including a comprehensive study of the problem, as well as changes to National Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System (NPOESS) program to ensure that critical climate monitoring sensors are added onto future NPOESS platforms. It is vital to both our economic and our national security that we take whatever measures are necessary to gain a comprehensive understanding of the mechanisms that drive global warming so that we can implement the full range of measures necessary to combat it.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for bringing us a bill that reflects the priorities of the American people, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment put forward by the gentleman from Arizona.

We should not be reducing the funding for the National Textile Center. Our national economic prosperity has grown from the formidable work ethic of the American people and vigorous investment in all areas of science and technology. We must not lose the scientific commitment which has brought our Nation so far and can help us go so much further.

The National Textile Center conducts advanced research work with life-saving applications. Some examples include the use of micro-technologies to develop heart stents, and three-dimensional weaving techniques to produce life-saving armor. Beneficiaries of the National Textile Center's work include firefighters, police officers and soldiers who require protective clothing that allows them to carry out their dangerous jobs. I am proud to have several companies in my district including 3Tex and FirstChoice Armor who are working closely with the National Textile Center to produce the next generation of life-saving textile products.

The research conducted by the National Textile Center is also advancing our understanding of more efficient textile manufacturing. New developments spearheaded by the National Textile Center help make our industrial processes more effective and help ensure we remain competitive in the international arena.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and maintain our national commitment to investments in science and technology that provide real benefits to American workers and real solutions for the greater good.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008".

Mr. MOLLOHAN. 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 (Mrs. TAUSCHER) having assumed the chair, Mr. SNYDER, 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. 3093) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, 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 562, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANZULLO. Is it appropriate at this time to ask for a re-vote on each and every amendment just voted on?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has just queried on that matter.

Mr. MANZULLO. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am in its present form.

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. 3093, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly with a deficit neutral amendment to provide:

(1) additional funding for Department of Justice immigration law enforcement capabilities (including investigative, prosecutorial and incarceration programs); and

(2) funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program at the level authorized pursuant to section 1196 of Public Law 109-162.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, the motion I have at the desk is a motion to recommit to recognize the fact that right now this country faces a crisis on its borders.

Illegal immigration not only affects those of us who represent States on the border, it is a pervasive problem across the country. The Homeland Security Appropriations bill that passed the House earlier this summer included significant increases for more Border Patrol agents and other border protection efforts.

□ 1700

The homeland security bill represents an important piece of our immigration enforcement system, but it does not fund all of it. It is this bill that funds prosecution and incarceration of the most violent criminal aliens, such as drug dealers, human traffickers and gang members. It is this bill that provides critical assistance to State and local law enforcement agencies that are on the front lines of the immigration problem.

As we increase our border enforcement efforts in the Department of Homeland Security, we must make sure that the Department of Justice has the funds it needs to fully prosecute and incarcerate all of the criminal aliens arrested by the Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement. In addition, until the Federal Government is able to secure its borders, we must provide our local governments with sufficient resources to reimburse them while they protect our communities.

Because my colleague from California, DAVID DREIER, former chairman of our Rules Committee, has been most involved in this issue and is on the point of our attempting to find a solution in California, I yield the balance of my time to Mr. DREIER to round out this discussion.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me just say that in the 109th Congress, Mr. LEWIS and I joined together to offer an amendment to the Violence Against Women Act which actually authorized a level of \$950 million for the reimbursement to the States for the incarceration of illegal immigrant felons. At that time, Madam Speaker, 414 Members of this House voted in support of that bill. Just yesterday, 338 Members voted in favor of the amendment that we offered which had an increase to a level of \$460 million total for the issue of the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program. It is literally a drop in the bucket. Even with this new level, State and local governments will, Madam Speaker, only receive 10 cents on the dollar that they expend for the incarceration of people who are in this country illegally and commit crimes.

I believe that it is absolutely essential, if we're going to allow State and local governments to work on the very, very important crime problem that

they have, that we should step up to the plate and take on the responsibility that only the Federal Government can address, and that is the security of our Nation's borders.

