

offered zero interest financing, which, as GM said, has kept America rolling.

I will never apologize for defending the domestic auto industry against the Democratic leadership.

**THANK YOU AND WELCOME HOME,
RED BULL DIVISION**

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota Red Bulls are not an energy drink, but let me tell you about what an amazing energy force they have been for our freedom in the United States.

They are now returning home from the longest continuous deployment of any U.S. military unit during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The Red Bulls hail from the 1st Brigade, 34th Infantry Division of the Minnesota National Guard based in Bloomington, Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, these men and women are true citizen soldiers. They have put service to their country ahead of their family, of their friends, and their careers since September of 2005.

During their deployment, let me tell you what the Red Bulls have done for our country, Mr. Speaker. They completed 5,200 combat logistical patrols. They secured 2.4 million convoy miles, and they discovered 462 improvised explosive devices prior to detonation. In addition, they completed 137 reconstruction projects and helped start two Iraqi newspapers for the local population that covered stories on these reconstruction projects.

On behalf of a grateful Nation and a free world, we welcome back the Minnesota Red Bulls and we thank you.

**CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GRADUATE
MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM**

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, as the House continues its consideration of the Labor-HHS appropriations bill today, I urge all my colleagues to support funding for the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program.

Even though this amount is lower than the amount suggested by some of us in the 109th Congress, the \$307 million in this appropriation bill will go to training and educating graduate medical students who will help our children at our children's hospitals across this Nation.

Especially close to my heart is my godson, Kyle, who at 18 months old was diagnosed with cancer and for the last 12 years has survived and has been helped and aided by these graduate medical students.

So I urge my colleagues, please support this bill. It is so critical to the health of our children.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELCH of Vermont). Pursuant to House Resolution 547 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3043.

□ 1025

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3043) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mrs. TAUSCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 17, 2007, amendment No. 5 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 42, line 21.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAVES:

Page 42, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$125,000,000)".

Page 42, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$125,000,000)".

Page 84, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$125,000,000)".

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Chairman, let me begin by thanking the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee for working together in a true bipartisan fashion to begin providing a long overdue down payment to special education funding. In particular, I want to thank Ranking Member WALSH for his amendment in committee to provide a \$335 million increase in special education funding for fiscal year 2008.

When the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act was signed into law more than 30 years ago, the Federal Government committed to pay the States 40 percent of the costs of providing services to students covered under this act. However, for three decades the Federal Government has often provided less than half the money promised.

What has this shortfall meant? For one, it has meant higher taxes at the State and local levels and less funding for other education programs as States and local governments struggle to make up the shortfall in Federal resources.

The amendment I introduce today builds on the bipartisan cooperation of the House Appropriations Committee by providing a further \$125 million increase in funding for IDEA part B

grants to the States. To pay for my amendment, I offset the cost by reducing a portion of the U.S. contribution to the Global Fund. My amendment helps us fulfill our commitment to funding special education while also providing a small increase in funding to the Global Fund as was provided last year. I don't take this money from any domestic program. These funds are dedicated to an overseas program, and they still see a \$1 million increase over last year.

My amendment sets the right priorities for our Nation's children with special needs, and I urge support from all of my colleagues. Again, I would thank the chairman and ranking member for their hard work on this.

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, frankly, I am looking for my ranking minority member. But until he gets here let me take a little time and say that I would simply suggest to the gentleman, if he thinks this is a good idea, that he take this idea up with the President of the United States.

What this committee has tried to do both on this subcommittee and on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee is to respect and work with the administration in their effort to provide global leadership to deal with the AIDS epidemic around the world. And the fact is that this item in this bill is a critical piece of the President's program.

Given our disarray around the world because of Iraq, I think it is a wonderful exception when we can be seen to be providing constructive leadership in the world on something. And certainly, although I have many differences with the President, this is one area where I think he has exercised significant leadership.

□ 1030

And I think it would undercut our standing yet again in the world if we were to withdraw this funding.

I just think that we've struck a good balance with respect to this program. I think both subcommittees have tried to see to it that we meet our international responsibilities.

You and I are very lucky human beings. Our souls were, thanks to God, infused in a body that lives in the United States. If they had been infused in a body that was born in Africa or in Asia or in some of the other hot spots in the world in terms of these diseases, I think we would take a look at this issue in a quite different way.

This program provides the only real leadership in the world to attack this program. I think it would be a horrendous mistake if we were to adopt the gentleman's amendment. I would urge defeating the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES).

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

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to general medical sciences, \$1,966,019,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to child health and human development, \$1,273,863,000.

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to eye diseases and visual disorders, \$677,039,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For carrying out sections 301 and 311 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 243, 281 et seq.) with respect to environmental health sciences, \$652,303,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON AGING

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to aging, \$1,062,833,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND MUSCULOSKELETAL AND SKIN DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to arthritis and musculoskeletal and skin diseases, \$516,044,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DEAFNESS AND OTHER COMMUNICATION DISORDERS

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to deafness and other communication disorders, \$400,305,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NURSING RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to nursing research, \$139,527,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to alcohol abuse and alcoholism, \$442,870,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DRUG ABUSE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to drug abuse, \$1,015,559,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to mental health, \$1,425,531,000.

NATIONAL HUMAN GENOME RESEARCH INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to human genome research, \$493,996,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BIOMEDICAL IMAGING AND BIOENGINEERING

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to biomedical imaging and bioengineering research, \$303,318,000.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH RESOURCES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to research resources and general research support grants, \$1,171,095,000.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR COMPLEMENTARY AND ALTERNATIVE MEDICINE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to complementary and alternative medicine, \$123,380,000.

NATIONAL CENTER ON MINORITY HEALTH AND HEALTH DISPARITIES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to minority health and health disparities research, \$202,691,000.

JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER

For carrying out the activities of the John E. Fogarty International Center (described in subpart 2 of part E of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 287b)), \$67,599,000.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241, 281 et seq.) with respect to health information communications, \$325,484,000, of which \$4,000,000 shall be available until expended for improvement of information systems: *Provided*, That in fiscal year 2008, the National Library of Medicine may enter into personal services contracts for the provision of services in facilities owned, operated, or constructed under the jurisdiction of the National Institutes of Health: *Provided further*, That in addition to amounts provided herein, \$8,200,000 shall be available from amounts available under section 241 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 238j) to carry out the purposes of the National Information Center on Health Services Research and Health Care Technology established under section 478A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 286d) and related health services.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

For carrying out the responsibilities of the Office of the Director, National Institutes of Health, \$1,114,422,000, of which up to \$14,000,000 shall be used to carry out section 214 of this Act, of which \$110,900,000 shall be for continuation of the National Children's Study, and of which \$495,153,000 shall be available for the Common Fund established under section 402A(c)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 282a): *Provided*, That funding shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 29 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only: *Provided further*, That the National Institutes of Health is authorized to collect third party payments for the cost of clinical services that are incurred in National Institutes of Health research facilities and that such payments shall be credited to the National Institutes of Health Management Fund: *Provided further*, That all funds credited to such Fund shall remain available for one fiscal year after the fiscal year in which they are deposited: *Provided further*, That no more than \$500,000 shall be available to carry out section 499 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290b): *Provided further*, That amounts appropriated to the Common Fund shall be in addition to any amounts allocated to activities related to the Common Fund through the normal research priority-setting process of individual institutes and centers: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided \$10,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses when specifically approved by the Director of the National Institutes of Health: *Provided further*, That the Office of AIDS Research within the Office of the Director of the National Insti-

tutes of Health may spend up to \$4,000,000 to make grants for construction or renovation of facilities as provided for in section 2354(a)(5)(B) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300cc-41(a)(5)(B)).

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For the study of, construction of, renovation of, and acquisition of equipment for, facilities of or used by the National Institutes of Health, including the acquisition of real property, \$121,081,000, to remain available until expended.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

For carrying out titles V and XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa et seq., 300w et seq.) ("PHS Act") with respect to substance abuse and mental health services, the Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act (42 U.S.C. 10801 et seq.), and section 301 of the PHS Act (42 U.S.C. 241) with respect to program management, \$3,272,928,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 520A(f)(2) of the PHS Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-32(f)(2)), no funds appropriated for carrying out section 520A are available for carrying out section 1971 of such Act: *Provided further*, That in addition to amounts provided herein, the following amounts shall be available under section 241 of the PHS Act (42 U.S.C. 238j): (1) \$79,200,000 to carry out subpart II of part B of title XIX of the PHS Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-21 et seq.) to fund section 1935(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-35(b)) relating to technical assistance, national data, data collection, and evaluation activities, and further that the total available under this Act for activities under such section 1935(b) shall not exceed 5 percent of the amounts appropriated for subpart II of part B of title XIX of such Act; (2) \$21,413,000 to carry out subpart I of part B of title XIX of the PHS Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-1 et seq.) to fund section 1920(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-9(b)) relating to technical assistance, national data, data collection, and evaluation activities, and further that the total available under this Act for activities under such section 1920(b) shall not exceed 5 percent of the amounts appropriated for subpart I of part B of title XIX of such Act; (3) \$16,000,000 to carry out national surveys on drug abuse; and (4) \$4,300,000 to evaluate substance abuse treatment programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. WHITFIELD

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 29 offered by Mr. WHITFIELD:

Page 49, line 25, before the period insert "*Provided further*, That, of the funds made available under this heading, \$10,000,000 is for carrying out section 3990 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-4)".

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, in 2005, the U.S. Congress adopted the National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting Act, which was signed into law by the President in 2005. The amendment at the desk simply provides funding of \$10 million for this authorized program. The \$10 million is taken from the Secretary's Management Account, so the offset is taken care of.

On March 29 of this year, 2007, Chairman DINGELL, Ranking Member BARTON and the chairman and ranking

member of every subcommittee of Energy and Commerce, as well as other Members, sent a letter to Chairman OBEY and Ranking Member LEWIS requesting that they consider funding this program. And we had hoped that it would be included in this HHS appropriation bill because NASPER, as passed by the Congress, is located and placed at HHS.

Now, the Appropriations Committee on another bill has provided funding for an unauthorized drug monitoring program located at the Department of Justice. That program is primarily based and focused on law enforcement. And we do not object to that program in any way, but I might say that last year, for 2007 and 2006, money was made available for both the NASPER program at HHS and the Department of Justice program, which is more based on law enforcement. The NASPER program really addresses the prescription drug addiction problem and helps physicians work with patients and makes physicians aware of prescriptions that those patients have. So last year we were quite pleased that both programs were funded. And we were disappointed that this year's program, the authorized program, was not funded; the unauthorized program was funded.

And so we come today and ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the ranking member, both of whom have worked diligently on a very complicated bill that provides great services to our country, we come this morning and ask them to consider funding this authorized program.

I might add that Secretary Leavitt testified for it. We had 2 years of hearings on this program. Secretary Leavitt endorsed it. Former Secretary Tommy Thompson endorsed it. And as I said, we're not asking that they defund the unauthorized program because we know that it's doing a good job, but we're simply saying the Energy and Commerce Committee had 2 years of hearings, passed this legislation. It passed the Senate overwhelmingly. The President signed it. It was funded last year, and we strongly request that the chairman consider funding it again this year.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to my friend's amendment.

The gentleman's amendment really is unnecessary, and it duplicates work that the Justice Department is engaged in under the Prescription Drug Monitoring Grant Program.

I understand that primarily, as a result of the efforts of Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, the Justice Department has been operating for several years, running a grant program to assist States in building and enhancing prescription

drug monitoring systems, facilitating the exchange of information among States, and providing technical assistance and training for effective State programs.

The Office of Justice Programs runs this grant program, along with the assistance and technical expertise of the Drug Enforcement Administration and is currently funded at \$7.5 million.

From all accounts, the Justice Department effort is well run and effective. For that reason, I ask Members to oppose this amendment, which would set up a competing and duplicative program.

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

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

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

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of Mr. WHITFIELD's amendment that would amend funding for the National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting Act, or NASPER.

Two years ago, Congress passed NASPER and it was signed into law, making it the only statutory authorized program to assist States in combating prescription drug abuse of controlled substances through prescription drug monitoring programs. Congress realized that more needed to be done to aid States to set up or improve State systems that enable authorities to identify prescription drug abusers, as well as the problem doctors who betray their high ethical standards of their profession by over or incorrectly prescribing prescription drugs.

The new law, NASPER law, authorized \$10 million in fiscal year 2008 and \$10 million each year through fiscal year 2010. Although NASPER has been signed into law, Congress has yet to appropriate funds to the HHS for this program for the past 3 years. Given the existence of this authorized program, it would seem to be inappropriate not to fund NASPER, while funding unauthorized prescription drug monitoring programs. By doing this, Congress sets a bad precedent in sanctioning the creation and continued operation of Federal programs through the appropriation process.

NASPER was passed with bipartisan support after many years of hard work by many Members on both sides of the aisle and those of us who are on the Energy and Commerce Committee. NASPER is the only solution which will assist physicians, establish minimum standards for State prescription drug monitoring programs, and substantially reduce prescription drug abuse.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Whitfield amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Whitfield amendment to fund NASPER, the National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting Act, which the gentleman from Kentucky and I sponsored in the last Congress.

As was mentioned already, this is the authorized program that would deal with this issue. And I don't want to get into necessarily contrasting this with the other program that the gentleman from New York mentioned, but I do think it's necessary to understand that this program is authorized and it's not funded. I mean, obviously we should be funding programs that are authorized, not those that are not.

But beyond that, the bottom line is that the NASPER program mandates that States participate in the program. We only have about 22 States now that are participating, so I would certainly argue that the status quo with this alternative Justice Department program simply is not working. If we want more States to get involved, we need to fund the authorized program.

During the time since August of 2005 when this became law and has not been funded, during this time since then prescription drug abuse has reached an all-time high, with an estimated 9 million Americans using prescription drugs for nonmedical purposes. Most disturbing is the fact that there is an epidemic of prescription drug abuse among teenagers. So if the argument is that the existing Justice Department program is working and we don't need to fund this authorized program, I think the facts show very much the opposite.

NASPER will ensure that prescription drugs are only being used for medical purposes. With better monitoring and tracking systems, people will not be able to seek multiple prescriptions or cross State lines to get prescriptions filled without their provider knowing. NASPER reaches across State lines, with timetables and benchmarks aimed at eliminating the problem of prescription drug abuse. It's a public health program in the Department of Health and Human Services, where it belongs, not in the Justice Department. And most important, it is the only statutorily authorized program to assist States in combating prescription drug use.

Right now, a lot of the program is with doctors. The Justice Department program doesn't really help doctors prevent this epidemic. Also, the Justice Department program is totally focused on enforcement, not on trying to get people more involved in the States at a preventive level dealing with the doctors. We have enforcement as well, but it's not the only thing.

I would simply say that we've made this pledge a couple of times. My understanding is that this amendment is going to be withdrawn. But I just need to ask the appropriators, please consider the fact that in the future we need to address this. This needs to be

affected. The other program that's in effect now is not doing the job. We simply ask that you collectively take a look at this and figure out how to do it so we can get funding for the NASPER program, which is the one that the Congress authorized and which will address this epidemic effectively. We're not having an effective response right now.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would say to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the ranking member that we didn't really want to force this issue this morning. But it is a program, as has been said, we spent 2 years having hearings on this program. It mandates States to adopt these programs. We feel like it is a great program. It was funded last year, and we would respectfully request that at conference maybe the chairman and ranking member would work with us in trying to address the issue.

Mr. OBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply say that we sort of feel like we're caught in the middle of this one because Mr. LEWIS, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, gave us a lecture yesterday about how we should avoid duplicative programs.

□ 1045

Then, today, this amendment would have the effect of creating in one department a program that is virtually identical to a program that already exists in another department. So we can't win, no matter how we deal with the issue. I don't care which agency this is in. I just want it to be wherever it would be run the most efficiently and effectively.

I am certainly willing to discuss with anybody involved in the issue how we resolve this issue. We didn't put it in in the first place. It was put in by, as you know, a person from your party from your own State.

So we are happy to work with all of you, but I don't want to get cross-wised between two people from the same State. I don't want to be standing here accepting an amendment that creates a duplicative program.

So I think the most constructive result would be if the gentleman would withdraw his amendment and we try to work this out down the line, so that if it is not in the right place, we can talk about how to get it in the right place.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Chairman OBEY, I am going to withdraw the amendment, but I would like to make this point: This is an authorized program that we

are talking about. We had 2 years of hearings on this project. There is some sentiment in the Congress, I believe today, that the appropriators seem to authorize on their appropriations bill when it is convenient for them.

Madam Chairman, I am going to withdraw the amendment because of the respect that I have for the gentleman from Wisconsin and the ranking member, as well as the Member from Kentucky that was talked about.

I do believe that this is an effective program. We look forward to working with you as we continue through the process to try to resolve it in some way.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman will yield further, if I can simply say again, on this side of the aisle I feel like I am being whipsawed. This was in the other bill because we were trying to accommodate a Republican Member of the House who felt strongly that it ought to be in that bill. Now we are being criticized by another Republican from the same State because we accommodated the other Republican. I can't go in both directions at the same time, which is why I don't seek to have this program in any department. I don't care where it is.

I would just as soon that you settle your differences with your colleague from your own State, and when you have, come and see me. I will try to work with whoever is the winner of the rassing match.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I am here as an advocate for the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows.

AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY

HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY

For carrying out titles III and IX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq., 299 et seq.), and part A of title XI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.), \$329,564,000; and in addition, amounts received from Freedom of Information Act fees, reimbursable and interagency agreements, and the sale of data shall be credited to this appropriation and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount made available pursuant to section 937(c) of the Public Health Service Act shall not exceed \$47,064,000.

CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES

GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAID

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act, \$141,630,056,000, to remain available until expended.

For making, after May 31, 2008, payments to States under title XIX of the Social Security Act for the last quarter of fiscal year 2008, for unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

For making payments to States or in the case of section 1928 of the Social Security

Act (42 U.S.C. 1396s) on behalf of States under title XIX of the Social Security Act for the first quarter of fiscal year 2009, \$67,292,669,000, to remain available until expended.

Payment under title XIX may be made for any quarter with respect to a State plan or plan amendment in effect during such quarter, if submitted in or prior to such quarter and approved in that or any subsequent quarter.

PAYMENTS TO HEALTH CARE TRUST FUNDS

For payment to the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as provided under sections 1844 and 1860D-16 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w, 1395w-116), sections 103(c) and 111(d) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 426a(c), 1395i-1), section 278(d) of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 426 note), and for administrative expenses incurred pursuant to section 201(g) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401(g)), \$188,828,000,000.

In addition, for making matching payments under section 1844 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w), and benefit payments under 1860D-16 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-116), not anticipated in budget estimates, such sums as may be necessary.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles XI, XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act, titles XIII and XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988, not to exceed \$3,230,163,000, to be transferred from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as authorized by section 201(g) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401(g)); together with all funds collected in accordance with section 353 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 263a) and section 1857(e)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-27(e)(2)), funds retained by the Secretary pursuant to section 1893(h)(1)(C) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ddd(h)(1)(C)), and such sums as may be collected from authorized user fees and the sale of data, which shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That all funds derived in accordance with section 9701 of title 31, United States Code, from organizations established under title XIII of the Public Health Service Act shall be credited to and available for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That \$49,869,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, is for contract costs for the Healthcare Integrated General Ledger Accounting System: *Provided further*, That \$163,800,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, is for Medicare contracting reform activities of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading are available for the Healthy Start, Grow Smart program under which the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services may, directly or through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements, produce and distribute informational materials including, but not limited to, pamphlets and brochures on infant and toddler health care to expectant parents enrolled in the Medicaid program and to parents and guardians enrolled in such program with infants and children: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall collect fees in fiscal year 2008 from Medicare Advantage organizations pursuant to section 1857(e)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395s-27(e)(2)) and from eligible organizations with risk-sharing contracts under section 1876 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395mm) pursuant to section

1876(k)(4)(D) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395mm(k)(4)(D)).

HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL ACCOUNT

In addition to amounts otherwise available for program integrity and program management, \$383,000,000, to be transferred from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as authorized by section 201(g) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401(g)), of which \$288,480,000 is for the Medicare Integrity Program at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to conduct oversight of activities authorized in titles I and II of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-173), with oversight activities including those activities listed in section 1893(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395www(b)); of which \$36,690,000 is for the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General; of which \$21,140,000 is for the Medicaid program integrity activities; and of which \$36,690,000 is for the Department of Justice: *Provided*, That the report required by section 1817(k)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i(k)(5)) for fiscal year 2008 shall include measures of the operational efficiency and impact on fraud, waste and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs for the funds provided by this appropriation.