Madam Speaker, any Member who votes against this motion to recommit is, in fact, voting to not provide reimbursement to State and local governments for this onerous responsibility which we have thrust upon them by virtue of the fact that we are not securing our Nation's borders.

Vote to support the motion to recommit that Mr. LEWIS is offering here so that we will have a chance to provide that very, very important support for State and local governments and the security for the constituents who we represent.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, and I won't use any more time, I appreciate very much Mr. DREIER's assistance in this matter. I urge very strongly that all Members vote "aye" on this motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, I yield back my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit. If I heard the gentleman from California correctly, I believe he misspoke and said that he encouraged a vote against the motion to recommit. Of course he's not against the motion to recommit, but if he were, that would be the only place that I agree with him on this amendment.

Obviously this is a killer amendment. This is the "I got you" amendment. It provides for promptly returning the bill back to the House. That means that the bill will not pass today on the Floor. That's the "got you" part of each one of these motions to recommit. It means we wouldn't be able to pass the bill here today.

Additionally, the amendment asks for additional funding for the Department of Justice immigration law enforcement capabilities. We just had a number of amendments proposing across-the-board cuts during this proceeding. Many of their supporters have argued that there's too much money in these bills and in these accounts. We're funding this bill substantially above the President's request, \$3.2 billion above last year and \$2.3 billion above the President's request.

It would always be good to have additional funding in law enforcement, but we're proud of how robustly we are funding law enforcement, and particularly for State and local law enforcement, which is \$1.7 billion above the President's request. Those funds help with the local law enforcement, including prosecutorial, incarceration programs, and many others across the board. While this bill is well in excess of the President's request, much of

that is for funding for law enforcement above last year's levels.

The other provision of this motion to recommit would fund the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program at the level authorized. Let me just suggest that the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program is a privileged account in this bill. We began funding through subcommittee at \$375 million. In full committee, it increased to \$405 million. On the floor, this program was again increased now to \$460 million. It is certainly getting its fair share of funding relative to other accounts in the bill.

Indeed, if this motion to recommit were passed and were acted upon, we would have to go back and cut State and local law enforcement, FBI, DEA, and meth programs. We would have to cut law enforcement funding that puts police on the streets, that hires additional FBI agents, additional DEA agents, and funds meth programs.

If we approve this motion to recommit, we would really have to go back and cut all of that funding.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN).

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I concur with the suggestion that this motion to recommit be defeated.

As the author of the amendment yesterday to increase SCAAP funding by \$55 million, I can certainly not be counted as someone who does not support funding for State and local alien incarceration programs.

On the other hand, we had offsets for our amendment yesterday, \$55 million in offsets, and if I had found additional offsets that didn't adversely impact the Drug Enforcement Agency or the FBI or the COPS program or the National Science Foundation, I would have suggested an even bigger amount. I couldn't find those offsets.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, this is not about substance. This is about killing this bill. The gentleman will say it comes back promptly. It doesn't come back promptly.

We spent 14½ hours trying to get money to law enforcement, immigration enforcement and all the other objects in law enforcement, first responders, in this bill. This is about killing this bill. This is about delay. This is about politics, trying to give some of our people a bad vote.

Vote this motion down because it is not real. It is not for substance sake. It is not for the objective as it is articulated in the amendment. It is designed to fail. Reject this chicanery on this floor. Vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

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. DREIER. Madam 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 209, noes 215, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 743]