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS

For making payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV-D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), \$2,949,713,000, to remain available until expended; and for such purposes for the first quarter of fiscal year 2009, \$1,000,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For making payments to each State for carrying out the program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children under title IV-A of the Social Security Act as in effect before the effective date of the program of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) with respect to such State, such sums as may be necessary: *Provided*, That the sum of the amounts available to a State with respect to expenditures under such title IV-A in fiscal year 1997 under this appropriation and under such title IV-A as amended by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 shall not exceed the limitations under section 116(b) of such Act.

For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV-D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), for the last three months of the current fiscal year for unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

For making payments under section 2604(a)-(d) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8623(a)-(d)), \$1,980,000,000.

For making payments under section 2604(e) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8623(e)), \$682,000,000, notwithstanding the designation requirement of section 2602(e) of such Act.

REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses for refugee and entrant assistance activities and for costs associated with the care and placement of unaccompanied alien children authorized by title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8

U.S.C. 1521-1524) and section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (8 U.S.C. 1522 note), for carrying out section 462 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279), and for carrying out the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 2152 note) \$650,630,000, of which up to \$9,814,000 shall be available to carry out the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.): *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading pursuant to section 414(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and section 462 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 for fiscal year 2008 shall be available for the costs of assistance provided and other activities to remain available through September 30, 2010.

PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT

For carrying out the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.), \$2,137,081,000 shall be used to supplement, not supplant, State general revenue funds for child care assistance for low-income families: *Provided*, That \$18,777,370 shall be available for child care resource and referral and school-aged child care activities, of which \$982,080 shall be for the Child Care Aware toll-free hotline: *Provided further*, That, in addition to the amounts required to be reserved by the States under section 658G, \$267,785,718 shall be reserved by the States for activities authorized under section 658G, of which \$98,208,000 shall be for activities that improve the quality of infant and toddler care: *Provided further*, That \$9,821,000 shall be for use by the Secretary for child care research, demonstration, and evaluation activities.

SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

For making grants to States pursuant to section 2002 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397a), \$1,700,000,000.

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SERVICES PROGRAMS

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5711 et seq.), the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15001 et seq.), the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.), the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.), sections 310 and 316 of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10409, 10416), the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991a et seq.), title II of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 5111 et seq.) (adoption opportunities), sections 330F and 330G of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-6, 254c-7), the Abandoned Infants Assistance Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 670 note), sections 261 and 291 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 15421, 15461), subpart 1 of part B of title IV and sections 413, 1110, and 1115 of the Social Security Act, for making payments under the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9901 et seq.), sections 439, 473B, and 477 of the Social Security Act, and the Assets for Independence Act (42 U.S.C. 604 note), and for necessary administrative expenses to carry out such Acts and titles I, IV, V, X, XI, XIV, XVI, and XX of the Social Security Act, the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981, title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, and section 505 of the Family Support Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 9926), \$9,125,940,000, of which \$9,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, shall be for grants to States for adoption incentive payments, as authorized by section 473A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b) and may be made for adoptions completed before September 30,

2008: *Provided*, That \$6,963,571,000 shall be for making payments under the Head Start Act, of which \$1,388,800,000 shall become available October 1, 2008, and remain available through September 30, 2009: *Provided further*, That \$701,125,000 shall be for making payments under the Community Services Block Grant Act: *Provided further*, That not less than \$8,000,000 shall be for section 680(3)(B) of the Community Services Block Grant Act: *Provided further*, That in addition to amounts provided herein, \$6,000,000 shall be available from amounts available under section 241 of the Public Health Service Act to carry out the provisions of section 1110 of the Social Security Act: *Provided further*, That to the extent Community Services Block Grant funds are distributed as grant funds by a State to an eligible entity as provided under the Act, and have not been expended by such entity, they shall remain with such entity for carryover into the next fiscal year for expenditure by such entity consistent with program purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish procedures regarding the disposition of intangible property which permits grant funds, or intangible assets acquired with funds authorized under section 680 of the Community Services Block Grant Act, to become the sole property of such grantees after a period of not more than 12 years after the end of the grant for purposes and uses consistent with the original grant: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for section 680(a)(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act shall be available for financing construction and rehabilitation and loans or investments in private business enterprises owned by community development corporations: *Provided further*, That \$64,350,000 is for a compassion capital fund to provide grants to charitable organizations to emulate model social service programs and to encourage research on the best practices of social service organizations: *Provided further*, That \$15,720,000 shall be for activities authorized by the Help America Vote Act of 2002, of which \$10,890,000 shall be for payments to States to promote access for voters with disabilities, and of which \$4,830,000 shall be for payments to States for protection and advocacy systems for voters with disabilities: *Provided further*, That \$136,664,000 shall be for making competitive grants to provide abstinence education (as defined by section 510(b)(2) of the Social Security Act) to adolescents, and for Federal costs of administering the grant: *Provided further*, That grants under the immediately preceding proviso shall be made only to public and private entities which agree that, with respect to an adolescent to whom the entities provide abstinence education under such grant, the entities will not provide to that adolescent any other education regarding sexual conduct, except that, in the case of an entity expressly required by law to provide health information or services the adolescent shall not be precluded from seeking health information or services from the entity in a different setting than the setting in which abstinence education was provided: *Provided further*, That within amounts provided herein for abstinence education for adolescents, up to \$10,000,000 may be available for a national abstinence education campaign: *Provided further*, That in addition to amounts provided herein for abstinence education for adolescents, \$4,500,000 shall be available from amounts available under section 241 of the Public Health Service Act to carry out evaluations (including longitudinal evaluations) of adolescent pregnancy prevention approaches: *Provided further*, That up to \$2,000,000 shall be for improving the Public Assistance Reporting Information System, including grants to States to support data

collection for a study of the system's effectiveness.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 34 offered by Mr. HOLT:

Page 58, line 21, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$21,000,000)".

Page 60, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$21,000,000)".

Page 60, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$15,000,000)".

Page 60, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$6,000,000)".

Page 63, line 4, insert after the first dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$21,000,000)".

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, as you may know, the funding authorized for the Help America Vote Act of 2002, known as HAVA, for disability access and protection and advocacy payments, was never fully appropriated. Section 261 of HAVA authorized \$100 million in disability access funding to make polling places accessible to individuals with disabilities and to provide them with information about the accessibility of polling places.

I am sure the Chair and my colleagues would agree, it is important for equality under the law that all voters have good access to voting.

In addition, section 291 authorized \$10 million annually for fiscal years 2003 through 2006 and such sums as necessary thereafter to pay for the protection and advocacy systems of each State to ensure full participation in the electoral process for individuals with disabilities, including the process of registering to vote, casting a vote and gaining access to polling places. To date, only \$55 million of that amount has been appropriated under HAVA to fund accessibility, and only \$22 million has been appropriated to fund protection and advocacy systems.

Voting is indeed the cornerstone of our democracy, and unless all eligible voters are assured access to the polls, that fundamental right and the integrity of our electoral system generally are severely undermined. Therefore, I seek to amend the bill to provide \$15 million in funding for accessibility under section 261 of HAVA, and an additional \$6 million in funding for protection and advocacy systems under section 291 of HAVA, for a total increase of \$21 million. This would result, as you can quickly calculate, in several hundred thousand dollars per State to assist in voting for voters with disabilities.

I urge my colleagues to support this increase.

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I understand the motivation behind this amendment. The gentleman wants to provide additional funding for a very legitimate purpose. It is something we should have done a long time ago, and I understand that. But having said that, I am simply tired of having to defend administrative accounts from people on both sides of the aisle.

So I am not going to object to the amendment, but I do want to point out to the gentleman, as I will point out to many other Members who offer similar amendments today, that this committee is being whipsawed. We are being told by the White House that there is too much money in this bill, yet virtually every amendment that has been offered, save one, has been motivated principally by a desire to increase rather than decrease funds in this bill. This is another similar amendment. While I recognize that it has an offset, it is a "let's pretend" offset, just like a number of the offsets were last night.

Anybody who understands how government works needs to understand that if an agency is a grant-making agency and if you gut its administrative budget, then there ain't going to be nobody in the agency to issue the grants in the first place. Therefore, I want Members who offer these amendments to understand that even if they are accepted, when we go to conference we are going to have to make very large adjustments, and a lot of what is adopted on the House floor, if it is based on some of these "let's pretend" offsets, will in fact wind up on the cutting room floor by the time we get back from conference. That is just a practical fact of life.

Madam Chairman, as I say, I will not object to the gentleman's amendment, but I don't want anyone to be under any illusion that we can fund all of these additional wonderful things by simply going to the administrative budgets of the agencies, because occasionally you need somebody in that office to turn on the light.

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

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

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his agreement, and simply ask that he continue, as he always has, to stand up for the American ideal of equality for all at the polling place.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. I will be very brief, Madam Chairman. I absolutely agree with the chairman's statement. It is a responsible statement. We

can't continue to do the nice things on the one hand by looking like we are putting more money into a program, and at the same time cutting the fat, muscle and limbs of the departments that are supposed to administer these programs. So I support the chairman's contention. We will deal with this in conference.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Chairman, I just want to commend the chairman for the work that this committee has done to achieve the very purpose that this amendment that the gentleman from New Jersey has proposed.

□ 1100

Frankly, we have this year on July 26 the anniversary of the Americans With Disabilities Act, and we have taken many steps backward as a Nation in guaranteeing the civil rights of all Americans with disabilities. Clearly that means we need to guarantee nothing special for people with disabilities, just the same rights. Guaranteeing equal access regardless of ability is what we need to do in this country.

This amendment seeks to do that; but I might add, so does the underlying bill. I hope that Members listening to this debate do not come away with the understanding that it is because of amendments like this that we are accomplishing it. The underlying bill, if people were to see it and really look at it, does so much to offer independence and hope to people who previous to this bill were denied many opportunities because of previous budgetary priorities that shut people out in this country.

So I want to commend the chairman and the ranking member for producing a good bill that goes along the same lines as this amendment by opening up the doors of opportunity to all Americans.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 41 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

Page 58, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$8,000,000)".

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, if my ears did not deceive me, I think I heard the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee either observe or lament that with one exception, every amendment offered on this bill, its purpose was to increase

spending. If that was a lamentation, I certainly share his angst. Not wanting to disappoint, I am coming to the floor with several amendments that are designed to do just the opposite, spend less of the people's money to try to save hardworking American taxpayers more, let them keep more of what they earned.

Now, Madam Chairman, this is a modest amendment, but it represents a very, very important principle. Today, right now, the Federal Government is spending \$23,289 per family. This is the highest level spent in real inflation-adjusted terms since World War II.

Earlier this year, the Democrat budget resolution included the largest single tax increase in American history which when fully put in place would put \$3,000, an average of \$3,000, additional tax burden on the average American family. And now even if Congress were for some reason to just disband today and add no new government, just the government programs we have on automatic pilot threaten to double taxes on the next generation. So we need to find every opportunity that we can today to save the poor beleaguered taxpayer even more money.

Madam Chairman, I do not myself know exactly how many Federal programs exist. I have seen one estimate, I believe, from the Heritage Foundation that we have over 10,000 Federal programs spread across 600 different agencies. I defy any man, woman or child to tell me what each and every one of them does. Some of them I am sure do good things; but the question is given the fiscal challenges that we face, are they truly a priority.

Madam Chairman, some may have even completed their mission. And some, perhaps like the amendment that I am offering today, are actually duplicative. This is a modest amendment that would save the American taxpayer \$8 million. In this particular program, ostensibly, funding is used for training and technical assistance in developing and managing water facilities. But the Office of Management and Budget has recommended that this particular program be eliminated, stating that "the program is duplicative of other Federal entities such as the Bureau of Reclamation's rural water program which is responsible for water and wastewater treatment facilities." That is from the Office of Management and Budget.

So we ought to make sure that we are not simply engaging in legislation by symbolism. I know every single program has a lofty-sounding name to help some constituency that is important to us. But we have to look beyond that and see if it is actually achieving its purpose, are there other programs that are also achieving its purpose as well. And according to the Office of Management and Budget, this program is duplicative of other programs.

So we have to ask ourselves a very important question. In light of the fact that the Federal Government has never

ever spent since World War II so much money of the American family, \$23,289, given that the Democrat budget resolution includes the single largest tax increase in history, given that although the national deficit has come down, not due to any spending discipline but due to the fact that we are awash in tax revenues, we still have a tax deficit. So it is a simple question: Do we want to fund a program that the administration considers duplicative given that if we don't, either the funds are coming from the Social Security trust fund, and many of my colleagues have pledged not to do that, if it is not coming from that, it is going to add to this \$3,000-per-American-family tax burden, or more debt will be passed on to our children.

I believe we ought to use this opportunity to eliminate one duplicative Federal program and return \$8 million to the American taxpayer.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I was going to yield a minute of my time to the gentleman from Texas to explain his amendment. I appreciate his speech, and I thought the gentleman's speech was a thoughtful speech. He has come to the floor consistently on every appropriations bill in an effort to save money, but I would like to yield to the gentleman just so he can tell us what his amendment does in this bill. If the gentleman would be kind enough to explain that to us, we would appreciate it over here on the majority.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If I was not clear, this amendment would save the American taxpayer \$8 million. It would remove a duplicative program, according to OMB, the Rural Community Facilities Program. I don't need a minute to explain what the amendment does. That is it. I certainly apologize to my colleague if I was unclear as to the purpose of the amendment or how it operates.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I appreciate the gentleman and his analysis.

At least as I read page 58, line 21, the gentleman seeks to reduce by \$8 million section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 and section 505 of the Family Support Act of 1988. That reduction the committee fundamentally opposes in part because of Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 and the Family Support Act of 1988 are reputable programs that have provided an enormous benefit to the American taxpayer. That is precisely why it is in the bill. And it is specifically in the section of the bill "Children and Families Services Programs" because of its enormous benefit to the American taxpayer.

I appreciate the gentleman's effort at fiscal accountability and fiscal respon-

sibility, and the gentleman has clearly led a crusade through every single one of these appropriations bills, but I would encourage Members to oppose the Hensarling amendment.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Chairman, I tell the gentleman, in my State, I will give you a perfect example of where this would make a difference.

In a rural part of my State we had a contamination of our well water, and it was a contamination because of the MTBE, the chemical that goes into gasoline. I might add under the Republican majority, you all indemnified the oil and gas industry from lawsuits so that my community can't get the justice it deserves so it can clean up its wastewater and make due reparation to my constituents. What they had to do is they had to go down to the local high school to take showers. They had to attach a pump through the fire department to the next-door community.

Now under this section of the bill, this is a public health hazard. You know why, because even at home when they turn on the water, they were getting lesions on their skin because the shower water was giving them lesions. Even when they turned on the steam, the children were breathing in the steam and were getting asthma attacks. Now if you are wondering what the nexus is, this is what the nexus is between your amendment and health and why infrastructure makes an enormous difference in providing clean, safe drinking water to rural communities.

Now I don't come from a very rural State so you might think that it is kind of interesting that I would come up and speak on behalf of this. I would think that your State would probably benefit a lot more from this. Your constituents must be wondering about you offering an amendment against a section that would benefit your State more than it does mine. Frankly, this is an important program.

If anything in this country, we haven't invested enough in infrastructure. Mr. JACKSON, I'm sure, has talked to his mayors and local community leaders, and they have told him that their infrastructure is falling apart. I would just commend all of us to say that if we have to do anything, we have to do more in the way of infrastructure, not less.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Reclaiming my time, I want to make sure, and I appreciate the gentleman from Rhode Island's thoughts on the subject, but I want to make sure that this amendment is going to the heart of Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 and Family Support Act of 1988.

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hensarling amendment. I love a good debate. It is a great privilege for me to be able to come to the floor at a time when Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. JACKSON are here. I find them to be two of the most forceful and effective advocates of their view in the Congress in the majority, and so I welcome this opportunity to join in the debate. And I thank the gentleman from Texas who is consistently the strongest advocate for fiscal discipline and reform in the House of Representatives.

I will leave aside for the moment the whole question of which party forced the requirement of MTBE to be added to gasoline and created the regulatory challenges that the gentleman refers to, and just get to the larger question here.

Madam Chairman, we have an \$8 trillion national debt. This is an amendment to cut \$8 million. And it is being forcefully opposed. I think for anyone who would be looking on the people's House today, that is a rather dramatic comparison. Let me repeat that again. The Hensarling amendment, facing the stark reality of \$8 trillion in national debt, comes to the floor with an idea to ask the Federal Government to do without spending \$8 million.

The new majority, and I congratulate them again on securing the majority in the Congress, the American people spoke. But I do remember the new majority pledged no new deficit spending. I remember promises by this new majority in last year's campaign season that we would pay as we go in the Federal budget. If there was to be spending increases, they would be offset by cuts in other areas.

Yet this legislation, the bill is \$7 billion over the 2007 request, \$10.2 billion over the President's request, and it follows seven other pieces of legislation all of which have increased spending. And some of which, Madam Chairman, I have supported, but not all.

And it does seem to me as I walked here to this floor, I passed one sign after another in front of the offices of some of my most distinguished Democrat colleagues that bear the number \$8 trillion writ large. If we are to be concerned about \$8 trillion, will we not support an effort to cut \$8 million?

□ 1115

That's the choice here today and whether the gentleman from Illinois, who I deeply respect, considers that this \$8 million to be an enormous benefit, might there not be States and local governments that could make up for that, with the recognition that we are creating a burden for future generations of Americans that we ought not to create?

So I support the Hensarling amendment. It is the least we can do to take a step backwards.

I want to associate myself with the distinguished chairman of this committee who rose earlier to say, and I'm

quoting now, that he was tired of defending administrative accounts with amendments by people who were coming to ask for more spending in other areas.

It is greatly to the credit of the gentleman from Texas that he is coming to this floor simply asking that we not spend this money. There's no other amendment or no other spending request that he's making in this regard, and it's what the American people ask us to do.

In fact, I would close, Madam Chairman, simply by saying I think the American people are tired of the national debt. I think they're tired of the sea of red ink. I think they were tired of it when my party had control of the place, and as the gentlewoman knows, I was one of the strongest opponents of wasteful government spending when my own party was in charge.

And so I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know the gentleman from Texas and myself and other colleagues, we come to this floor with sincerity of purpose and with consistency that we think government ought to live within its means and pay its bills, and we think we ought to balance budgets. And the Hensarling amendment simply asks that we might cut \$8 million as a modest response to \$8 trillion in national debt.

And I challenge my colleagues, in the spirit of goodwill, let's make this statement, let's start in the direction of fiscal discipline and reform or, for heaven's sake, Madam Chairman, and I say with a smile, let's take the signs down from the hallways. Let's stop pretending that we worry about the national debt if we cannot come together as a Congress and as a nation and accept an \$8 million cut to deal with an \$8 trillion national debt.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Drone on, drone on, O ship of State. That's what I'm tempted to recite when I hear these repetitious dronings on bill after bill after bill.

Let me simply say, I think it is legitimate for individual Members of this body to offer amendments in order to illustrate their concern about a larger question. I've done that many times myself in this institution.

But I think that after 3 weeks of hearing the same point made again and again, we understand that these gentlemen believe that we are putting too much money into education and health care and science and other areas that we regard as crucial investments, and that's a perfectly legitimate position to have. But please spare me the sanctimony, spare me the nonsense that somehow these amendments will contribute in any meaningful way to significant deficit reduction.

Let me simply point out, if people were interested in significant deficit reduction, they would not be supporting an Iraqi war which has already

spent over \$400 billion and which we'll spend another 140 billion bucks by the time we pass the President's supplemental. They would not be insisting that we provide \$57 billion in tax cuts to people making a million bucks a year. No, they don't argue about those two things.

What do they do? They come to the floor and squawk about an \$8 million program to help the poorest rural communities in this country get basic services like sewer and water. I represent many towns in my District with populations of less than a thousand people. At least half the households in many of those towns are headed either by senior citizens or a woman with a low income, and that means that when they get hit with the DNR order to clean up their water or clean up their sewer, they do not have the tax base to proceed, and they don't have technical expertise even to know how to begin going about it.

We've got a \$385 billion backlog in this country of sewer and water needs, and yet we're hearing these complaints about this tiny little program and what terrible abuse it is for the taxpayer.

Imagine a congressional committee trying to do something to help poor communities deal with their sewer and water problems. Isn't that awful? Isn't that wasteful? Good God, Almighty, we ought to be putting that \$8 million into the pockets of millionaires in additional tax cuts, right? At least that's what their record shows they believe. Nonsense.

I'm getting up once on this amendment, but I don't intend to continually get up in what is a filibuster by amendment. So I wanted to get that off my chest once, and then I'm just going to sit back and let people drone on, drone on, O ship of State, and occasionally I might even listen.

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

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

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 42 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

Page 58, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)"

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, I listened intently to the distinguished chairman of the committee, as

I do whenever he is on the floor. Apparently he does not like amendments that increase spending in this bill, and apparently he doesn't like amendments that decrease the spending in the bill. So apparently he doesn't like amendments. So that much is clear.

Second of all, Madam Chairman, when I come down to the floor in efforts to try to save taxpayers money, let them keep more money for their education programs, their health care programs, their energy programs, sometimes we're told that, well, this is so draconian, you know, to try to save this much money. And then other times we're told, well, this is just a piddling little amount.

Well, I'm reminded first of a famous quote from the late Senator Everett Dirksen, a billion here, a billion there, pretty soon we're talking about real money. I'm even talking about more modest amounts today.

But there's a fundamental principle involved here, and the fundamental principle is that we have a Federal budget growing way beyond the ability of the family budget to pay for it. Make no mistake about it, Madam Chairman, government will be paid for. It's either going to be paid for in the short term by continuing to raid the Social Security Trust Fund, which is what's going to happen if this particular amendment fails. It will be funded by the single largest tax increase in American history which my friends on the other side of the aisle, the Democrat majority, has done in their budget, or perhaps it may even be funded by sending more debt to our children and grandchildren.

I think we should look for every opportunity. Given the challenges that we face, the Comptroller General of America has said we are on the verge of being the first generation in America's history to leave the next generation with a lower standard of living. Never happened before in the history of America.

So, Madam Chairman, I make no apologies for, to use the distinguished chairman's term, droning on about what fiscal perils lay in wait for future generations if we don't start now. And then, again, it's a little bit like Goldilocks and the three bears. Either the porridge is too hot or the porridge is too cold. When is the porridge just right to try to save the family budget from the onslaught of the Federal budget?

So when we have the Office of Management and Budget single out a number of different programs, and I certainly think that their expertise in this area is great, to single out certain programs that, one, have outlived their usefulness; number two, are not meeting their objective; or number three, are duplicative, I think amendments are in order for the people's House to save the people money.

We have to quit engaging again in the fact of legislation by symbolism. It has a lofty name or it has a lofty pur-

pose, well, let's look at what's actually happening to the money.

So this is a modest amendment, and I admit it's modest. I've tried to save big chunks of money and haven't been terribly successful there, and so we're going to attempt to save little chunks of money and perhaps set a precedent here.

So this amendment is designed to save the American taxpayer \$5 million by hopefully zeroing out the account of a program which the Office of Management and Budget has said does not have performance standards. They do not have performance standards to assess their impact or are too narrowly focused to have a major benefit. They duplicate other Federal programs and award grants on a noncompetitive basis.

Now, ostensibly this program is a job opportunities program for low-income individuals, but I happen to know that practically every single one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted against the tax relief that has created 8 million new jobs in our economy, which is an undeniable fact. That's truly the best job opportunity program for low-income individuals.

And I know that this body recently voted against the maximum opportunity to create an artificial wage to deny some people their opportunity to get on the lowest rung of the economic ladder.

There's a lot of ways that we can help low-income people with job opportunities, but one more duplicative program that awards grants on a non-competitive basis is not it. Let's not raid the Social Security Trust Fund. Let's not be a part of the largest single tax increase in American history. Let's save the American people \$5 million.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROMOTING SAFE AND STABLE FAMILIES

For carrying out section 436 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629f), \$345,000,000 and for section 437 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 629g), \$89,100,000.

PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE

For making payments to States or other non-Federal entities under title IV-E of the Social Security Act, \$5,082,000,000.

For making payments to States or other non-Federal entities under title IV-E of the Social Security Act, for the first quarter of fiscal year 2009, \$1,776,000,000.

For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States or other non-Federal entities under section 474 of title IV-E of the Social Security Act, for the last three months of the current fiscal year for

unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

ADMINISTRATION ON AGING
AGING SERVICES PROGRAMS

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3011 et seq.) and section 398 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280c-3), \$1,417,189,000.

□ 1130

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR.
HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 44 offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

Page 62, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$21,400,000)".

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, again we have another modest amendment aiming at saving the American taxpayer, in this case \$21.4 million. Again, we have a program that has a very lofty name, Preventive Health under the Administration of Aging. But I think that, again, the program needs to be put in the larger context.

We are being asked now to provide in this particular appropriations bill \$152 billion in discretionary funding, one of the largest bills that will come to the people's House. It has, I believe, a 4.8 percent increase over last year, when I assure you, American families who are being asked to pay for this did not enjoy a 4.8 percent increase.

We, once again, have another portion of the Federal budget growing beyond the ability of the family budget to pay for this. So we all know that this is a part of a plan that will increase an additional \$26 billion for domestic programs under the budget resolution of the Democrat majority, on top of the \$6 billion that has been added to the current year omnibus, on top of the \$17 billion in nonwar emergency spending they have added to the Iraq war supplemental.

Again, I recall the words of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, referring to those of us who may drone on about attempting to save the Federal taxpayer money, but there are also those who seemingly use the same old argument that government knows how to spend money better than the American family.

Somehow, if we take money away from American families, that's an investment. But if they somehow keep it, well, that's waste, or somehow that's going to bring down the government to its knees. I just don't buy that argument. Somehow we are supposed to believe in the roughly 10,000 Federal programs spread across 600 different agencies, growing at roughly twice the rate of inflation, growing beyond the ability of the family budget to pay for it, that somehow, somehow, every single penny of Federal expenditures is sacrosanct.

Yet there is nothing sacrosanct about the money we take away from the American people to pay for that.

Now, the funds in this particular program are awarded to States and territories that supposedly educate older Americans about the importance of healthy lifestyles, a very noble purpose. But I would note with the exception of, I think, two, maybe three States, every single one of them is running a surplus.

We are granting money to 95, 98 percent of the States that are running the surplus, while the Federal Government continues to run a deficit. Although that deficit is coming down because we are awash in tax revenues, it certainly hasn't been from any spending disciplines. The bottom line is we are running a deficit, and we are handing out money to States that are running surpluses.

Again, this is a program that the Office of Management and Budget says should not be funded: "It is duplicative of services that States can provide to the Administration on Aging's community-based supportive services program."

I have heard nobody address or take the opposite viewpoint of OMB and say the program is duplicative. So maybe they approve of duplication. If they think that OMB has got it wrong, I would be interested in hearing that particular argument or that particular debate.

Furthermore, OMB says that AOA and visions integrating, prevention is an underlying principle in its core programs and that is better than the current mechanism of providing a small funding stream of unfocused seed money through the Preventive Health Services Program. Again, I feel we have too much legislation by symbolism.

We should never forget, when we are talking about the lofty purposes, that this will provide in vital investments and health care. Let's remember the vital investments in health care that the American people have. I mean, they are going to have to pay for this.

Again, I often hear from my constituents, like Joyce in Tennessee Colony, Texas, says, "Please do what you can to stop the wasteful spending. I am retired and disabled. I am raising my three grandchildren and now one great grandchild. I sometimes can't afford my own medicine."

So here we have a choice. We can take money away from Joyce in Tennessee Colony, take money away from her health care program, to engage in this particular program which OMB says is duplicative.

I have heard from David in the city of Garland.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Chairman, I think this is a perfect, perfect example of a gentleman offering an amendment where he knows the cost of something but the value of nothing.

If he were to visit any congregate meal site in his district or were to visit any of the Meals-on-Wheels programs in this country and was able to see what a difference those programs make in people's lives, he would understand that it was these kinds of programs that saved the taxpayer money.

I guess, by this amendment, he is saying what a waste it is for us to pay for someone's illness. Let's put off paying for their illness until they get really sick. Then they have got to get hospitalized. Then let's pay for it through Medicare.

Frankly, the former Speaker Newt Gingrich, every modern health care magazine, Republican Presidential contender Tommy Thompson, former HHS director, every leader and study in health care knows we ought to be going in the opposite direction. It's all about health. In case anybody has not been looking, our health care system is an acute care system. It's a sick care system. We need to be going preventive care. We need to be going health care. We need to be going chronic care management.

What in the world are we thinking by considering that we are going to actually go back to the dark days where we are going to actually spend more money on the back door to wait until people get sick as opposed to trying to prevent people from coming in and getting sick in the first place. I find this amendment absolutely mind boggling that it would even be offered as an excuse for saving money.

Quite frankly, it will end up costing the taxpayer money. Tragically, more than costing us money, it will cost us lives. It will cost us lives, and it will cost us misery amongst those senior citizens who are going to have to suffer the consequences of the cutbacks that this amendment will propose. I think that's a very unfortunate thing.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, as I understand Mr. HENSARLING's amendment, he goes at the heart of the Administration on Aging, section 204 of the report, and these programs, including supportive service centers, preventive health, are protection for vulnerable and older Americans that are at the heart of the bill. It's clear to me that according to the Health and Human Services budget in brief that consumer empowerment, healthy lifestyles, community living incentives, are a critical part of taking care of families and their caregivers. And I just don't know where the gentleman arrives at the numbers that he seeks to cut in the bill.

The committee learned through exhaustive testimony from the Office of the Secretary of Health and Human

Services the importance of funding this program. As the gentleman, Mr. HENSARLING knows, the President has sought to fund the program, and the committee has worked in a Republican and Democrat bipartisan way, sought to increase the program, and so we are going to stick with this number.

I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for yielding me the time. I am encouraging members of the committee to oppose the Hensarling amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time.

I am pleased that in other bills that we are going to be taking up this year, we are going to be offering, the Democrats, medical home legislation that will allow us to invest in preventive medicine. Because we, as Democrats, believe we need to not rearrange the deck chairs on this Titanic of our health care system.

We need to reinvent our health care system and invest in health care, which is broken in this country, and start investing in prevention and not go down this road that has gotten us in so much trouble to begin with, and that is try to take care of the problem after it's already broken. Let's take care of people first and keep them out of the hospital.

Unfortunately, this amendment goes a great deal of distance in the wrong direction, not the right direction.

Madam Chairman, I yield back my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided, for general departmental management, including hire of six sedans, and for carrying out titles III, XVII, XX, and XXI of the Public Health Service Act, the United States-Mexico Border Health Commission Act, and research studies under section 1110 of the Social Security Act, \$363,224,000, together with \$5,851,000 to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, and \$46,756,000 from the amounts available under section 241 of the Public Health Service Act to carry out national health or human services research and evaluation activities: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading for carrying out title XX of the Public Health Service Act, \$13,120,000 shall be for activities specified under section 2003(b)(2), all of which shall be for prevention service demonstration grants under section 510(b)(2) of title V of the Social Security Act without application of the limitation of section 2010(c) of such title XX: *Provided further*, That of this amount, \$51,891,000 shall be for minority AIDS prevention and treatment activities; and \$5,941,000 shall be to assist Afghanistan in the development of maternal and child health clinics, consistent with section 103(a)(4)(H) of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FERGUSON

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON:

Page 63, line 4, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)".

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Ferguson-Langevin amendment that will set aside \$10 million for implementation and to fund the Lifespan Respite Care Act.

I know the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. LANGEVIN, will be speaking on this amendment as well. I really want to praise him and thank him for his great leadership on this issue over the years. He and I have worked together as friends and partners on this issue in particular. I have great respect and admiration for the work that he has done on this issue.

Together, we have worked to pass the Lifespan Respite Care Act. It was unanimously approved by this Chamber and the Senate last Congress. It deserves the funding necessary to launch this critically important program. Funding the Lifespan Respite Care Act will, for the first time, establish a national policy to help our Nation's 50 million family caregivers who provide daily care for their loved ones with disabilities or chronic conditions or illnesses.

This program allows families to care in home for their loved ones instead of an institutionalized setting. In-home family caregivers provide minute-by-minute special assistance to their loved ones due to disability or critical illness or chronic condition.

Family caregivers are remarkable people. They make extraordinary sacrifices to help those who they love so dearly.

I saw an example of this firsthand in my own family. Ten years ago my mom was diagnosed with cancer. For 6 years I got to watch my dad as he cared for my mom through this very difficult struggle with cancer. Three years ago yesterday she lost that battle with cancer, but it was a great example to our family and so many others that we know of a great example of a family caregiver who made extraordinary sacrifices. There are some 50 million people just like my dad who provide care for a loved one in their own family.

These are folks who may not be blessed with a support structure that we had in our family. We had my siblings and me and others in our family who were able to give my dad a break when he needed a break from that family caregiving. There are many people in our country who are not fortunate enough to have that support structure around them. They are desperately in need of a break from time to time.

While the benefits that come from in-home care can be enormous, for caregivers and for that loved one who is ill, the cost for the family caregiver, from emotional to financial, can really be

overwhelming. Lifespan Respite Care will provide much-needed breaks for caregivers who are providing intense and exhaustive care 24 hours a day. An occasional break can literally be a lifesaver.

I had a conversation with a constituent from my district, Ms. Pinter, who told me that caring for her special-needs child can be a very joyful but also can be a very challenging experience. You know what? She is exactly right.

Two-thirds of caregivers report physical or mental health care problems linked to their own caregiving. Recent studies have found that family caregivers suffer poor health or even higher mortality rates than nonfamily caregivers. Currently our Nation lacks a coordinated approach between different levels of government or advocacy groups to aid those who are in need of respite care.

Respite care is in short supply or doesn't exist at all in some areas of our country. This legislation and these funds would change that.

Funding the Lifespan Respite Care Act would improve coordination and access for respite care to recruit and train respite care providers, would aid family caregivers regardless of age or disability or their family situation, help them to find and pay for respite services. Through competitive grants, States would get funding to make quality respite care available and accessible regardless of age or disability or family situation.

Respite care improves the health and the well-being of caregivers and reduces the risk of abuse or neglect. Importantly, it also delays or even avoids more costly hospitalizations or placements in nursing homes or in foster care.

I want to thank all of the family caregivers in our Nation who provide tireless care for their loved ones, and I also want to extend my thanks to the numerous groups and organizations around this country in their exhaustive effort to establish this Lifespan Respite Care program. Providing relief to our Nation's family caregivers is long overdue.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Once again, I am pleased and honored to have worked with the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) on this important legislation.

□ 1145

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the Ferguson-Langevin amendment. Last year, I was so pleased to work closely with Mr. FERGUSON to ensure the passage of the Lifespan Respite

Care Act, which will offer relief to so many family caregivers across the country.

I had the privilege of traveling with Mr. FERGUSON to Iraq going back a couple of years now, and I know his personal commitment to this issue. He shared the story with me about his mom, and so I know, as in my case as well as with Mr. FERGUSON, this is certainly a very personal issue that we have personal knowledge about and we care passionately about. So I am pleased to join him today and in the effort to direct funding now for this important program. As I mentioned, I know firsthand what a difference a dedicated caregiver can make in the life of a person with a disability or chronic condition.

Family caregiving is an essential yet often overlooked aspect of our Nation's health care system. The ability to live at home and remain a part of one's community can make a tremendous difference in a person achieving independence, recovery, or treatment. And whether they are caring for a child with a behavioral disorder or a parent with ALS or a spouse with multiple sclerosis, we all know someone who is a family caregiver. They live in all of our communities and they are often silent heroes, ensuring family stability and helping those who struggle with disease or disability to avoid more costly out-of-home placements.

We were so excited last year when this Congress really took a bold initiative in enacting the Lifespan Respite Care Act, and it gave hope to so many families across America. Today, this amendment that we are proposing directs \$10 million toward the Lifespan Respite Care Act, which would authorize grants to make quality respite care available and accessible to family caregivers regardless of age or disability. So it is exciting if we can actually put now the funding into the Lifespan Respite Care Act that we so desperately need to help America's families who are providing this type of care in the home.

I urge all of my colleagues who are so supportive of the passage of this bill to vote in favor of the Ferguson-Langevin amendment.

I also want to commend my colleague Mr. FERGUSON, the gentleman from New Jersey, for his passion and dedication on this issue. It has truly been a team effort. And, again, I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, again, I feel required to make the same comments that I made on a previous amendment that was offered about one-half hour ago.

This amendment seeks to do a very worthy thing: It seeks to increase support for respite care. God knows, having watched my mother-in-law for 7 years, having watched my father-in-law take care of her every day, God knows that anyone who has ever seen something like that understands that we need a lot more respite care.

But having said that, I want again to use this amendment to illustrate what is happening on this bill, because here is what the amendment says:

Page 63, line 4: After the first dollar amount insert, reduce by \$20 million, increase by \$20 million.

Now, what the amendment really does is simply to serve as a vehicle by which these two worthy Members can raise the issue that there is not enough money in this bill for respite care. And you know what? There isn't. And there isn't enough money in this bill for CDC; there isn't enough money in this bill for NIH; there isn't enough money in this bill for education; there isn't enough money in this bill for Pell Grants; there is not enough money in this bill to sufficiently reduce the Social Security backlog; there is not enough money in this bill to keep all the Social Security offices open that are closing around the country. And, yet, the administration is sending out a letter telling Members of Congress that they ought to vote against this bill because there is too much money.

Now, I don't fault the two gentlemen at all for using this device in order to raise their concerns; it is about the only thing they can do. But the fact is, as chairman of this committee, I have an obligation to point out to the House and to the occasional other person who might be listening that Members are being forced to go through these kinds of machinations because instead of meeting our obligations to the most needy people, the most vulnerable people in this society, we are instead squirting away billions of dollars on an Iraq war and billions more dollars in tax cuts for persons who make over \$1 million a year.

The day that we decide not to do that, the day that we decide that we are not going to spend \$150 billion more in Iraq this year, the day that we decide that we are not going to put tax cuts for millionaires ahead of the needs of our disabled and ahead of the needs of our isolated seniors, then that is the day when amendments like this will be real, because then there will be sufficient room in the budget to do what we ought to be doing on these programs.

Again, I will not stand in the way of this amendment because it is a worthy cause. But, understand, this is not a real offset; it doesn't add any new money to this account; and when we go to conference, we are going to have to jettison much of what is adopted on the floor because, like this amendment, in reality, because of budget constraints, it ain't real.

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

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF MEDICARE HEARINGS AND APPEALS

For expenses necessary for administrative law judges responsible for hearing cases under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (and related provisions of title XI of such Act), \$65,000,000, to be transferred in appropriate part from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds.

OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL COORDINATOR FOR HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

For expenses necessary for the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology, including grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements for the development and advancement of an interoperable national health information technology infrastructure, \$13,302,000: *Provided*, That in addition to amounts provided herein, \$48,000,000 shall be available from amounts available under section 241 of the Public Health Service Act to carry out health information technology network development.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Inspector General, including the hire of passenger motor vehicles for investigations, in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$44,687,000: *Provided*, That of such amount, necessary sums are available for providing protective services to the Secretary and investigating non-payment of child support cases for which non-payment is a Federal offense under section 228 of title 18, United States Code.

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For expenses necessary for the Office for Civil Rights, \$33,748,000, together with not to exceed \$3,314,000 to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

RETIREMENT PAY AND MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

For retirement pay and medical benefits of Public Health Service Commissioned Officers as authorized by law, for payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan and Survivor Benefit Plan, for medical care of dependents and retired personnel under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C. chapter 55), such amounts as may be required during the current fiscal year.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES EMERGENCY FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary to support activities related to countering potential biological, disease, nuclear, radiological and chemical threats to civilian populations, and for other public health emergencies, \$757,291,000, of which not to exceed \$22,363,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, is to pay the costs described in section 319F-2(c)(7)(B)

of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-6b(c)(7)(B)).

For expenses necessary to prepare for and respond to an influenza pandemic, \$948,091,000, of which \$870,000,000 shall be available until expended, for activities including the development and purchase of vaccine, antivirals, necessary medical supplies, diagnostics, and other surveillance tools: *Provided*, That products purchased with these funds may, at the discretion of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, be deposited in the Strategic National Stockpile: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 496(b) of the Public Health Service Act, funds may be used for the construction or renovation of privately owned facilities for the production of pandemic vaccine and other biologicals, where the Secretary finds such a contract necessary to secure sufficient supplies of such vaccines or biologicals: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein may be transferred to other appropriation accounts of the Department of Health and Human Services, as determined by the Secretary to be appropriate, to be used for the purposes specified in this sentence.