AYES—209

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Moran (KS)
Akin	Gallegly	Murphy, Patrick
Alexander	Garrett (NJ)	Murphy, Tim
Altman	Gerlach	Musgrave
Bachmann	Giffords	Neugebauer
Bachus	Gilchrest	Nunes
Baker	Gillibrand	Paul
Barrett (SC)	Gillmor	Pearce
Barrow	Gingrey	Pence
Bartlett (MD)	Gohmert	Peterson (PA)
Barton (TX)	Goode	Petri
Biggert	Goodlatte	Pickering
Bilbray	Granger	Pitts
Bilirakis	Graves	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Hall (TX)	Poe
Blackburn	Hastert	Porter
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Boehner	Hayes	Pryce (OH)
Bonner	Heller	Putnam
Bono	Hensarling	Radanovich
Boozman	Herger	Ramstad
Boren	Hill	Regula
Boustany	Hobson	Rehberg
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Reichert
Brown (GA)	Hulshof	Renzi
Brown (SC)	Inglis (SC)	Reynolds
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Jindal	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Jones (NC)	Roskam
Calvert	Jordan	Royce
Camp (MI)	Kagen	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	Keller	Sali
Cannon	King (IA)	Saxton
Cantor	King (NY)	Schmidt
Capito	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Carney	Kirk	Sessions
Carter	Kline (MN)	Shadegg
Castle	Knollenberg	Shays
Chabot	Kuhl (NY)	Shimkus
Coble	Lamborn	Shuler
Cole (OK)	Lampson	Shuster
Conaway	Latham	Simpson
Crenshaw	LaTourette	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Davis (KY)	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Davis, David	Linder	Souder
Davis, Tom	LoBiondo	Stearns
Deal (GA)	Lucas	Sullivan
Dent	Lungren, Daniel E.	Tancredo
Donnelly	Mack	Terry
Doolittle	Manzullo	Thornberry
Drake	Marchant	Tiahrt
Dreier	Marshall	Tiberi
Duncan	McCarthy (CA)	Turner
Ehlers	McCaull (TX)	Upton
Ellsworth	McCotter	Walberg
Emerson	McCrey	Walden (OR)
English (PA)	McHenry	Walsh (NY)
Everett	McHugh	Wamp
Fallin	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Feeley	McMorris	Weller
Ferguson	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Flake	McNerney	Whitfield
Forbes	Mica	Wicker
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Wilson (NM)
Fossella	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Franks (AZ)	Mitchell	Young (FL)

NOES—215

Abercrombie Gutierrez Ortiz
 Ackerman Hall (NY) Pallone
 Allen Hare Pascrell
 Andrews Harman Pastor
 Arcuri Hastings (FL) Payne
 Baca Herseth Sandlin Perlmutter
 Baird Higgins Peterson (MN)
 Baldwin Hinchee Pomeroy
 Bean Hinjosa Price (NC)
 Becerra Hiroko Rahall
 Berkley Hodes Rangel
 Berman Holden Reyes
 Berry Holt Rodriguez
 Bishop (GA) Honda Ros-Lehtinen
 Bishop (NY) Hooley Ross
 Blumenauer Hoyer Rothman
 Boswell Inslee Roybal-Allard
 Boucher Israel Ruppersberger
 Boyd (FL) Jackson (IL) Rush
 Boyda (KS) Jackson-Lee Ryan (OH)
 Brady (PA) (TX) Salazar
 Braley (IA) Jefferson Sánchez, Linda
 Brown, Corrine Johnson (GA) T.
 Butterfield Johnson, E. B. Sanchez, Loretta
 Capps Jones (OH) Sarbanes
 Capuano Kanjorski Schakowsky
 Cardoza Kaptur Schiff
 Carnahan Kennedy Schwartz
 Carson Kildee Scott (GA)
 Castor Kilpatrick Scott (VA)
 Chandler Kind Serrano
 Clay Klein (FL) Sestak
 Cleaver Kucinich Shea-Porter
 Clyburn Langevin Sherman
 Cohen Lantos Sires
 Conyers Larsen (WA) Skelton
 Cooper Larson (CT) Slaughter
 Costa Lee Smith (WA)
 Costello Levin Snyder
 Courtney Lewis (GA) Braley (IA)
 Cramer Lipinski Solis
 Crowley Loebssack Space
 Cuellar Lofgren, Zoe Spratt
 Cummings Lowey Stark
 Davis (AL) Lynch Stupak
 Davis (CA) Mahoney (FL)
 Davis (IL) Maloney (NY)
 Davis, Lincoln Markey Tauscher
 DeFazio Matheson
 DeGette Matsui
 Delahunt McCarthy (NY)
 DeLauro McCollum (MN)
 Diaz-Balart, L. McDermott
 Diaz-Balart, M. McGovern
 Dicks McIntyre
 Dingell McNulty
 Doggett Meek (FL)
 Doyle Meeks (NY)
 Edwards Melancon
 Ellison Miller (NC)
 Emanuel Miller, George Schultz
 Engel Mollohan Waters
 Eshoo Moore (KS) Watson
 Etheridge Moore (WI) Watt
 Farr Moran (VA) Waxman
 Fattah Murphy (CT) Weiner
 Filner Murtha Welch (VT)
 Frank (MA) Nadler Wexler
 Gonzalez Napolitano Wilson (OH)
 Gordon Neal (MA) Woolsey
 Green, Al Oberstar Wu
 Green, Gene Obey Wynn
 Grijalva Olver Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Clarke Hunter Myrick
 Cubin LaHood Young (AK)
 Davis, Jo Ann Michaud