COVERED COUNTERMEASURE PROCESS FUND

For carrying out section 319F-4 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-6e) to compensate individuals for injuries caused by H5N1 vaccine, in accordance with the declaration regarding avian influenza viruses issued by the Secretary of Health and Human Services on January 26, 2007, pursuant to section 319F-3(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 247d-6d(b)), \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Funds appropriated in this title shall be available for not to exceed \$50,000 for official reception and representation expenses when specifically approved by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall make available through assignment not more than 60 employees of the Public Health Service to assist in child survival activities and to work in AIDS programs through and with funds provided by the United States Agency for International Development, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, or the World Health Organization.

SEC. 203. None of the funds appropriated in this Act for the National Institutes of Health, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration shall be used to pay the salary of an individual, through a grant or other extramural mechanism, at a rate in excess of Executive Level I.

SEC. 204. None of the funds appropriated in this title for Head Start shall be used to pay the compensation of an individual, either as direct costs or any proration as an indirect cost, at a rate in excess of Executive Level II.

SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended pursuant to section 241 of the Public Health Service Act, except for funds specifically provided for in this Act, or for other taps and assessments made by any office located in the Department of Health and Human Services, prior to the preparation and submission of a report by the Secretary of Health and Human Services to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the planned uses of such funds.

SEC. 206. Notwithstanding section 241(a) of the Public Health Service Act, such portion as the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall determine, but not more than 2.4 percent, of any amounts appropriated for

programs authorized under such Act shall be made available for the evaluation (directly, or by grants or contracts) of the implementation and effectiveness of such programs.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 207. Not to exceed 1 percent of any discretionary funds (pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.)) which are appropriated for the current fiscal year for the Department of Health and Human Services in this Act may be transferred between appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 3 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That an appropriation may be increased by up to an additional 2 percent subject to approval by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority granted by this section shall be available only to meet unanticipated needs and shall not be used to create any new program or to fund any project or activity for which no funds are provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate are notified at least 15 days in advance of any transfer.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 208. The Director of the National Institutes of Health, jointly with the Director of the Office of AIDS Research, may transfer up to 3 percent among institutes and centers from the total amounts identified by these two Directors as funding for research pertaining to the human immunodeficiency virus: *Provided*, That the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate are promptly notified of the transfer.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 209. Of the amounts made available in this Act for the National Institutes of Health, the amount for research related to the human immunodeficiency virus, as jointly determined by the Director of the National Institutes of Health and the Director of the Office of AIDS Research, shall be made available to the "Office of AIDS Research" account. The Director of the Office of AIDS Research shall transfer from such account amounts necessary to carry out section 2353(d)(3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300cc-40b(d)(3)).

SEC. 210. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be made available to any entity under title X of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) unless the applicant for the award certifies to the Secretary of Health and Human Services that it encourages family participation in the decision of minors to seek family planning services and that it provides counseling to minors on how to resist attempts to coerce minors into engaging in sexual activities.

SEC. 211. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no provider of services under title X of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) shall be exempt from any State law requiring notification or the reporting of child abuse, child molestation, sexual abuse, rape, or incest.

SEC. 212. None of the funds appropriated by this Act (including funds appropriated to any trust fund) may be used to carry out the Medicare Advantage program if the Secretary of Health and Human Services denies participation in such program to an otherwise eligible entity (including a Provider Sponsored Organization) because the entity informs the Secretary that it will not provide, pay for, provide coverage of, or provide referrals for abortions: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall make appropriate prospective adjustments to the capitation payment to such an entity (based on an actuarially

sound estimate of the expected costs of providing the service to such entity's enrollees): *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to change the Medicare program's coverage for such services and a Medicare Advantage organization described in this section shall be responsible for informing enrollees where to obtain information about all Medicare covered services.

SEC. 213. (a) Except as provided by subsection (e) none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to withhold substance abuse funding from a State pursuant to section 1926 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-26) if such State certifies to the Secretary of Health and Human Services by May 1, 2008, that the State will commit additional State funds, in accordance with subsection (b), to ensure compliance with State laws prohibiting the sale of tobacco products to individuals under 18 years of age.

(b) The amount of funds to be committed by a State under subsection (a) shall be equal to 1 percent of such State's substance abuse block grant allocation for each percentage point by which the State misses the retailer compliance rate goal established by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 1926 of such Act.

(c) The State is to maintain State expenditures in fiscal year 2008 for tobacco prevention programs and for compliance activities at a level that is not less than the level of such expenditures maintained by the State for fiscal year 2007, and adding to that level the additional funds for tobacco compliance activities required under subsection (a). The State is to submit a report to the Secretary on all fiscal year 2007 State expenditures and all fiscal year 2008 obligations for tobacco prevention and compliance activities by program activity by July 31, 2008.

(d) The Secretary shall exercise discretion in enforcing the timing of the State obligation of the additional funds required by the certification described in subsection (a) as late as July 31, 2008.

(e) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to withhold substance abuse funding pursuant to section 1926 of the Public Health Service Act from a territory that receives less than \$1,000,000.

SEC. 214. In order for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to carry out international health activities, including HIV/AIDS and other infectious disease, chronic and environmental disease, and other health activities abroad during fiscal year 2008:

(1) The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the "Secretary of HHS") may exercise authority equivalent to that available to the Secretary of State in section 2(c) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2669(c)). The Secretary of HHS shall consult with the Secretary of State and relevant Chief of Mission to ensure that the authority provided in this section is exercised in a manner consistent with section 207 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3927) and other applicable statutes administered by the Department of State.

(2) The Secretary of HHS is authorized to provide such funds by advance or reimbursement to the Secretary of State as may be necessary to pay the costs of acquisition, lease, alteration, renovation, and management of facilities outside of the United States for the use of the Department of Health and Human Services. The Department of State shall cooperate fully with the Secretary of HHS to ensure that the Department of Health and Human Services has secure, safe, functional facilities that comply with applicable regulation governing location, setback, and other facilities requirements and serve the purposes established by

this Act. The Secretary of HHS is authorized, in consultation with the Secretary of State, through grant or cooperative agreement, to make available to public or non-profit private institutions or agencies in participating foreign countries, funds to acquire, lease, alter, or renovate facilities in those countries as necessary to conduct programs of assistance for international health activities, including activities relating to HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases, chronic and environmental diseases, and other health activities abroad.

SEC. 215. (a) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of the National Institutes of Health (in this section referred to as the "Director of NIH") may use funds available under section 402(b)(7) or 402(b)(12) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 282(b)(7), 282(b)(12)) to enter into transactions (other than contracts, cooperative agreements, or grants) to carry out research identified pursuant to such section 402(b)(7) (pertaining to the Common Fund) or research and activities described in such section 402(b)(12).

(b) PEER REVIEW.—In entering into transactions under subsection (a), the Director of the NIH may utilize such peer review procedures (including consultation with appropriate scientific experts) as the Director determines to be appropriate to obtain assessments of scientific and technical merit. Such procedures shall apply to such transactions in lieu of the peer review and advisory council review procedures that would otherwise be required under sections 301(a)(3), 405(b)(1)(B), 405(b)(2), 406(a)(3)(A), 492, and 494 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241(a)(3), 284(b)(1)(B), 284(b)(2), 284a(a)(3)(A), 289a, and 289c).

SEC. 216. Funds which are available for Individual Learning Accounts for employees of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention ("CDC") and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry ("ATSDR") may be transferred to "Disease Control, Research, and Training", to be available only for Individual Learning Accounts: *Provided*, That such funds may be used for any individual full-time equivalent employee while such employee is employed either by CDC or ATSDR.

SEC. 217. The Director of the National Institutes of Health shall require that all investigators funded by the NIH submit or have submitted for them to the National Library of Medicine's PubMed Central an electronic version of their final, peer-reviewed manuscripts upon acceptance for publication, to be made publicly available no later than 12 months after the official date of publication: *Provided*, That the NIH shall implement the public access policy in a manner consistent with copyright law.

SEC. 218. Not to exceed \$35,000,000 of funds appropriated by this Act to the institutes and centers of the National Institutes of Health may be used for alteration, repair, or improvement of facilities, as necessary for the proper and efficient conduct of the activities authorized herein, at not to exceed \$2,500,000 per project.

SEC. 219. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to administer to any child under 3 years of age an influenza vaccine during the 2008-2009 influenza season for which thimerosal is listed on the labeling as an ingredient.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, 2008".

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For carrying out title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ("ESEA") (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) and section

418A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070d-2), \$16,016,318,000, of which \$7,698,807,000 shall become available on July 1, 2008, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009, and of which \$8,136,218,000 shall become available on October 1, 2008, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009 for academic year 2008-2009: *Provided*, That \$6,808,971,000 shall be for basic grants under section 1124 of ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6333): *Provided further*, That up to \$4,000,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary of Education on October 1, 2007, to obtain annually updated local educational-agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census: *Provided further*, That \$1,365,031,000 shall be for concentration grants under section 1124A of ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6334): *Provided further*, That \$3,094,562,000 shall be for targeted grants under section 1125 of ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6335): *Provided further*, That \$3,094,260,000 shall be for education finance incentive grants under section 1125A of ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6337): *Provided further*, That \$9,330,000 shall be to carry out sections 1501 and 1503 of ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6491, 6493): *Provided further*, That \$1,634,000 shall be available for a comprehensive school reform clearinghouse.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the request for a recorded vote on the Ferguson amendment be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is adopted.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 36 offered by Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

Page 77, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$46,500,000)".

Page 77, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$46,500,000)".

Page 83, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$46,500,000)".

Page 83, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$46,500,000)".

Page 83, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$46,500,000)".

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise today with an amendment to restore funding for the State grants portion of the Safe Drug and Preschool and Communities program to the fiscal year 2007 level.

These grants are an essential part of drug prevention and funds essential in effective services, including peer resistance and social skills training, parent education, student assistance, and education about emerging drug needs. This program serves 97 percent of our Nation's schools, and it is the only program that provides funding for universal prevention of all of our Nation's school-aged youth.

The success of this program has been documented by numerous States and local agencies. It is extremely effective and has contributed to a 23 percent decline in drug use among youth over the

past 5 years. It is important to keep drug prevention as a priority. Historically, when funding for drug prevention is cut, drug use amongst youth surges. This program also provides coordinated school and community-based efforts to target emerging drug trends among community members.

As a result, this program has made significant contributions to reducing methamphetamine and black tar heroin use among school-aged youth in many States throughout the country. Over the past 2 years, in Dallas, Texas, we have had 23 teens die from overdoses of a black tar heroin mixture that is called cheese with Tylenol PM, and we work with DEA and local merchants and all around trying to get some handle on it. But through the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program, local antidrug coalitions have partnered with schools throughout to hold prevention conferences in order to combat this growing epidemic.

□ 1200

They have targeted both students and parents to raise awareness surrounding this issue and have also held town hall meetings for teenagers. I have held one myself.

Without the infrastructure provided by this program, the antidrug coalitions would have little if any access to these students and parents, and the heroin problem would have undoubtedly increased.

This issue of emerging drug trends is not isolated. And while drug use among school-age children has declined, emerging drug trends continue to rise. We've recently seen new drugs aimed at our children, such as the candy-flavored meth and cocaine in many States, including Texas, California, Arkansas, Nevada, and Alabama. Without strong and effective prevention programs, these growing epidemics will have a devastating impact on the educational performance of students nationwide.

As you're aware, drug prevention is critical to ensuring the overall academic success of our youth. Studies have found that lower reading and math scores are linked to peer substance abuse. Our Nation cannot afford to see alcohol and drug use or violence rise above their current levels.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment to restore the funding for the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Program to the 2007 level. \$46.5 million was reduced, and, Madam Chairman, I do have an offset. The offset for the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Program will come from the Reading First program.

The Reading First program has been mired by allegations of financial conflicts of interest and cronyism and is currently under investigation by the Department of Justice. The Office of Inspector General and the U.S. Department of Education have found numer-

ous legal and ethical violations in how Reading First has steered funds toward favored programs. There has been also conflicts of interest in hiring and the promotion of commercial reading materials. This mismanagement has already resulted in the program being cut by more than 60 percent of fiscal year 2008.

Just a few examples of this mismanagement include the Office of Inspector General found that the program administrator had improperly promoted commercial reading programs potentially in violation of Federal law. The Office of Inspector General analyzed hundreds of e-mails and concluded that the Department's program officials failed to maintain a controlled environment that exemplified management integrity and accountability.

They found that the Madison School District in Wisconsin had substantial data.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I move the adoption of this amendment, Madam Chairman.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I certainly can't support further cuts to the Reading First program. It's been cut by \$629 million. Further cutting this bill adds insult to injury.

There have been problems with the program. There have been abuses. And if laws have been broken, the Inspector General will bring charges against those violators. But we shouldn't punish small children and their teachers for those abuses.

We have a need in this country to teach children how to read. I don't think anyone could deny that.

So Madam Chairman, for that reason, I will not support any further cuts to a program that teaches those kids to read. And, in fact, I suspect by the time we get to conference, when some of these issues are clarified, we'll be adding money back to this program.

For that reason, I oppose the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, let me simply say again, as I have several times today, I am sympathetic to the goal of the gentlewoman's amendment, and I appreciate the fact that she did not craft her amendment in a way which would go after general departmental administrative costs. I appreciate that concession on the part of the gentlewoman.

Having said that, again, I will not personally object to the amendment because I understand what she is trying to do. But I definitely want to make clear what the gentleman from New York said, that there's only so far that you can cut any of these programs.

I happen to have insisted on a very deep cut in Reading First because of the abuse that occurred of the taxpayer funds in that account. But having said that, it's our hope that, frankly, and the House needs to know this, it's our hope that by the time we get to conference, we will have worked out enough of an understanding with the administration about the corrections that are needed so that we don't have to take the deep cuts that are in the bill now. But we are not yet at that point, so I think people who are bringing these amendments to the floor need to understand that many of them will not survive, simply for the same reason that I said earlier, that this bill is still short of the funds necessary to fund deserv-ing programs such as that pointed out by the gentlewoman from Texas.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me say to the gentleman who objected, I truly understand his objection on the reading program. However, statistics have shown that if these young people are under the influence of drugs, that's where they fall. And if we could prevent this drug usage, it probably will let some of the ability come through.

I know that it's difficult, but this is a very serious problem, and these cuts will hurt very severely in areas, primarily in school districts where we've had even young people having the ability to sell drugs to another young person. Obviously, it's coming from somewhere else.

But in Dallas, we have not found a single child that has experimented with this "cheese" that has survived. And we do have parents involved. We'll have to discontinue this program if we don't have these funds. And I would just plead with you to help find these funds somewhere, if you have a severe objection to it coming from this area.

But I felt that if the area's funding was not being handled correctly, it could be placed in a program that's going very well, that has influenced the decrease of 23 percent drug usage among our youth in the last 5 years. And I have grave concern about allowing this to go on without the assistance that's needed.

As I said earlier, I have worked with the FBI. They're working with merchants to try to get some of the Ty-

lenol PM and the other off the market in these areas. It is a serious undertaking in the area. And all of our law enforcement people are involved.

But our schools cannot continue this without the funding. And that's the reason why I plead for understanding for this funding.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Chairman, I just want to commend the lady from Texas for her amendment, and say that I know how many years she spent before coming to Congress dedicated to this issue.

We had a hearing in her district around this issue of mental health and addiction and alcoholism, and we heard from the law enforcement community themselves in her district testify to the fact that over 70 percent of the children in the juvenile justice system were there because of drugs and alcohol. And, frankly, this is a scourge on our schools, and we can't just wish it away by saying, just say no. Just say no won't work. We need to employ resources, and that's what this bill, this amendment, seeks to do.

And, frankly, when you have 20 million people in this country addicted, and you have nearly 10 percent of those people, children, you have a serious problem in this country. We better get about trying to address it, and this amendment seeks to try to do that. And I commend the gentlelady for her amendment and support it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALSH OF NEW YORK

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH of New York:

On page 78, line 3, before the period insert the following:

"Provided further, That for the purpose of determining adequate yearly progress for a specific school or school district, the Secretary shall include English language proficiency scores for students deemed to be English language learners only after such students complete their third year of instruction in English as a second language"

Mr. WALSH of New York (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Madam Chairman, my amendment, which I intend to withdraw, is very simple. It would prohibit the Department of Education from counting test scores for English language learners against school districts until after the student completes 3 years of English language instruction.

In our subcommittee's hearing, with Secretary Spellings, I raised some concerns regarding English Language Arts Test that student learning to speak English as a second language were given this year.

In my home State, there are over 192,000 immigrant students learning English, the majority of whom are in kindergarten through third grade. In the city of Syracuse, my hometown, we have an elementary school in which 43 percent of the kids are English language learners learning English as a second language.

I recognize that there are benefits to monitoring ELL student achievement on an annual basis. But school systems should not be penalized for student scores after only 1 year of instruction.

I'd like to state emphatically that we need to make sure that all of our kids speak and read English proficiently. It is essential to their ability to compete in a very competitive society and a very competitive world. And it is essential to the long-term viability of the American culture that we can all speak to each other in the same tongue.

But I've learned other languages myself, some better than others, and it took me more than 1 year to be considered proficient.

Let's not punish our schools, declaring them failing, before they've spent enough time to teach English thoroughly to our kids. So although I intend to withdraw this amendment, it would be my hope that Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MCKEON are aware of this problem and will take steps to address it when we reauthorize No Child Left Behind.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH of New York. I would be happy to yield to the chairman.

Mr. OBEY. I want to underscore that I agree with my friend from New York and to emphasize that in parts of my own State, school districts face similar problems. In fact, I would bet this problem exists all over the country.

Furthermore, I understand that school districts face a similar issue with respect to the test scores of students receiving special education services. So I'd like to suggest to the gentleman from New York that we sign a joint letter to the authorizing committee requesting that they address this serious issue in the No Child Left Behind reauthorization that they're expected to soon consider.

Mr. WALSH of New York. Reclaiming my time, I would be pleased to join with my chairman in signing that letter, and thank him for his support, knowing that as chairman of the full committee and of the subcommittee, his voice will be heard on the authorization committee.

Mr. SHADEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH of New York. I'd be happy to yield.

Mr. SHADEGG. I understand the gentleman intends to withdraw the amendment. However, I want to rise in strong support of the amendment. As the gentleman knows, we live on opposite sides of the country, you in New York and I in Arizona. But the essence of your amendment says we should not be judging these schools until they've had a chance to, in fact, educate these children in a second language. And judging them after only 12 months, as the gentleman clearly pointed out, is unrealistic and punishing the school, which means to punish all the students at that school and all the parents of those students and all of the teachers and administration officials at that school by evaluating those children and holding them accountable after only 12 months is unrealistic.

I would be happy to join in your letter, and I commend the gentleman for offering the amendment.

Mr. WALSH of New York. I thank the gentleman very much for his vote of confidence in the amendment. I would be happy to work with him on that communication with the authorization committee.

Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

IMPACT AID

For carrying out programs of financial assistance to federally affected schools authorized by title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), \$1,278,453,000, of which \$1,140,517,000 shall be for basic support payments under section 8003(b) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7703(b)), \$49,466,000 shall be for payments for children with disabilities under section 8003(d) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7703(d)), \$17,820,000 shall be for construction under section 8007(a) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7707(a)), \$65,700,000 shall be for Federal property payments under section 8002 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7702), and \$4,950,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for facilities maintenance under section 8008 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7708); *Provided*, That for purposes of computing the amount of a payment for an eligible local educational agency under section 8003(a) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7703(a)) for school year 2007–2008, children enrolled in a school of such agency that would otherwise be eligible for payment under section 8003(a)(1)(B) of such Act, but due to the deployment of both parents or legal guardians, or a parent or legal guardian having sole custody of such children, or due to the death of a military parent or legal guardian while on active duty (so long as such children reside on Federal property as described in section

8003(a)(1)(B) of such Act), are no longer eligible under such section, shall be considered as eligible students under such section, provided such students remain in average daily attendance at a school in the same local educational agency they attended prior to their change in eligibility status.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

For carrying out school improvement activities authorized by title II (20 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.), part B of title IV (20 U.S.C. 7171 et seq.), part A of title V (20 U.S.C. 7201 et seq.) and parts 6 and 9 of part D of title V (20 U.S.C. 7253 et seq., 20 U.S.C. 7259 et seq.), part A of title VI (20 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.) and part B of title VI (20 U.S.C. 7341 et seq.), and part C of title VII (20 U.S.C. 7511 et seq.) and part C of title VII (20 U.S.C. 7541 et seq.) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ("ESEA"); the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.); section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 (20 U.S.C. 9602); the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (48 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.); and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a et seq.), \$5,678,002,000, of which \$4,059,441,000 shall become available on July 1, 2008, and remain available through September 30, 2009, and of which \$1,435,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2008, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009, for academic year 2008–2009: *Provided*, That \$411,630,000 shall be for State assessments and related activities authorized under sections 6111 and 6112 of ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7301, 7301a): *Provided further*, That up to 100 percent of the funds available to a State educational agency under part D of title II of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6751 et seq.) may be used for subgrants described in section 2412(a)(2)(B) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 6762(a)(2)(B)): *Provided further*, That \$56,257,000 shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002: *Provided further*, That \$34,376,000 shall be available to carry out part D of title V of ESEA: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated under this heading may be used to carry out section 5494 under ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7259c): *Provided further*, That \$18,001,000 shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and for the Republic of the Marshall Islands: *Provided further*, That up to 5 percent of these amounts may be reserved by the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to administer the Supplemental Education Grants programs and to obtain technical assistance, oversight, and consultancy services in the administration of these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for such services: *Provided further*, That \$3,000,000 of the funds available for the Foreign Language Assistance Program shall be available for 5-year grants to local educational agencies that would work in partnership with one or more institutions of higher education to establish or expand articulated programs of study in languages critical to United States national security that will enable successful students to advance from elementary school through college to achieve a superior level of proficiency in those languages.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

Page 80, line 2, after the first dollar amount and after the second dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$21,000,000)".