□ 1726

Mr. LAMPSON and Mr. HILL changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, on July 26, I was participating in a briefing on National Security and I missed the first vote.

I take my voting responsibility very seriously and would like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted "no" on recorded vote number 743.

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 281, nays 142, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 744]

YEAS—281

Abercrombie Fortenberry Meek (FL)
 Ackerman Frank (MA) Meeks (NY)
 Aderholt Frelinghuysen Melancon
 Allen Gerlach Miller (MI)
 Altmine Giffords Miller (NC)
 Andrews Gilcrest Miller, George
 Arcuri Gillibrand Mitchell
 Berkley Gonzalez Mollohan
 Berman Goode Moore (KS)
 Baldwin Gordon Moore (WI)
 Barrow Green, Al Moran (VA)
 Bean Green, Gene Murphy (CT)
 Becerra Grijalva Murphy, Patrick
 Berkley Gutierrez Murphy, Tim
 Berman Hall (NY) Murtha
 Berry Hall (TX) Nadler
 Bilirakis Hare Napolitano
 Bishop (GA) Harman Neal (MA)
 Bishop (NY) Hastings (FL) Oberstar
 Blumenauer Hayes Obey
 Bono Herseth Sandlin Olver
 Boren Higgins Ortiz
 Boswell Hill Pallone
 Boucher Hinchee Pascrell
 Boyd (FL) Hinjosa Pastor
 Boyd (PA) Hobson Payne
 Braley (IA) Hodes Peterson (MN)
 Brown, Corrine Holden Platts
 Brown-Waite Holt Poe
 Broun, Zoe Ginny Honda
 Butterfield Hooley Porter
 Capito Hoyer Price (NC)
 Capps Inslee Pryce (OH)
 Capuano Israel Rahall
 Cardoza Jackson (IL) Ramstad
 Chandler Jackson-Lee Rangel
 Carson Johnson (GA) Regula
 Castor Johnson (IL) Reichert
 Chabot Johnson, E. B. Renzi
 Chabot Johnson, E. B. Reyes
 Clay Jones (NC) Rodriguez
 Cleaver Jones (OH) Rogers (KY)
 Carson Kilpatrick Rogers (MI)
 Castor Johnson (GA) Ross
 Chabot Johnson (IL) Rothman
 Chabot Johnson, E. B. Roybal-Allard
 Conyers Keller Ruppersberger
 Cooper Kennedy Rush
 Costa Kildae Ryan (OH)
 Costello Kilpatrick Salazar
 Courtney Kind Sánchez, Linda
 Cramer Kirk T.
 Crowley Klein (FL) Sanchez, Loretta
 Cuellar Kucinich Sarbanes
 Cummings Lampson Saxton
 Langevin Schakowsky
 Schiff Lantos
 Davis (AL) Davis (CA) Schwartz
 Davis (IL) Davis (WA) Scott (GA)
 Davis, Lincoln Davis, Tom Scott (VA)
 Defazio LaTourette Serrano
 DeGette Lee Sestak
 Delahunt Levin Shea-Porter
 Donnelly Lewis (GA) Shuler
 DeLauro Lipinski Sires
 Dent LoBiondo Skelton
 Dicks Loebssack Slaughter
 Dingell Lofgren, Zoe Smith (NJ)
 Doggett Lowey Smith (WA)
 Donnelly Lynch Snyder
 Doyle Mahoney (FL) Solis
 Edwards Maloney (NY) Space
 Ehlers Markey Spratt
 Ellison Marshall Stark
 Ellsworth Matheson Stupak
 Emanuel Matsui Sutton
 Emerson McCarthy (NY) Tancredo
 Engel McCollum (MN) Tanner
 Eshoo McGovern Tauscher
 Etheridge McHugh Taylor
 Farr McIntyre Terry
 Fattah Morris Thompson (CA)
 Feeney Rodgers Thompson (MS)
 Ferguson McNerney Tierney
 Filner McNulty Towns