Page 82, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$21,000,000)".

Page 82, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$21,000,000)".

Page 82, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$21,000,000)".

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, this amendment is offered in an effort to try to reprioritize monies between two separate funds related to gaining high-quality teachers in our Nation, the Teacher Incentive Fund and the Teacher Quality State Grants.

□ 1215

The Teacher Incentive Fund, my amendment would increase the funding for that by \$21 million. When the 2007 fiscal year budget was adopted or the appropriations bill adopted, receipt was \$2 million. The request from the President for this year was \$199 million, and the bill before us includes a provision for \$99 million, \$100 million less than the President's request.

As opposed to the Teacher Quality State Grants, which received last year \$2.8 billion, the President's request was for \$2.7 billion and the bill before us includes a provision for \$3.1 billion, \$400 million more than the request by the Department.

Teacher quality, Madam Chairman, is certainly the most important school-related factor influencing student achievement. The No Child Left Behind Act reflects this and one of the central tenets is putting a highly qualified teacher in every classroom. Congress now has a greater opportunity to take teacher quality initiatives a step further by increasing funding for the Teacher Incentive Fund, a program that rewards highly effective teachers and rewards results.

The Teacher Incentive Fund allows States and school districts to apply for Federal grants in order to develop and implement performance-based compensation systems for both teachers and principals. With the Teacher Incentive Fund, educators who improve student achievement in the classroom are provided with financial rewards such as bonuses and increasing salaries. In 2006, the Teacher Incentive Fund and Congress provided \$100 million for the new program; however, in 2007 it received only \$2 million, and this is for a program that has shown very successful and rewarding results.

There is certainly a need for the fund and to date 34 grantees have received money. But the Department of Education has received nearly 150 applications. More resources would mean more districts would be able to establish performance-based compensation systems.

Looking at the workforce, it is estimated that more than 2 million teachers will need to be hired over the next decade. Research has shown that performance pay can be effective at recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers. So the Teacher Incentive Fund will encourage a talented pool of individuals to go into the field of teaching.

Again, this is a reprioritization, a movement of \$21 million from the

Teacher Quality State Grants, which is slated to receive \$3.1 billion to the Teacher Incentive Fund, which would then receive \$120 million. By doing so, this money can be directly given to local districts to create compensation systems and therefore recruit and reward outstanding teachers. Nothing wrong with rewarding the best and brightest when it comes to educating our children.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I rise to support the gentleman from Georgia in his amendment. And the overall focus of his amendment is to do two things, first of which is what Congress should be asked to do by all of our constituents in all our districts from all across this country, and that is to take their hard-earned dollars that they send to us in the form of tax revenue and to prioritize them into the most efficient manner and into the most efficient programs and into the most efficient methodologies in order to get those programs effectuated for the good of the citizens. And that is what this amendment does.

In accord with the opinion of the administration, there are a number of programs now in existence essentially attempting to do the same thing. Here with regard to education, essentially trying to lift up the quality of education in this country, a laudable goal obviously; secondly, to lift up the quality of teachers in the classroom, again a laudable goal obviously. But we are asked to prioritize this to make sure that those dollars actually get to those teachers, where it can do the most good. The gentleman from Georgia's amendment would do just that.

One of the fundamental flaws in the No Child Left Behind program is to take away the issue of authority and local control from the frontlines, and that is the classroom and that is the teacher, and shift it someplace else. The fundamental flaw with No Child Left Behind is to say that the parents should not be involved in making the decisions or the teachers should not be the ones making the ultimate decisions on how we educate our children, but it should be the bureaucrats down in Washington and unelected at that.

We need believe that the focus should be shifted back to the parents, back to the teachers, for those who are the people on the frontlines, those are the people who are having the day-to-day interaction with our children.

When you think about it, if you have kids in school or if you have neighbors with kids in school and they have a problem in the classroom, where is the first place that they go to to try to re-

solve that problem? They go into the schoolhouse and into the classroom and talk to the teacher. They want to get to the bottom of it right then and there. And ultimately it is a matter of making sure that that teacher is the best qualified teacher that you can actually have in that classroom.

Parents do not go to Washington, DC, and speak with the U.S. Department of Education to try to resolve some difficulty they have in their classroom. Parents do not come down here to speak with the Secretary of Education to deal with difficulties they have in their classroom. They go to the teacher. And they sit down and work things out to try to get to the heart of it and the root of the cause of the problem.

And the gentleman from Georgia realizes this. And he realizes that in order to make a better classroom where more learning can occur, where we can have better schoolhouses and classrooms, where we can raise up the quality of education, it is to raise up the quality of our teachers. The gentleman from Georgia's amendment does just that by ending programs that are ineffective, ineffectual, and don't get the job done, and transfers them over to those programs that do get the job done. In this matter we should all be commending the gentleman and support his amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, I must confess a certain degree of confusion about this amendment. I always had the impression that good Republicans like block grants, and I also had the impression that thoughtful Republicans favor as much local control as possible. And yet this amendment would have us running in the opposite direction.

What this amendment would do is it would take the dollars in question out of a program which provides aid to all States in the Union and instead reserve that money for use in just the few States who have bought into the approach that is supported by these two gentlemen.

One of my favorite quotations is from Eric Sevareid, who used to be on CBS News a few years ago, and he said, "It is important to maintain the courage of one's doubts in an age of dangerous certainties."

And I have to say that I have a lot of doubts about what is the most effective way to teach children. I don't think I have all the answers. I don't think this House has all the answers. So I don't think we ought to be dictating to States what answers they seek in their teacher quality programs.

The virtue of the committee approach, as opposed to the approach suggested by the amendment, is that States can use the money in the block

grant as it is provided in the committee bill and they can use it for any variety of techniques, including the one that is being promoted by the two gentlemen pushing this amendment. It seems to me that at a time when we are already questioning the rigidity of No Child Left Behind, and I must confess I voted for No Child Left Behind but with serious reservations and I will not vote to renew it unless those reservations are corrected, but it just seems to me that at a time when we are recognizing that No Child Left Behind is needlessly rigid, we should not be piling on to that rigidity with additional pieces of our own.

So with that I would simply urge Members to allow States to continue to have the flexibility that they have under the committee approach, and I would urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, the sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate the Chair's comments and I agree with him that we don't have all the answers. I would suggest, however, that what this amendment does is more appropriately prioritize moneys based upon the concerns and recommendation of the Department of Education. The fundamental difference between the two programs, the Teacher Quality State Grants, which is a program that in many areas gets excellent results, the differences are two that this amendment addresses:

One is that the overwhelming portion of the money that is available has been put into the Teacher Quality State Grants, moving from \$2.8 billion last year to \$3.1 billion this year, as opposed to the Teacher Incentive Fund, which would move from a high of \$100 million in the last 2 years to \$99 million this year, in essence a flat appropriations.

The other main difference is that the Teacher Incentive Fund rewards results. It rewards performance. It rewards teachers and schools who are actually gaining those high quality results that we desire for all students across our Nation.

So I would respectfully disagree with the Chair, that this is not prescriptive in its formula and the only rigidity that it has in it is that it requires results. So, hopefully, the House will see that the sense in looking at performance, looking at quality teachers, looking at what they are doing in the classroom and the results that they are getting, and rewarding that kind of performance makes sense. I would suggest that that is what most of us have said at home when we talk to our constituents and that this amendment aligns

the actions of this House with what we have told our constituents we would be supporting here in the House of Representatives.

So I appreciate the time, and I encourage, again, my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his leadership. I compliment him on the amendment. I urge its adoption.

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

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

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

Mr. REGULA. First of all, Madam Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee for including funding for the teacher incentive fund. It is so vitally important to the inner cities to be able to attract the best teachers and this fund can be used by school districts to do just that.

Too often in the school systems, the best teachers tend to flee to the suburbs and they also flee to the good schools. Where we really need the top notch teachers are in the inner cities because our cities are really facing a crisis in the sense that their percentage of those who do not finish high school is growing and is a terrible waste of human capital. We can't afford that.

And one of the important things is to get these students in the early years, first grade, kindergarten, second grade, third grade, to like school and to like to learn, and that takes a quality teacher. And this program, and thanks to the chairman we have the 99 million dollars and this proposal for some additional, allows schools to give some financial incentives to the really top notch teachers to take on that responsibility.

I have an instance in my district where a handicapped teacher has inspired a class in a low-income neighborhood and it has made a world of difference in the lives of these young people.

So I just want to express, again, my appreciation to the chairman and for the interest of the gentleman from Georgia in the Teacher Incentive program because I think it is one of the vital challenges in addressing the drop-out rate in the big cities to ensure that these students get a taste for education and they enjoy the experience and they stay with it. I am hopeful that the States will use these funds in that way, to give incentives to the very best teachers to go into the toughest areas and inspire young people.

I will add that the Teach for America program does a great job in that respect because they send their Teach for America candidates into very difficult situations.

I hope that we can address the drop-out rate prospectively when we have a nation where 31 percent statistically do

not finish high school and we know it is much larger in the cities. So there is the challenge, and this program, which the chairman was gracious enough to include in the original bill, is one of the keys to addressing that problem. So I, again, commend the chairman and also the gentleman from Georgia for their concern to inspire and make it attractive for the quality teachers to teach in difficult situations.

The teacher is where it is. If you ask any group, as I do when I give a speech, how many of you had a teacher, maybe two that made a difference in your life? And every hand will go up, and that says so eloquently that we want to have teachers in the toughest situations where their students will at some time in the future say, yes, I had a teacher that made a difference in my life.

□ 1230

That's why I'm here. That's why I finished high school. That's why I press on.

I went into a charter school where there was a Teach for America Teachers and it was in one of the toughest parts of the city. And the teacher there said, as we walked through the door, these were fifth graders, "What do we do in 2010 or 2011?" Without missing a beat, every student said, "We go to college." Now, if I had done that 5 years ago or 3, they would have said, "What? What do we do? I don't know. Drop out, probably."

So I want to again commend the chairman for many parts of this bill that are important to giving teachers inspiration and making schools better so that whomever is here 25 years from now will not be saying that 31 percent of the students in the United States drop out. We can ill afford that in the competitive world in which we live.

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

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

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

Page 80, line 2, after each dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$33,907,000)".

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that mirrors the President's budget request to eliminate funding in the bill for the Alaskan Native Education Equity Program. By so

doing this, it will save our Nation's taxpayers \$33.9 million.

Now, as with many of the programs that you will be hearing us discussing both yesterday and today and in the future, this program does, in fact, support a worthwhile goal, and that is providing additional educational services to Alaskan Natives. The services provided to Alaskan Natives that are students through this program, however, are redundant of many of the other types of programs that are provided through various other agencies, most notably through the Department's other education programs.

See, our funding priorities must be exactly that. When we come together as a conference and then as a body to support appropriation bills, we are called upon by the American taxpayers to set those things, priorities, just as the American family budget is created each day, each week, each month in American families across their country and they sit down at their kitchen table to decide what are their priorities when it comes to spending their hard-earned dollars.

They have educational interests in mind as well. They may have children that they have to decide whether they're going to be sending them to college this year or next, to a high-priced college or a moderate-priced college, et cetera. They have to set priorities when it comes to how much money will they be able to set aside in their savings account for educational purposes. Or if their kids are in a K-12 system, whether it's public school or private school, likewise, the American public has to set their own priorities, decide how much money they can set aside if they choose to send their kids to a private school. Or if their kids are going to a public school, how much money will they set aside so that they can spend on their children when it comes to educational purposes for extracurricular activities or supplements to the school program.

American families are called upon to do this every single day, every single week of the year with their budget. And all we are asking right now is that the U.S. Congress and the Senate do the exact same thing with their hard-earned tax dollars that they've entrusted to us. In this matter, what we are doing is saying we have several programs, the same laudable goals. We are eliminating one and shifting the dollars to the another so that the program gets done.

I would now like to bring my colleagues' attention to a recent report by the Nonpartisan Tax Foundation. This report details how much money each State taxpayer contributes in Federal dollars and how much money each State taxpayer receives back. This is very interesting, especially if you come from the State of New Jersey, as I do.

According to this report, Alaska, which is the subject of this amendment, ranks second in the Nation, getting \$1.80 back for every \$1 that the

taxpayers up there pay in Federal taxes. In contrast, my good State of New Jersey ranks dead last. We receive back a paltry 63 cents back for every dollar that a New Jersey taxpayer sends to Washington. What does that mean? That means that New Jersey taxpayers, working just as hard as the taxpayers up in the great State of Alaska are, are sending one dollar in with their paycheck each week, or multiple dollars as it is. But at the end of the day, when they see how Congress appropriates those dollars, New Jerseyans find out that they're only getting back 63 cents on the dollar.

Conversely, we look up to Alaska, the subject of this amendment. How much does every taxpayer get back from the dollar that they contribute to the good of the country and the State? They get back \$1.80. It's a fairness issue, quite honestly, Madam Chairman. Where are our dollars going?

And with the new Democratic majority passing the largest tax increase in American history recently in its budget, the burden on New Jersey taxpayers will only continue to rise. Yet at the same time, we are providing nearly \$40 million for redundant services in a State that is already nearly on a 2-1 ratio on every dollar that it sends to Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Let me just finish this thought.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Madam Chairman. There is a problem with the amendment that is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New Jersey yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I am not yielding. I am finishing my thought.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, and I will be brief, we must remember that every dollar that we send to Washington comes out of that proverbial "family budget" that I referenced before. So when duplicate programs like this come before us, we should put ourselves in the shoes of the family in the same situation.

So, do you think that families would go out, families from the other side of the aisle would go out and spend their hard-earned tax dollars on a month's worth of groceries and then go out and eat every single night of the week? I don't think so. That would be duplicative. They would be spending money on the exact same thing. American families don't do that; neither should Congress. That doesn't make much sense to me, Madam Chairman, and quite frankly, neither does the funding of multiple Federal programs do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry before the gentleman begins.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, at the desk, the amendment that the gentleman was speaking to concerned Native Hawaiians, but the gentleman spoke about Alaskans. And I asked the Clerk if he had the amendment that the gentleman was speaking about on Native Alaskans and he said he did not have that amendment. So I'm trying to figure out, are we responding to the Native Hawaiian language for \$33,907,000, which is what is at the desk, or the gentleman's argument about Alaskans, which is not at the desk? And that is my inquiry.

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

The Clerk read the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Chairman, that's about Hawaiians.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the Clerk report the intended amendment?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, there are two amendments at the desk. The amendment that I was speaking on is my amendment, which goes to the issue of Native Alaskans. The gentleman may be referring to another subsequent amendment that will later on refer to Native Hawaiians. It's the same page, same line, same dollar amount, so I can understand the confusion.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the Chair.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Chairman, let me simply say that I have only been to Alaska once in my life. I have certainly never been in an Alaskan school. But my grandfather taught me a long time ago, and I'm sure you have heard this many times in your own lives, but he used to say that nothing is more expensive in the long run than a badly educated child. And I don't care if that child comes from New Jersey or Wisconsin or Hawaii or Alaska, a badly educated child is a menace to society. Why, just imagine a badly educated child could grow up to be elected as a Member of Congress from New Jersey or Wisconsin. They could come into this Chamber filled full of all sorts of half-baked ideas, and the Congress would be plagued with having to spend hours and hours dealing with those ideas. I'm sure I've presented a few of the bad ideas myself to this House in that time.

The point is that Alaska may seem remote and far away, but the fact is that there are special children who do

have special needs. Does anyone really believe that we are spending enough on Indian education programs around the whole country, for instance? And yet, we're told by the administration that we ought to eliminate the program for Alaska Native students because they benefit from the Indian education programs. Well, I've got tribes in my own State, and I know how inadequate some of those schools are, though they're trying the best they can.

I would simply say that if the authorizing committee wants to deauthorize this program, then fine, but I see no purpose right now in singling out one special group of children for exclusion from this bill and this account. I can think of a lot of things that go on in Alaska that I would just assume see stopped before I would see them stop educating children with special needs. I wish that they would take a different approach, for instance, on their highway aids. I think that their lack of judgment on that score has embarrassed the entire Congress. But I don't think that the Indian children or the Native Alaskan children who are educated under this should wind up being the principal victims of that action by the State of Alaska.

I sense in this House that people are touchy about voting for anything for Alaska since that happened. Well, I don't want these kids to be unlucky enough to run into accidents that started out to happen to somebody else. So it seems to me that the wise course is to reject the gentleman's amendment and allow the authorizing committee to determine whether or not this program ought to continue or not.

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

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

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I would like to recognize my good friend from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

And let me just begin to reference the chairman's comment as far as whether we should be excluding one set of children from this. Well, that's exactly the point; I believe that we should not be excluding any children. And the language in the bill that is before us right now excludes the children of 49 other States.

□ 1245

As the Representative of the Fifth District of New Jersey, I am concerned. I come to the floor because this underlying bill excludes the children from the State of New Jersey with this special extra funding. Let me assure the gentleman there are children with special needs in the State of New Jersey, and there are children with special needs in the State of Wisconsin as well.

They are excluded from the Alaska Native Education Program. I am trying to bring fairness to the overall program, which is also what the administration is trying to do.

Let me make that point by sharing with you this comment. The Alaska Native Education Program is authorized by the ESEA of 1965 and they are subject to the reauthorization. But the administration was not recommending reauthorization and, accordingly, funded it at zero. The administration, as do I, recognizes the importance of ensuring that the Alaska Native students receive appropriate educational services. This request is consistent with the administration policy of increasing resources for high-priority programs by eliminating small categorical programs that have a limited effect, such as this.

In addition, the services provided to Alaska Native students through this program are redundant with many of the programs through the Department's Indian Education Program already being funded.

School districts that wish to implement programs and services tailored to the educational and cultural needs of the Alaska Native students are able to use funds already provided under other Federal programs in the 2008 budget. That includes \$1 billion in direct support for the education of Indians and Alaska Natives in addition to the significant funds that are provided to those students who receive services through broader Federal programs; grant programs such as title I grants to local educational agencies and special grants.

Further, let me point this out as well: Alaska Native students will also benefit in addition to \$1 billion that I also already referenced. They will also benefit from the Department of Indian Education Programs, which provide more than \$118 million, \$118 million, in formula grants to school districts and competitive grants for demonstration and professional development programs as well.

You see, these programs already serve as the Department's principal vehicle for addressing those unique educational and culture-related needs which the gentleman from Wisconsin is referring to.

The bottom line is there are already programs established that address those concerns that the gentleman from Wisconsin raises. The administration recognized this and already requested appropriations of \$1 billion overall, plus the \$118 million in special formula grants.

So it is our position, in line with the administration, that we do need to address those specific needs of those children who are in unique circumstances such as we find with Native American Indians in Alaska. But we do not need to do it in a redundant manner.

Finally, I would just conclude by saying the gentleman from Wisconsin is correct. We do not want to have chil-

dren not being educated, regardless of what State they come from, whether it is from New Jersey, the good State of Georgia, the good State of Wisconsin or Alaska. But we are not doing the children any favor whatsoever if we do not appropriate the dollars in a manner that effectively gets that job done. This amendment works to effectuate and ensure those kids get properly educated.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank my friend from New Jersey for offering this amendment. I hope this House will see fit to pass it.

But let me say this: I think as we talk about children and education, that from my background, and I have a high school education, I attended college for a short period of time prior to being married, but let me say this: What I have found is that education is best from the local level, and I don't know that the Federal Government can really take some of these programs and put them down into a local school district and say here is this money, use it for this purpose or you don't get the money.

To me, it would be much better if some of this money were set down in a block grant to the State and let the State identify the problems and especially the funding problems that they have and be able to administer the money.

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

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

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Chairman, I am standing here today speaking for young people in Alaska. I am sure that when Mr. YOUNG gets the opportunity, he will be down here to speak for them, too.

I wasn't aware of the fact that the young children in Alaska needed the tender mercies of the gentleman from New Jersey to speak for them. I would think that the children in New Jersey have all they can do, considering the level of the rhetoric I have heard for the last few minutes, to get the best education possible there. The Congress is certainly not being well informed about it today.

I most certainly agree with the other gentleman who said that education is best left to the local level. How about letting the gentleman from Alaska, or any other place where they understand what the educational needs of their children are, handle it at their level? That would be the way to take care of it.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. No, I will not yield. You had more than enough time to make your case.

Madam Chairman, I am going to make a case for those children and the children in Hawaii and the children in every other State and area in this

country who deserve the support of this Congress. I have heard talk already down here today about taxes being paid. You don't think taxes are being paid in Alaska or in Hawaii or elsewhere?

When you talk about local programs, I have the local programs that we have in Hawaii. I am sure Mr. YOUNG has the local programs that we have in Alaska. I haven't examined them in New Jersey, but, as I say, I have heard the rhetoric for the last few minutes. Maybe I had better go up there and give them a hand.

Now, I respect every Member of this floor, and I expect to receive the same in return. When the State of Hawaii came into the Union, one of the protocols of the Admissions Act is the requirement that we recognize and take care of our Hawaiian children. We have programs that are geared towards that. We have Historically Black Colleges in this country. We have established over the past few decades studies in various backgrounds, ethnically, culturally, racially. We have caucuses in this Congress that recognize the various backgrounds from which our people come.

Hawaii, I can tell you, just as Alaska is, because I have visited Alaska and have had an opportunity to speak with the teachers and schoolchildren in Alaska, we are a multi-cultural, multi-racial, multi-ethnic country. We are a multi-racial, multi-ethnic, multi-background, rainbow state in Hawaii, and we recognize those backgrounds and we try to take care of it in our educational processes.

All we are asking for is the opportunity here to help fund local programs that have local assistance as well. That is done in program after program after program.

Now, if the gentleman does not care to have the Federal Government fund anything for education in the United States, that is his prerogative. I recognize that and respect that. I don't approve of it, and I hope the Congress won't approve of it. But to have any Member come into another State without any notice to anybody that they are going to do it, by the way, a courtesy that I would extend to anybody in here, I have to find out about it by osmosis that this is being done, it is shameful and it needs to be stopped and it needs to have an end put to it.

Now, if the gentleman has specific objections to anything being done in Alaska, he should have taken it up with the gentleman from Alaska. That is minimum courtesy in this body. But to come on the floor and make the kind of accusations that are made today is an insult to the gentleman from Alaska and an insult to the Appropriations Committee and an insult to the House of Representatives.

If there are objections to anything in the next one that comes up, I hope that whoever offers that amendment with Hawaii would have had the courtesy to sit down with me and with Representative HIRONO and specifically state what

their objections were, so that we might be able to accommodate them, had they legitimacy and foundation. That is the minimum we can expect from one another.

This is a shameful process. I hadn't realized until right now that we could solve the educational problems in this country if we could just keep those Alaskan kids from getting a dime for any program that has been put together by Representative YOUNG and the local educators in Alaska.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I thank the Chair, and I appreciate the gentleman's passion. I would suggest, however, that each of us are elected to this House to determine best how we should use our vote, to either concur or disagree with the manner in which this body spends hard-working American taxpayer money. So I wouldn't criticize anybody for coming to the floor and providing their assessment of priorities as to where they believe hard-earned American taxpayer money ought to be spent.

I am pleased to yield to my good friend from New Jersey for a comment.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, and I would just make reference to the gentleman from Hawaii. I believe he misstates the intent of the legislation here when he says that the intent is to make sure that Alaska or Hawaii, and this bill is only on Alaska, does not get a dime. As my testimony indicated, Alaska will continue to get more than a dime, as the President's budget request included \$1 billion in direct support for the education of Indian and Alaskan Natives. That is more than one dime.

Native Alaskans will also get \$118 million in formula grants to school districts, competitive grants for demonstration and professional development programs. That is more than one dime.

Finally, to the gentleman from Hawaii's first point, which he agreed with the previous comment that education is best done locally and that the folks of Alaska know best about how to educate their children and the folks from Hawaii know best how to educate their children, I would presume he would agree the people from New Jersey also know how best to educate their children.

I would ask the gentleman from Hawaii, if he truly believes that, would he support our initiatives and my initiative in the LEARN Act to allow States to opt out of the cumbersome regulations of education from the Federal level and keep their dollars in Hawaii and keep their dollars in Alaska so they would be in the best position to educate their children.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my friend for offering the amendment, and

I thank him for his explanation. There is no desire to remove all funding in this area. That would be a different debate and a different discussion. That is not the debate we are having right now.

Madam Chairman, I do want to point out the larger picture, the bigger picture we are talking about here, and that is the issue of fiscal responsibility and the issue of responsibly spending taxpayer money, hard-earned American taxpayer money.

I was pleased to hear the chairman of the Appropriations Committee say to the gentleman from New Jersey that if the committee determined that those funds ought not be authorized, that they would be pleased to remove those funds, or something like that.

I would point out to the gentleman and to my colleagues that on page 302, 303, 304, and 305 of the report of the Committee on Appropriations, there is a paragraph that is headed "Appropriations Not Authorized By Law." I would suggest that we revisit these items and require that they be authorized.

"Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1)(B) of rule XIII of the Rules the House, the following table lists the appropriations in the accompanying bill," this bill we are talking about right now, "which are not authorized by law for the period concerned."

It may be helpful, Madam Chairman, for individuals to hear which ones are not authorized, not talking about the quality of those programs or the need for them, but the fact that this is a process that has come about where we are appropriating money for many programs which are in fact not authorized.

Department of Labor, for example, Training and Employment Services, not authorized since 2003. Appropriations in this bill, \$3.5 billion.

Not authorized in this bill, the Veterans Workforce Improvement Program, not authorized since 2003. Appropriated in this bill, \$1.649 billion.

□ 1300

National Health Service Corps, not authorized since 2002, again not talking about the appropriateness of the appropriation itself, but whether or not the process is such that it ought not be authorized prior to carrying out the appropriation. In this bill, \$131 million.

Not authorized in this bill, Healthy Start, not authorized since 2005. In this bill, \$120 million.

Not authorized in this bill, Rural Health Outreach Grants, not authorized since 2006. Funding in this bill to a level of \$52.9 million.

Not authorized in this bill, cancer registries, not authorized since 2003. In this bill, funded at the rate of \$47.9 million.

Not authorized in this bill, oral health promotion, not authorized since 2005. Funding in this bill, \$13.1 million.

Not authorized in this bill, substance abuse and mental health services programs, not authorized since 2003. Funding in this bill, \$3.26 billion.

Madam Chairman, the list goes on and on, and I draw my colleagues' attention to it, because I would agree with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that we ought to be concerned about what is authorized by the authorizing committees and whether or not appropriations ought to be spent for items that are not authorized.

But the challenge for us is to spend responsibly, spend hard-earned taxpayer money responsibly.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I just want to thank the gentleman for bringing to the attention of the House again the fact that the authorizing committees have failed to do so much work in past years.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. My friends, this is a sad day in this body. Apparently the students of New Jersey are trying to take money from Alaskan students, pitting State against State instead of talking about education.

I am a little bit chagrined with the gentleman from New Jersey. This is supposed to be a House of honor. You didn't tell me you were going to offer this amendment. You didn't talk to the gentleman from Hawaii on the amendment. You are attacking two States that are not contiguous to the United States. This is a harmful thing to do. We are a new State. I have poverty that you don't even think of, and yet you say you want my money, my money for my students that need to be educated to go to New Jersey.

That is a sad day for this House.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee for putting this in the bill. And if we continue this, we will be called biting one another, very much like the mink in my State that kill their own. There is always another day when those who bite will be killed, too, and I am very good at that.

I just think it is a disgrace to have one State, the education of one State, being pitted against another State. This is education. These are needy students, a minority that has been neglected, has not been helped to the degree they should have been over the centuries. I can truthfully say and proudly say we have been good in the last years, over the last 35 years. I have provided education and supported education. My people have risen and become leaders because this Congress saw the wisdom of us providing us money.

And now we have an individual from a State that doesn't have the greatest reputation in the world trying to take money from one State to give to another State. If that is the case, then let's just all have a big donnybrook right here. I'm ready. I'm really ready because what we are doing is dead wrong.

I told the gentleman here about 2 years ago, shame on you. Shame on you. Shame on each one of you. And the guys that are trying to not spend money and the guys that are trying to balance the budget, to take and attack education in States, Hawaii and Alaska, that have the least representation as far as numbers go. And if there is guilt here, it is because I have been able to represent my State better than New Jersey. I would suggest New Jersey ought to elect some new Congressmen, I suggest respectfully, that can do the job. I believe that is really true. If they can't do the job, elect somebody new. I have done it. I am going to continue to do it. I am going to fight for my State, and I am going to fight for my State every time.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, is it appropriate for the speaker to say that the people from New Jersey should be electing—

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. CAPUANO). Does the gentleman from Alaska yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I have not yielded. I will not yield.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I make a point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Is it a violation of parliamentary decorum by suggesting that a Member not be re-elected in the State of New Jersey?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I don't know what the gentleman is talking about. I just said they were not well represented. Respectfully, if I can say that, I don't name anybody's name. I don't mention anybody. I don't specifically mention any names. And that is not why.

For the rest of you that continue this constant harping on this floor about cutting monies from other areas under the guise of balancing the budget, I say shame on you, too. I say shame on you because we are not doing the legislative process any good.

Regardless of who is in power in this House, Democrat or Republican, we should be leading this Nation and we are at a standstill now. That is one reason our ratings are very low, totally, and that is a shame. Because we do have the work of this Nation that we should be doing and we should be addressing and we should take care of it.

I don't agree with everything that side does. We should not always agree on everything, but we should have the ability to get together and solve problems and to legislate, and we have not done that. So I am a little frustrated. And like I say, those that bite me will be bitten back.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Is it appropriate political decorum for a Member to say that he represents his State in a better manner than the entire delegation of another State represents their State?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair is unable to rule on such remarks after other debate has ensued.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Is there a manner in which I can rephrase the question so that the Chair will be able to answer the question or comment on the previous speaker's statements?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair can only rule on such words if a timely point of order is made.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I'm sorry, I didn't hear the last part.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair is unable to rule on words between Members previously spoken in debate, absent a timely point of order or demand that such words be taken down.

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

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I have noticed that the last several speakers on the House floor were rather strident in their comments, engaged in ad hominem attacks and perhaps at least one of them could have had their words taken down.

Having served in this body for several years, I have yet to discover any direct correlation between the stridency with which one delivers their message and the righteousness behind their cause.

Many have come here to say that somehow House decorum demands that one speak to another Member before offering an amendment that somehow may be injurious to their district's interests. In all of the years I have served in this body, I have yet to have somebody come to me and explain to me ahead of time how their amendment, how it impacts the people in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas.

Yet every day we see something like the largest tax increase in history, which certainly has a terrible impact on the hardworking people of the Fifth Congressional District of Texas. Nobody sought out my permission before they brought that particular piece of legislation to the floor.

We have pieces of trade legislation, or it should be called anti-trade legislation, coming to the floor, harming my cow-calf operators in the Fifth District of Texas. Nobody seeks my permission or acquiescence before that legislation is brought to the floor.

We have legislation imposing death taxes on people who have worked their whole life to build small businesses in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas. Nobody seeks my acquiescence

or permission before bringing that legislation to the floor.

I also noticed that an earlier speaker referred to the funds in this amendment as "my money." Well, isn't that a fascinating concept, "my money." I thought it was the taxpayers' money, many of whom reside in the State of New Jersey. Many of whom reside in the State of Texas.

I am interested why we seem to have on top of all the other education funds we have, and it is not exactly like this is an area of Federal funding that has gone lacking, since 1995, the elementary and secondary education budget function has increased 147 percent. That is about the highest increase of any budget function in that period of time.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, maybe we ought to go out and create a special education fund for New Jersey and for Texas and for Arkansas and Maine and New Hampshire. Why don't we create one for all 50 States. Then what we can do is we can go ahead with the Democrats' plan for the largest tax increase in history, and we can take all of this money away from American families. Then Washington can keep, say, a third of it in administration cost and waste and inefficiency, and then we can design these programs with our State names on them, take credit for it, and then hand it back to the taxpayers, whose money it is in the first place.

So I want to salute the gentleman from New Jersey for his courage, for his steadfast leadership on this issue, his dedication to education, his dedication to fiscal responsibility, and for coming and suffering these ad hominem attacks. That, Mr. Chairman, is what is truly shameful about this particular moment.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding for just a moment.

As the Representative from the Fifth District of the State of New Jersey, I remind the gentleman from Alaska that the State of New Jersey has 13 congressional Representatives from both sides of the aisle. And so when the gentleman from Alaska makes reference to our Representatives from the State of New Jersey not doing their job and not appropriately representing the people of the State, I remind him that it is an accusation not against simply this one gentleman who is standing at the microphone right now proposing this one amendment, but it is an entire body of 13 gentlemen from both sides of the aisle who I say, and I commend both Representatives from the Democrat and the Republican side of the aisle, for appropriately and admirably representing the good citizens from the State of New Jersey.

My colleagues from the other 12 districts do not need to be defended against these rash accusations by the gentleman from Alaska. But I do come to the floor now to appropriately defend them, nonetheless.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I also take up the comment that the gentleman from Texas was just making reference to which the gentleman from Alaska stated in his statement what was "my money" or it is Alaska's money. Well, maybe that is the problem we have had in this Congress for too long, even when Republicans were in the majority and now that the Democrats are the majority, too. Too many Members of Congress see the dollars that we appropriate here not as the taxpayers' dollar, but see it as their very own personal checking account. Maybe that is the fundamental problem that we have with why we spend more and more each year.

I remember when the Democrats were running for office this past election. They were railing against the Republican Party, that we were the party out of control, spending more and more and more. If they were elected to office, they would come here and rein things in when it came to spending. And I served on the Budget Committee when the Democrats were in the minority, and how they railed against us from the other side of the aisle. And at times I even agreed with them on some of the charges that they made, that we were spending too much money.

And now when the Democrats take control, what do they do? Give us the largest tax increase in U.S. history, and we see spending continue to go through the roof. Where do those dollars come from? They come from American taxpayers, from the family budgets, from men and women in Alaska and New Jersey and across this country, working hard just to get by, and yet they are being forced by the Democrats' tax increases to send more dollars here to Washington.

When the gentleman from Alaska comes forth and says it is "my money," maybe that is why in some respects when there are projects that are appropriated such as bridges to nowhere and the like, the American public says that is our dollars going to Washington, and it shouldn't be looked at for just such frivolous things as this.

□ 1315

The amendment that's before us right now is an appropriate amendment to say that the hard-earned tax dollars should go to programs that are necessary but be spent in an effective manner.

Members from all 50 States see the need to educate our children. Members from all 50 States, including the State of New Jersey, see the need to deal with the issue of Alaska native stu-

dents, and that is why this administration has already requested appropriations of \$1 billion for that, \$118 million in other categorical aids such as that. So all we are doing is saying make sure that those dollars that come from New Jersey and elsewhere are spent effectively.

Finally, to close on this point of "my money," maybe the gentleman from Alaska was not listening at the opening of my comments when I said that New Jersey taxpayers send a dollar to Washington and only get 63 cents back on the dollar, whereas his constituents, yes, they do much better. They send a dollar to Washington and then they get \$1.80 back.

I would ask the gentleman from Alaska and other Members from the Democrat side of the aisle, where do they think that other 80 cents on the dollar is coming from? I will tell you it's coming from the good, hardworking taxpayers from the State of New Jersey and Connecticut and New York that are donor States to States like Alaska, that we are subsidizing their programs.

I would ask the gentleman from Alaska to refrain from, therefore, referring to it as his money. It is the taxpayers in the Fifth Congressional District and the rest of New Jersey, whether you're in a Democrat district or Republican district, who are helping fund these programs.

Ms. FOXX. I want to just say I am very concerned when there is an attitude here in the Congress that it is our money to spend. I want to make sure that nobody ever forgets that we are the stewards of money that we legally steal from the people of this country. We take it from them under duress, and we have a tremendous responsibility to make sure that that money is being spent well.

There's no such thing as Federal dollars. It's all money that belongs to the American taxpayers, and we're up here confiscating a great deal of their money and deciding how to spend it. And it's up to us to make sure that we spend it very, very carefully and very, very fairly.

The Constitution provides for no role for the Federal Government in education. We're already overstepping our bounds, and if we're going to overstep our bounds, we better be extraordinarily careful in that respect.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a point here because I think what just happened on this House floor 5 minutes ago was extraordinary.

For a member of the Republican Party to get up and defend what has happened here and the investments that we're making I think exposes what's been going on here for the last several months, is that we have a fringe group, Mr. Chairman, of Mem-

bers of this Congress who consistently get up and try to pin Members against each other, try to find specific programs and somehow expose somebody as somehow being irresponsible. And I think it's extraordinary what happened here, that we have an extreme group in this Congress that consistently tries to divide us when we're trying to get the people's work done.

This is the United States of America, and the gentleman from New Jersey benefits from the Federal court system that helps Wall Street thrive. It's the rule of law in this country that is funded by the taxpayer, courts, judges, buildings, the rule of law, and that allows Wall Street to benefit. That allows citizens in New Jersey to earn a good living and to pay taxes.

And we have Members from Texas, Mr. Chairman, the great investment that this country has made into that great State, NASA, the universities, Texas has benefited from those investments.

Members from the West, where the West wouldn't even exist, we have congressional districts that wouldn't exist if it wasn't for the investment of the Federal Government to build dams. The Colorado River Basin Project—there wouldn't be congressional districts in the West if it wasn't for the Federal investment.

We're the United States of America, for God's sake, and let's stop trying to divide each other. Let's recognize that this bill has been supported unanimously from the Appropriations Committee, Democrats and Republicans, and I want to thank the distinguished Member from New York who put so much thought and concern into this bill, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), who have consistently tried to make investments and recognize that people in Alaska, kids in Alaska need help, and I'm okay with that. I've never been to Alaska but we have needs.

Let's stop trying to divide each other and stop the lectures of fiscal responsibility. The mess we're in is here because of \$3 trillion in debt that our friends have borrowed from China and Japan and OPEC countries over the past 6 years; borrowed more money, Mr. Chairman, from foreign interests than every President and Congress before them combined.

So enough of the lectures on fiscal responsibility. We're here now. Let's make these investments. Let's compete in a global economy by making these investments. We're competing against 1.3 billion people in China, 1.2 billion people in India. We need to make these investments. We only have 300 million people in this country. They need to be educated. They need to be healthy, and they need to live in a clean environment. That's what this bill does.

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

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

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this is supposed to be a healthy debate, and quite frankly, I don't think Members on either side should criticize Members for coming to the floor and debating issues.

The gentleman from New Jersey raised, I believe, a legitimate issue, and that is the issue of the equity of people from one State paying in much more money to the Federal Government than they get back versus people from another State getting much more money back from the Federal Government than they pay in and questioning a particular program. That's the kind of debate that is supposed to occur here. It's the kind of debate that should occur here.

Indeed, I think everyone on this floor acknowledges we have a problem with having spent too much money. We have a problem with too much debt, and I think the people on this side of the aisle have tried to make the point that at some point we need to stop that spending or slow that spending, and I believe the people who have carried forward this discussion, at least from this side of the aisle, have readily acknowledged that a great deal of that overspending occurred on our watch. We're not trying to point blame, but we do have a duty to come here and debate our financial priorities and debate our jobs.

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

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank my friend from New Jersey for offering this amendment because I did not know that this would open up the types of discussions that it has, but I think it's great for this body.