Udall (CO) Wasserman
 Udall (NM) Schultz
 Upton Waters
 Van Hollen Watson
 Velázquez Watt
 Visclosky Waxman
 Walden (OR) Weiner
 Walsh (NY) Welch (VT)
 Walz (MN) Weldon (FL)
 Weller

NAYS—142

Akin Fossella Moran (KS)
 Alexander Foxx Musgrave
 Bachmann Franks (AZ) Myrick
 Bactus Gallegly Neugebauer
 Baker Garrett (NJ) Nunes
 Barrett Gillmor Paul
 Bartlett (MD) Gingrey Pearce
 Barton (TX) Gohmert Pence
 Biggert Goodlatte Peterson (PA)
 Bilbray Granger Petri
 Bishop (UT) Graves Pickering
 Blackburn Hastert Pitts
 Blunt Hastings (WA) Price (GA)
 Boehner Heller Putnam
 Bonner Hensarling Radanovich
 Boozman Herger Rehberg
 Boustany Hoekstra Reynolds
 Brady (TX) Hulshof Rogers (AL)
 Broun (GA) Ingles (SC) Rohrabacher
 Brown (SC) Issa Ros-Lehtinen
 Buchanan Jindal Roskam
 Burgess Johnson, Sam Jordan
 Burton (IN) King (IA) Ryan (WI)
 Buyer King (NY) Sali
 Calvert Kingston Schmidt
 Camp (MI) Kline (MN) Sensenbrenner
 Campbell (CA) Sessions
 Knollenberg Shadegg
 Cannon Cantor Shays
 Carter Lamborn Shimkus
 Castle Lewis (CA) Stearns
 Cole (OK) Lewis (KY) Shuster
 Conaway Linder Simpson
 Crenshaw Lucas Smith (NE)
 Davis (KY) Lungren, Daniel Smith (TX)
 Davis, David E. Souder
 Deal (GA) Mack Stearns
 Diaz-Balart, L. Manzullo Sullivan
 Diaz-Balart, M. Marchant Thorntberry
 McCarthy (CA) Tiahrt
 Drake McCaul (TX) Tiberi
 Dreier McCotter Turner
 Duncan McCrery Walberg
 English (PA) McHenry Wamp
 Everett McKeon Westmoreland
 Fallin Mica Whitfield
 Flake Miller (FL) Wicker
 Forbes Miller, Gary Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—9

Clarke Hunter Michaud
 Cubin LaHood Sherman
 Davis, Jo Ann McDermott Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are less than 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1734

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall 744, final passage of H.R. 3093, the FY08 Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. Had I not been detained, I would have voted in favor of final passage.