My friend from Ohio, Mr. RYAN, who, Mr. Chairman, I stood up on that podium and listened to many nights with the 30-something group, that talked about the spending of the Republicans, I hope he will come back now and talk about the largest tax increase in the history of this country. He talked about dividing Members, and I stood there, Mr. Chairman, right where you're at, and I listened to the rhetoric that was designed to divide Members.

And talking about a spending and what's a good investment, I don't know when we were in the majority party why the things we weren't doing wasn't a good investment. Now, all of the sudden spending \$11 billion more than the President's recommendation is a good investment. So spending more money is a good investment, and he's talking about that we borrowed money from foreign countries. I don't agree with that, but you know what, they probably won't borrow money from a foreign country. You know what they're going to do, Mr. Chairman? They're

going to go up on your taxes. They have passed and are passing appropriations bills, other pieces of legislation that's going to cause this country to have the largest tax increase in history.

So I want to thank him for bringing this up, and I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing this up because this is a perfect example that we have to prioritize, and we all have different ideas about prioritizing. We all have different ideas about who's writing a budget, if it's a good investment or if it's wasteful spending.

So, I support the gentleman's amendment because I don't think that those children in Alaska, regardless if a Member of my party says it or not, or the children of Hawaii need special exception and more money than my kids, my special need kids in the Third District of Georgia.

So I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding, and I yield back.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to conclude this by simply noting that no Member who brings an amendment to an appropriations bill is criticizing the ranking member or the chairman of that committee. Indeed, I think it's a long-standing tradition and an honorable one in this body that appropriations bills come to the floor under an open rule so that we can have these discussions, and the votes reflect the will of the Nation as they should.

So I want to make it clear that I don't believe that by the gentleman from New Jersey or myself or any other Member of this body, any Member on the majority side, offering an amendment, and there have been amendments offered, in doing so that they are in any way criticizing the good hard work. Indeed, I think we're honoring the tradition of the Appropriations Committee in that these are, in fact, brought to floor under an open rule, and we have full and open debate which I think is what the American people want.

And I compliment the Chairman of the committee and I compliment the ranking member of the committee for their hard work in doing their jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

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

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. 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 New Jersey will be postponed.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Chairman, for decades during the Cold War, hundred of thousands of Department of Energy employees, including thousands of workers at the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant in my district, worked diligently at our Nation's nuclear weapons facilities. These men and women worked with radioactive and other hazardous materials, and some ultimately sacrificed their health for the security of our Nation.

In response, Congress enacted the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act to provide compensation and medical benefits to these former nuclear employees. The intent of this act was to honor and care for Cold War veterans who became ill while working at the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant and other DOE facilities.

However, due to mismanagement and delays, the compensation program has only paid 11,829, or 23 percent, of the 51,188 claims that have been filed nationwide. My constituents, and thousands of former DOE employees like them, have been subjected to bureaucratic red tape and unfair burdens of proof, delaying their compensation and even, in some cases, preventing them from filing claims.

Congress made clear in enacting the compensation program that our Nation's Cold War heroes should be justly compensated for the illnesses they contracted while serving our country. Sadly, the Department of Labor has failed to ensure that the claims are properly processed and approved.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request your assistance in asking the Department of Labor to report to Congress on the administration of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program, and specifically, I believe it is vital that the Secretary provide Congress with information concerning, first, the length of time it takes to process and evaluate a claim; second, the reasons behind the current backlog in processing these claims; third, the staffing of the relevant offices assigned to administer the program; fourth, the quality of communication with claimants; fifth, the process through which claims are approved or denied, as well as the oversight currently in place to assure that claims are handled properly; and sixth, the possibility of providing greater assistance through the Department of Labor to those wishing to file claims, many of whom are elderly and in poor health.

Our Nation's former nuclear workers are truly among the unheralded heroes of the Cold War. We owe them and their families better than bureaucratic red tape, and I would greatly appreciate your assistance in assuring that the Department of Labor remains committed to providing these workers with the recognition, treatment and compensation they deserve.

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

Mr. LOEBSACK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for raising this important issue. The purpose of the Energy Employee Occupational Illness Compensation Program is to fairly compensate our Nation's former nuclear workers for illnesses they contracted while serving our country.

Former Department of Energy employees who are now elderly and ill have been subjected to bureaucratic run-arounds by the agencies responsible for adjudicating their claims. The Department of Labor is responsible for administering compensation for these former nuclear workers, and I concur with the gentleman from Iowa that a report from the Secretary detailing the administration of the compensation program would provide Congress with highly valuable insight into the agency's implementation of the program.

Streamlining and expediting the method through which claims are processed and compensation provided is in the best interests of the families and claimants to whom our country owes its deepest gratitude and respect.

I'd be happy to work with the gentleman to request this information from the Department and to ensure that the true intent of the program is being carried out with due diligence by the administration.

□ 1330

Mr. LOEBSACK. Reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his willingness to address this important issue and look forward to working with him.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I rise to associate myself with the comments of Chairman OBEY and Mr. LOEBSACK of Iowa.

The American workers who fell ill during service to our country must be justly compensated in a reasonable period of time. As you have said, these men and women are American heroes. They really made a difference for our country.

I have been an outspoken critic, both in the Appropriations Subcommittee and in my district, of EEOICPA's lack of removing the bureaucratic hurdles faced by claimants. I thank my two colleagues and join them in requesting the Department of Labor to provide this information.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman and look forward to working with him on this issue.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDIAN EDUCATION

For expenses necessary to carry out, to the extent not otherwise provided, part A of title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), \$124,000,000.

INNOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

For carrying out activities authorized by section 1504 (20 U.S.C. 6494), part G of title I (20 U.S.C. 6531 et seq.), subpart 5 of part A of title II (20 U.S.C. 6651) and part C and part D of title II (20 U.S.C. 6671 et seq., and 20 U.S.C. 6751 et seq.), and part B (including subpart 2), part C, and part D of title V (20 U.S.C. 7221 et seq., 20 U.S.C. 7231 et seq., and 20 U.S.C. 7241) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ("ESEA"), \$992,354,000: *Provided*, That \$10,695,000 shall be provided to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to carry out section 2151(c) of ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6651(c)): *Provided further*, That from funds for subpart 4 of part C of title II (20 U.S.C. 6721 et seq.), up to 3 percent shall be available to the Secretary for technical assistance and dissemination of information: *Provided further*, That \$258,988,000 shall be available to carry out part D of title V of ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7241 et seq.), of which \$99,000,000 of the funds for subpart 1 shall be for competitive grants to local educational agencies, including charter schools that are local educational agencies, or States, or partnerships of (1) a local educational agency, a State, or both and (2) at least one non-profit organization to develop and implement performance-based teacher and principal compensation systems in high-need schools: *Provided further*, That such performance-based compensation systems must consider gains in student academic achievement as well as classroom evaluations conducted multiple times during each school year among other factors and provide educators with incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles: *Provided further*, That up to 5 percent of such funds for competitive grants shall be available for technical assistance, training, peer review of applications, program outreach, and evaluation activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. FOXX:
Page 82, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 82, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 84, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 84, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce funding for the Fund for the Improvement of Education by \$10 million, while increasing IDEA State grants by \$10 million.

Transferring these funds will ensure that Congress does not create a new unauthorized \$10 million grant program for "full-service community schools" with the Fund for the Improvement of Education, a program which was specifically mentioned in the committee report. We should not be using appropriations bills to authorize programs.

It appears that language in the committee report for this program has been taken from legislation introduced by the House majority leader, as well as in the Senate by Senator NELSON. Their bill would create a \$200 million full-service community school grant program.

What exactly is a full-service community school? According to the underlying funding bill, it's a "public elementary or secondary school that coordinates with community-based organizations and public-private partnerships to provide students, their families and the community access to comprehensive services."

The language specifies that the grants must be used to provide not fewer than three services selected from a variety of selective services, including community service, service learning opportunities, nutrition services, job training and career counseling, primary health and dental care, mental health counseling services adult language, including instruction in English as a Second Language.

I am concerned we are moving schools away from focusing on the basics, academics. Our schools still have room for much improvement in ensuring all students are proficient in the basics of math, reading, writing, science and history. So why is the Federal Government sending money to turn schools into social, medical, educational job training hubs?

I am also concerned about the unsettling prospect of having adult, non-family members of the community regularly visiting school grounds for job training and medical and mental health services when young children and teenagers are present. Combining schools with health care and other social services for community residents poses a danger to students that would need to be addressed in any future legislation.

Since 1965, Congress has increased the role of the Federal Government in public primary and secondary education, as well as in higher education. If history has taught us anything about education, it's that the proliferation of Federal programs and regulations has not improved education. In a time where the Federal Government continues to spend more and more and expand its reach with very limited results, I question the need for us to meddle in affairs such as this.

With this in mind, my amendment would transfer \$10 million from the Fund for the Improvement of Education to IDEA grants. These grants help States and localities pay for the rising cost of special education for 6.9 million children with disabilities.

While my amendment adds only a small amount to these State grants, any amounts are helpful in fully funding Congress' commitment to fund 40 percent of the average per-pupil excess cost of educating students with disabilities.

IDEA part B grants to States is funded at only \$11.29 billion, which is \$7 billion or 41 percent below the 2007 authorized level of \$19.2 billion. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment to ensure that any full-service community school legislation goes forward through the proper authorizing process, not through the appropriations

process, and we put money where it's desperately needed, as we all know from hearing from the schools in our districts.

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

Mr. OBEY. In reserving my point of order, I would like to ask a question of the gentlewoman. Does she have a score from the CBO?

Ms. FOXX. I do. We would actually save \$1 million with this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. So the CBO indicates that the amendment is outlay neutral?

Ms. FOXX. Yes.

Mr. OBEY. If that is the case, then I withdraw my reservation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

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. There are two problems I have with this amendment. First of all, it seeks to cut \$10 million from an item in the bill which is meant to establish full-service community schools. These are supposed to be schools which test the concept of making schools neighborhood centers which include early childhood education, remedial education, academic enrichment activities, programs that promote parental involvement and family literacy, mentoring and other youth development programs. It's meant to be a much more holistic educational experience than is usually found in an individual school. We believe that that deserves an opportunity to be tested.

Secondly, I would simply say that, lest this amendment be portrayed as an amendment that does anything significant for special education, I want to point out that this is an especially marginal amendment. The damage it does to the neighborhood school concept that we are trying to explore in the bill is far larger than the negligible impact that it has on the special education program.

What I mean by that is this: Special education is an \$11 billion program. This amendment adds \$10 million to it. It is another one of those symbolic amendments which I think ought to be placed in context.

The committee has already increased this account by \$500 million. It is \$800 million above the President, and it seems to me that, by comparison, the amendment is demonstrably but a blip on the radar screen in comparison to the funds that we have already put in this bill.

Now, I know that many of these amendments can be offered, and they can be converted into nice, sweetly packaged 30-second TV spots which tend to leave the impression that a Member has done something significant. Unfortunately, this amendment doesn't fit into that category of being significant, and it may make a very good television spot, but I doubt it's going to be very meaningful in the scheme of things.

I would ask for a "no" vote.

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

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

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

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in support of this amendment. I hadn't intended to, but I think it's a good amendment, partially because it provides additional funds to IDEA.

In committee, we amended the bill to add \$335,000,000 more to IDEA. This is a small one, but it's helpful. More importantly, this concept of community schools is a wonderful concept. But that's what we have committees for, committees of jurisdiction, to vet these ideas.

In my hometown of Syracuse, there's lots of talk about community schools. Remembering that primary and secondary education is a responsibility of the municipality, the county and the State and not of the Federal Government is an important thing to consider. A community school in Syracuse is very different than a community school in Maryland or California or Arizona.

But more importantly than all of that is that our schools, especially our inner-city schools, are having a very difficult job graduating the kids now. In fact, many of our urban schools aren't even graduating 50 percent of the kids who start in ninth grade. That's a fact. No one is comfortable with that fact, but it is a fact.

So why would you provide or require or suggest to a school that is already only attaining 50 percent of its responsibility with its primary task, why would you give them additional work? Why would you give them additional responsibilities? Maybe there's good reason for that, but there is certainly a committee structure. The education committee has plenty of experts and staff to try to determine the best way to approach this.

I admire the author of the concept's ingenuity, but this really needs to go through committee to have proper authorization. Absent that, I think this is a good idea. Ten million dollars will go into a program that everyone knows needs more money, that we are putting additional burdens on those local school districts by not providing this money. It would provide some relief to them to meet their primary task of educating our kids. So I think this is a very good amendment. I strongly support it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield at this time to the author of this amendment such time as she may consume.

Ms. FOXX. I appreciate the ranking member for yielding time to me.

I want to say that I am very troubled by the fact that the terms that are being used here that we want to test, creating holistic educational experiences, that's one of the problems, again, with the Federal Government

being involved in the education process. It is not up to us to be doing that. The testing needs to be done at the local level.

There are programs. North Carolina has a tremendous number of programs where it's working through community centers, sometimes at schools, most of the time not, where they are trying to do these kinds of things. We don't need to be funding this at the Federal level. If the States want to do it, they ought to be doing it.

I think that calling this a symbolic amendment is a denigration it doesn't deserve. This is a serious amendment. We are violating our processes. We are violating what we say we are going to do here. Appropriations bills should not be authorizing bills. We separate that process.

I have not been here very long, and I know I don't know all the rules and the way things are done, but I noticed that the chairman reserved a point of order, but they were able to waive points of orders in order to authorize. So when the majority wants to break the rules, it easily breaks the rules to try to accomplish what it wants to accomplish when it can't accomplish it the other way. So I am very concerned about it. I think this is a very valid amendment done very seriously.

I haven't sat over here for a couple of hours and haven't worked on this for many hours to think that it is frivolous or simply symbolic. It's an important thing. And I don't appreciate the amendment being denigrated in the way it has been denigrated by the chairman of the committee.

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

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, this concept of community schools Mr. WALSH correctly refers to is a concept that is present in many States, many communities.

□ 1345

My wife Judy was the supervisor of early childhood education in Prince Georges County, Maryland, just down the road. She started a concept in our county of full service schools, community schools. There are now 24 Judy Centers in the State of Maryland. Maryland has paid for them, started them.

The problem with a full service community school, as Judy found out and as all of us know, is the turf battles. The turf battles are ferocious. Some people have made fun of the fact that it takes a village to raise a child. Now, obviously, hopefully every child has a good parent. But we have many services available to make sure that our young people, when they get to the ninth grade, are ready to succeed in the ninth and 10th and 11th and 12th

grades. But those services in many communities are discordant and not coordinated. So the concept of a full service or a community school is to bring together services, not in a forced way, but in a cooperative way.

Now, the gentlelady refers to the authorization on the appropriation bill. I know that the ranking member is shocked by that ever happening. I remember, perhaps before the gentlelady got here, when Bill Frist added 40 pages in the dead of night of authorizing language to an appropriation bill just a few years ago to preclude insurance company liability.

The fact of the matter is this \$10 million in NIE is to encourage, facilitate cooperation, not to mandate spending more money; but to encourage educators, social services, child care providers, other services, as they have in the State of New York. I have visited some of them in the city.

So I would hope that we would not take this \$10 million and add it to an \$11 billion program. A critically important program, the gentlelady is absolutely correct, but it is a program that is funded \$800 million more than President Bush asked for by this bill. And in order to add that \$10 million to an \$11 billion program, you will undermine the effort to see if we can create cooperation, in effect magnifying the role of each as they cooperate with one another. That is the concept, and it is a concept that works.

Superintendent Grasmick in my State has talked about this concept all over this country. I have talked about it to Secretary Spelling; I have talked about it to their predecessors. In fact, we did pass a bill through the House that didn't make it through conference which LYNN WOOLSEY had sponsored which had this concept. It is a concept that the Education and Labor Committee is now considering. They may go much broader than this.

But this is what NIE is all about. It is trying to facilitate better ways to deliver education to our children. And I remind the gentleman from New York, who is my friend and I am pleased to see him as the ranking member, but we do participate significantly in the education of children in this country, particularly children at risk. That is what this attempts to do as well, to magnify the services available, coordinate them, bring them together so they are accessible by people who can't get in their car at \$3.15, and drive from this place to the other place to the other place to get services for their children.

So I would hope, ladies and gentlemen of this House, that we would reject this amendment. I thank the chairman for including this provision in the bill, and I would hope that the amendment would be rejected.

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the gentlelady from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague for yielding to me. And I want to say again that I am sorry that my colleague from Maryland is not aware of this really excellent program that exists in North Carolina called Smart Start, which did this back in 1995, where we pulled together these different agencies to work together on this very good concept. But it is being done in States without Federal dollars, and I would urge the people in Maryland to look at that concept and deal with it.

I want to say that I am very concerned again, not by your comments but by the comments of the chairman, about the denigration of the allocation of \$10 million as negligible. That is the attitude of people from Washington that adding \$10 million is negligible. That is hard for people who are paying their taxes every day to understand that. I am sure that the teachers and parents of special needs students who are getting just a small percentage of money already authorized by this Federal Government to do what we are demanding that they do, they are not getting all their money.

Now, I commend the majority party for increasing the spending in this area, but it is the biggest complaint that I get when I talk to people about what is happening in education and the Federal role. So I think we need to put every dime we can possibly find into authorized programs already that are not spending what they should be spending. And I would say, I find it hard to look in the eyes of the parent of a special needs child or the teacher of a special needs child and say: We had an opportunity to give you 10 million more dollars and it was turned down; because they are there, and they need it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Reclaiming my time, I would be happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I would simply say to the gentlelady, it so happens I have known two of your Governors pretty well, once as a young person, Terry Sanford, and as a contemporary of Jim Hunt, who was a good friend of mine for the last 45 years.

You mentioned the programs that you have in North Carolina. BOBBY ETHERIDGE, of course one of the former superintendents of your State's system, your State has been an innovative, progressive leader in education and Jim Hunt has been one of the educational leaders in our country. I have no doubt, because I have worked with him over the last 20 years that I have been in Congress on various programs while he was Governor and since then, that, yes, you have moved ahead in North Carolina, but you have also done it in partnership with many Federal programs. I know that because I have worked with your Governor on that. I simply wanted to make that point. Again, this is a partnership. And I thank my friend for yielding.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman, Mr. OBEY, in a colloquy regarding strengthening of the Children's Graduate Medical Education Program, as well as enhancing Federal support for health information technology.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman yield for that purpose?

Ms. ESHOO. I do.

Mr. WALSH of New York. The question is, have we disposed of the pending amendment before the Committee?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. We have not.

Mr. WALSH. Is this statement by the gentlelady from California in regards to this amendment?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Apparently not.

Mr. WALSH of New York. I would respectfully request that we return to the amendment before we continue the conversation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has begun.

Ms. ESHOO. I am sorry, I didn't hear.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. However, the gentlewoman has begun her statement. At the conclusion of her remarks, the Chair will put the question on the amendment.

Ms. ESHOO. I will be as brief as possible so that we can get back to what was being debated.

I want to thank Mr. OBEY for including \$307 million for the Children's Graduate Medical Education Program. While this amount is less than the \$330 million authorized by Congress last year, it is obviously a good improvement over the levels proposed by the President, which is \$110 million, and the Senate Appropriations Committee, which is \$200 million.

The reason I wanted to have the colloquy is to go on record, urge the chairman to do everything he can to not only maintain the House's funding level when the bill goes to conference, and perhaps even be able to do more.

I think that we all have a healthy understanding of what the Children's Hospitals GME represents. It has been an outstanding success. It is important to note that Children's Hospitals receive 80 percent of what other teaching hospitals receive on average from Medicare's Graduate Medical Education Program.

In recent years, Children's Hospitals have been able to sustain and improve their training programs so that the shortages of pediatric specialists in our country can be addressed. The program has also indirectly strengthened Children's Hospitals as premier pediatric

centers of excellence. They are the safety net for low-income children in their communities and they are the centers of pediatric research as well.

So I want to thank the chairman for everything he has done to fully fund the program this year, and I would be happy to yield to him.

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply say I agree with the gentlelady from California. The Children's GME is integral to ensuring a stable future for our children's hospitals and is a sound investment in children's health. I certainly will do everything I can to ensure that sufficient funding levels for Children's Hospitals GME are retained in conference.

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the chairman. I also want to raise the issue about my strong support for increased funding for Health Information Technology, often referred to as Health IT.

The adoption, I believe, of electronic health record systems I think will have a profound effect on the health care delivery in our country. I believe it will enhance patient safety, reduce medical errors, and improve the quality of care.

For several years, the administration and the Congress have not committed enough funds to make this promise a reality in our country. I recognize the continued commitment to HIT that is in this year's Labor-HHS bill, \$61 million, and I think we need to make a greater investment to make this a reality because it not only needs to be launched effectively, because we have to have interoperability, and without it we really won't have a Health IT system.

So I want to thank the committee, most especially the chairman, for weeding through what is really a difficult bill to put together because we are constrained moneywise. But if there is any opportunity at conference, I want to urge optimizing that possibility.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to thank my colleague from California for bringing this important matter to the attention of the House. The gentlelady is a strong advocate for the establishment of a robust and interoperable health information technology network, and I want to work with her. I will be pleased to consider this funding need should additional funds become available in conference.

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

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

Ms. FOXX. 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 North Carolina will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

□ 1400

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. SHADEGG

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SHADEGG. I was standing and I have an amendment that goes to page 82.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman have the amendment at the desk?

Mr. SHADEGG. Yes, I do.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was on his feet when the Clerk was reading.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 49 offered by Mr. SHADEGG: Page 82, line 6 after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,695,000)".

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read, not designated.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this is a simple and straightforward amendment. It is premised on the notion, not that the program doesn't work, but rather, that when the task is finished, the funding should stop.

This program, the Advanced Credentialing Program, was established by the Congress to develop teacher standards and to have those standards developed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards or other nationally certification or credentialing organizations. That task has, in fact, been accomplished.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, a private body, has received more than \$180 million from the Department of Education since 1991. These Federal funds supported the development and implementation of the certification standards and assessments in 24 different academic fields. That task has now been completed.

In addition, since the legislation called for such standards to be established by other nationally recognized certification or credentialing organizations, the Department awarded \$32.8 million in a 5-year grant to the American Board for the Certification of Teacher Excellence. That board will receive the final year of its funding in Fiscal Year 2007.

By Fiscal Year 2008, the American Board for the Certification of Teacher Excellence will have successfully completed the development and implementation of its teacher credential system. As a result, State and local teaching

organizations, educational agencies, will have not one but two different sets of standards to pick from, one developed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and one developed by the American Board for the Certification of Teacher Excellence. I believe when the task has been completed, it is important that we stop the funding.

I want to make clear that the purpose of this amendment is not to eliminate funding for States to encourage teachers to receive advanced degrees or to assist them in that endeavor.

My wife is a teacher. She has a master's degree. She received her advanced credentialing in order to improve her education and her ability to serve as a teacher, but the task has now been accomplished.

The Department, as well, supports giving States and districts more tools to help them identify and retain effective teachers. Indeed, the 2008 budget requests \$2.8 billion for the improving teacher quality State grants program and an additional \$199 million for the teacher incentive program. These programs combined provide flexible sources for State and local education agencies to use to improve their teacher recruitment and retention systems according to their own needs.

The goal of this amendment is to simply acknowledge that the creation of the standards has been accomplished and accomplished by two different entities, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and the American Board for the Certification of Teacher Excellence.

In addition, I would note for anyone concerned about this that the effects of the NBPTS credential system on student achievement have been somewhat mixed. There are studies that show it has been somewhat helpful. However, the studies have found the positive effects are very small and that they are neither large enough nor consistent enough to justify further Federal funding beyond that which is provided in the existing \$2.8 billion for improving teacher quality State grants, and the \$199 million that I already referred to in teacher incentive fund training.

I do wish, at this point, that I had reallocated the \$10.7 million that would be saved by this amendment to Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Having listened to the discussion of the last bill, I note that IDEA is underfunded. It has all been underfunded, and I wish that I had cast this amendment in that fashion. I did not do so but I, nonetheless, would encourage its adoption and would encourage, perhaps, those at conference to take that \$10.7 million and to add it to IDEA funding.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. OBEY. I withdraw my point of order.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I can't believe my ears. I just thought I heard the gentleman say that IDEA was underfunded. I'm shocked. I've never heard the gentleman say that anything was underfunded before.

Mr. SHADEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

I certainly believe IDEA is underfunded. I know in my school districts in my schools there is a crying need.

Mr. OBEY. Let me take back my time because I only have 5 minutes. But I agree with the gentleman. Many programs are underfunded in this bill.

Let me simply say, Mr. Chairman, that I would certainly support the gentleman's amendment if I thought that we had all of the excellent teachers in the country that we need, but the fact is we don't.

This is not a program that should be cut back or eliminated. This is a program that works. This is a program which helps teach trainers to go through rigorous certification processes. They are star teachers. They go back to their school districts, they become lead teachers in their schools, and I hardly think that that is damaging the national interest.

And I must also confess a certain amount of confusion, because just about an hour ago we were told by a series of Members that we should support the teacher incentive program because we needed to incentivize teachers to increase their skills. And now we have a program that does just that and identifies teachers based on merit, and we're told we ought to cut back the program.

Let me simply say that if you take a look at the way this program has been evaluated, the National Boards for Professional Teaching Standards tells us that this program raises student achievement. It inspires deeper learning. It improves teacher practice. It creates transformative professional development, and it helps these schools to retain teachers.

Let me say that there is a tiny increase in this program. That increase is aimed at helping teachers from low-income schools get master teacher certification.

We've been told for years that the toughest thing to do in education is to get your best teachers to go into your poorest schools or the schools in your poorest neighborhoods. This is a program that's effective in doing that. We ought not to throw the baby out with the bath water.

I would urge opposition to the amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. WESTMORELAND

Mr. WESTMORELAND. 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. 50 offered by Mr. WESTMORELAND:

Page 82, line 6 after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$23,533,000)".

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order, and I would ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment. We've listened to the other side talk about, I guess, some of us maybe being disingenuous or doing different things with this amendment. And the gentleman from Ohio talked about a fringe group over here, and I'm happy to be part of that fringe group. The Republican Study Committee I guess is who he was talking about in that we're trying to look after the taxpayers' money.

For the past 12 years, I would have to admit, although I've only been here three of those years, that we spent too much money. We expanded government too much, and we didn't do what we should have been doing. But it's good, because I think a lot of people woke up after the last election and realized that we had lost our brand of being fiscal conservatives, being responsible with the taxpayers' money, because it's not our money, it's their money, they work hard for it every day, and that we need to be more responsible with it.

And I think that the President got that message. And in this budget, he cut the funding for the writing instruction. It's \$23.5 million, or a very, very small percentage of the \$152 billion budget that the majority party is offering for this appropriations bill, which is \$11 billion more than the President offered. And, you know, it doesn't hurt to zero a program out if it's not working or not doing its job, or if the money can better be spent somewhere else in a different program, something that has more advantages for more people.

Under titles II, III and IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Federal Government provides extensive support to States and operates numerous programs designed to enhance teacher recruiting and training.

While many of these programs provide important services, States would be well served to receive this funding in the form of a block grant with increased flexibility to use these funds on the programs most needed in that State.

Mr. Chairman, I know from talking to my local school board superintendents and school board members that they certainly agree with that. No Child Left Behind, while working in a lot of situations, has cost them more money, really, to implement those programs than they receive in Federal dollars because a lot of that money is, has to be spent in a certain area.

This would be an opportunity that we could take this very, very small amount out. The President recommended a zero. It was funded at \$21.7 million last year, so there's been a 10 percent increase this year, and just zero the program out.

And so it's a pretty simple amendment. It puts back the writing instruction program back to zero, where the President put it, and I hope that my colleagues will finally decide, let's vote for one thing that actually cuts something.

I know one appropriations bill, Mr. Chairman, we were talking about, and I believe the chairman of the committee said they had cut 250 programs. And I asked for a list of those programs. Haven't received it yet. So, hopefully this will encourage him to support this amendment, because it is zeroing out a program, and also get me the list of the other 250 programs that this Congress has cut so far this year.

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me assure the gentleman that his party did not lose the last election because they did too much for education. Rather, they lost the last election, in my view, because the public so clearly understood that their party preferred to put spending \$57 billion in tax cuts for people who make over \$1 million to providing decent funding for education.

□ 1415

And the public understood that the other party preferred to spend \$600 billion in Iraq rather than spending a small portion of that at home for science and health care and the like to meet some of the needs of our own people. That is why the gentleman's party lost the last election, not because they did too much for education but because they were out of touch.

Having said that, let me simply say that this amendment eliminates funding for the National Writing Project. I would simply point out that this program supports teacher training programs so that teachers can help students write effectively and school districts match those funds dollar for dollar.

I must say all of us have large turnover of our staff here on Capitol Hill. The number one problem that I have in my office and the number one problem I have heard so many other Members comment on is that when young people come in and interview for jobs, they don't know how to write.

When both of my sons went away to college, at least my oldest son asked me, "Dad, what do you think is the most important thing to learn?"

And I said, I think the most important thing to learn is how to write because if you can write clearly, it means you are thinking clearly, and if you are thinking clearly, it means you can communicate. And I would say that I don't think that this country is over blessed with a number of great writers. I also must say if you listen to some of the congressional speeches written by our staffs, you would certainly agree that we need more help in writing in this country.

So let me simply say that I understand that we are engaged in a little filibuster by amendment. But nonetheless, I wanted to take this time to simply urge Members to vote against this amendment. If you believe in raising the quality of discourse in this country, you have to start with writing, and that is what this program tries to do.

I would urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SAFE SCHOOLS AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

For carrying out activities authorized by subpart 3 of part C of title II (20 U.S.C. 6711 et seq.), part A of title IV (20 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), subpart 2 of part D of title V (20 U.S.C. 7245), subpart 3 of part D of title V (20 U.S.C. 7247), and subpart 10 of part D of title V (20 U.S.C. 7261 et seq.) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ("ESEA"), \$714,075,000, of which \$300,000,000 shall become available on July 1, 2008, and remain available through September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That \$300,000,000 shall be available for subpart 1 of part A of title IV of ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7111 et seq.) and \$222,335,000 shall be available for subpart 2 of part A of title IV of ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7131 et seq.), of which \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the Project School Emergency Response to Violence program to provide education-related services to local educational agencies, and institutions of higher education, in which the learning environment has been disrupted due to a violent or traumatic crisis: *Provided further*, That \$158,422,000 shall be available to carry out part D of title V of

ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7241 et seq.): *Provided further*, That of the funds available to carry out subpart 3 of part C of title II of ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6711 et seq.), up to \$12,072,000 may be used to carry out section 2345 (20 U.S.C. 6715) and \$3,025,000 shall be used by the Center for Civic Education to implement a comprehensive program to improve public knowledge, understanding, and support of the Congress and the State legislatures.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. BRADY OF TEXAS

Mr. BRADY of Texas. 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. 52 offered by Mr. BRADY of Texas:

Page 83, lines 14 and 15, after each dollar amount, insert "(reduced \$72,674,000)".

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Carol White Physical Education Program was named after a long-standing and dedicated public servant here on Capitol Hill. Carol White, a long-time Chief of Staff for Senator TED STEVENS, who aptly named this program because they have dedicated their lives to trying to make this country better inside our schools and out. This program provides the funding basically to help schools initiate and expand their physical education programs, which is just a great goal, and many of the grants have been used for playground equipment on schools.

Physical education is important. I think we all know that. Our young people are becoming more and more static between video games and television shows and sometimes lack of outdoor recreation. We are seeing more obesity. It is important that PE be part of an integral curriculum of our schools. In fact, our States and local districts have targeted PE as an area that they want to reintroduce back to the curriculum for our children.

The only reason I raise this program up is to have some type of thoughtful debate about who should fund PE programs and, more importantly, what should our Federal priorities be.

I ask that because I know that today we are running a deficit. We have a major national debt. I know that every dollar that we spend above the deficit, and we will run a deficit again with the budget we are discussing today, but I know that every dollar that goes to our public debt is picked up by these same children we are trying to help where it will result in a tax increase for families. So it seems right and proper that we scrutinize every program regardless of how much we might admire the person it is named after.

This program has been rated by the program assessment rating tool as the results not demonstrated at this point. I imagine that is why the President did not request funding for it. Like the chairman, who has identified apparently 200 or more programs for dismissal, we have to make tough choices.

What we are seeking here is a simple question. In our rural schools and our

smaller schools, they have the money to buy playground equipment or to build a swingset for kids. What they don't have is money to hire a special needs teacher. What they don't have is money to help kids read and write at grade level. What they don't have is money to help try to prevent the dropouts that are hitting our schools and a case where nearly half of our minorities in eighth grade or ninth and graduating to 12th grade. It just seems to me that from the Federal funding level, our local schools can afford a playground set. What we need to help them with is what they can't afford, which are teachers to help our special needs kids; equipment to help our kids with disabilities; teachers in science, in math, and technology subjects; food for kids who come to school hungry. Despite the merits and the goal which are so laudable for this program, it seems to me that we ought to set our highest priorities to help schools with what they cannot do today, which really is to help our kids read and write, to help our special needs students reach their potential, to try to stop this horrendous dropout rate in America.

So I would propose that we, as the President suggested, not fund this program, reserve those resources. And, again, these are tough choices you always have to make through the process. It is not much fun either way. I am sure the chairman did not delight in cutting any of the programs that he had proposed. It is just a way that we try to get closer to a balanced budget and try to prioritize where we fund our schools and our kids and, again, try to make the greatest use of every tax dollar we have.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment is not a healthy amendment.

As you pointed out, our children are more complacent than ever. Sometimes it is because of video games. In some parts of the country, it is because the streets aren't safe. In other parts of the country, it is because children are latchkey and moms and dads want to know where they are while they are working. So obesity is becoming a huge problem in this country. And in order for children to really be ready and prepared to learn, they have to be physically fit. They go together. I taught school. They go hand in hand.

The CDC has made childhood obesity and the obesity that is already occurring with adults a challenge for our country to get ahold of if we are going to be competitive, if we are going to have a healthy workforce, and if we are going to control our health care costs. What has happened with the No Child Left Behind Act, it was under funded by this Congress. It didn't come up

with the dollars that the President promised. So school district after school district after school district, in order to balance their ledger with this unfunded mandate, have been cutting arts and they have been cutting physical education.

Now, I am pleased to hear that in your district you are able to maintain a physical teacher and you are able to maintain the things that you need to keep your children fit. But district after district has been cutting physical education in order to pay for the unfunded tests in No Child Left Behind. And childhood obesity is a problem.

This might be the first generation that does not live as long as their parents. Now, my children and the children in my neighborhood, I would like to see them not only outlive me but outlive me in a very, very healthy lifestyle. And physical education is part of learning, mind and body, in order to be productive and healthy. This is going to keep America healthy, but it is also going to keep our health care costs down, which we know we have to get under control.

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to bring to the House the following facts: We have been at this bill now for the better part of yesterday. We have been on this bill since 10:30 this morning, and we have been trying to negotiate a unanimous consent agreement so that Members might be able to leave here tomorrow night. I know there is a CODEL of Members going to Iraq but I want to put them on notice now. I doubt very much that you are going to make it unless you want to miss a lot of votes because as things are developing, I am told that right now, because of the insistence that a number of amendments, which we have heard time and time again, will still be subjected to 40 minutes' debate time even though there are five similar amendments, each of which will take about 40 minutes. When you calculate it all, it comes out to about 800 minutes of debate time. That means roughly 13 hours. By the time you account for slippage, the time it takes for Members to be recognized, the time it takes for them to find their amendments, you have to add about another 5 hours plus your voting time.

What that means is that if we continue until 1 o'clock this morning, it will still probably be required for Members to be here until about 8 o'clock or later tomorrow night, which means that we will finish just in time for you to all miss your planes.

I just wanted you to know that so that if you think that you would like to see another result, you talk to individuals who right now seem to think that 40 minutes' time on a repetitive

amendment is more important than ending a filibuster by amendment.

Two years ago when this bill was on the floor, it took about 12 hours. At this rate it will take about three times that amount of time. So I want Members who are coming up to me asking me about whether they are going to be able to make their planes or their CODELs, I want them to understand that if they miss them, I want them to know who to blame because it is not going to be me.

□ 1430

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I will not use the whole 5 minutes. I just want to make one point.

The gentlelady from Minnesota, I believe, who was just speaking, I want to concur with a portion of her remarks with, A, the remarks with regard to the physical problem with childhood obesity in the country, and that is of a concern nationally. And, B, the problem that she set out with regard to NCLB not funding to the level necessary so that school districts across the country are put in what you might call a catch-22 situation.

And a catch-22 is, okay, do we, A, comply with NCLB? In which case we spend a lot of our own money on tests, fourth and 8th grade reading and math tests; or, B, if you don't comply with it, then of course you get written up in the local newspaper because your school failed, or your school didn't do very well on the test and you've become an underperforming school. And, instead, provide the funds where you would like to put them, which may well be in physical education programs.

So I concur with her comments on that and suggest that the solution to the problem may be multifaceted. Part of it is the gentleman's amendment right here can be one aspect to address it. And I support the gentleman's amendment to make sure that the dollars that are coming from the Federal Government go to those programs that are effectively getting the job done, including the issue of physical education and childhood obesity and what have you. And just like all the other amendments, I'm sure the gentleman will concur that you want to make sure that the money goes to those programs that really accomplish something, and are not duplicative.

The other aspect of the problem, however, is with NCLB and the burden that they put on the schools as saying, do I do this or do I do that; do I comply with NCLB, or do I do what I really want to do locally? And I think the answer to that is to say this: NCLB is just too top down, ordering the schools, basically you've got to do this or you've got to do that when, with all due respect to all the educated, I'll say

bureaucrats, who are in the U.S. Department of Education and in all due respect to the Secretary of Education, a very nice lady and well-intentioned, the people who really can decide where the dollars can be spent best is the teacher in the classroom, the local school board in conjunction with the parents. They know whether their school has more of a problem in the area of childhood obesity than other schools. I find that, from the studies that I've seen, that it is in certain areas of States and certain demographic regions as opposed to other ones. Those are the people who really know how to decide these things.

And so I would concur with the gentlelady from Minnesota and suggest that the solution is, A, put the money where the dollar should go to effectively; and, B, get out from under the rubric of NCLB and just let the schools, the teachers, the parents, the local school boards first and foremost make those decisions, because they know best.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the committee, Mr. OBEY.

Mr. OBEY. I'm happy to engage the gentleman.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Chairman, Oconaluftee Job Corps Center in Cherokee, North Carolina, has served a vital role in providing opportunity and direction to the young people of western North Carolina. This center has operated under the control of the National Parks Service along with the Harpers Ferry Job Corps Center and the Great Onyx Jobs Corps Center in Mammoth Cave, Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, all three of these centers face uncertain future. Earlier this year, the Department of Labor closed the Oconaluftee center without warning, citing safety concerns. The U.S. Forest Service has expressed interest in fixing these safety concerns and reopening the Oconaluftee center. The U.S. Forest Service has also proposed to assume management of the other two centers. The National Park Service has stated it is willing to transition these three centers to the Forest Service.

The U.S. Forest Service has a longstanding tradition of quality and service in the Appalachian region.

Mr. Chairman, the Senate Interior Appropriations bill contains language directing the Park Service to transfer control of these three Job Corps centers to the U.S. Forest Service. The community surrounding the Oconaluftee Job Corps Center is in favor of this transition.

Mr. Chairman, would you be willing to work with me to ensure that this language is included in the final conference version of this bill?

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to thank the gentleman for bringing to our attention the important work that the U.S. Forest Service has done in running its 19 Job Corps centers.

I have reviewed the provision in the Senate Interior Appropriations bill. I support retaining the language in conference that directs the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to execute an agreement to transfer the three Job Corps centers currently administered by the National Park Service to the U.S. Forest Service.

I hope the Department of Labor will recognize the merits of this approach which I understand was successful in another case involving the Mingo Job Corps Center in Missouri several years ago.

I also understand that the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture support this approach and expect to work cooperatively with the Secretary of Labor on this matter.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your continued cooperation and help.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

For carrying out part A of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6811 et seq.), \$774,614,000, which shall become available on July 1, 2008, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009, except that 6.5 percent of such amount shall be available on October 1, 2007, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009, to carry out activities under section 3111(c)(1)(C) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 6821(c)(1)(C)).

SPECIAL EDUCATION

For carrying out the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.), \$12,310,831,000, of which \$5,467,594,000 shall become available on July 1, 2008, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009, and of which \$6,641,982,000 shall become available on October 1, 2008, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009, for academic year 2008–2009: *Provided*, That \$11,880,000 shall be for the activities authorized by section 674(c)(1)(D) of such Act: *Provided further*, That the amount for section 611(b)(2) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1411(b)(2)) shall be equal to the lesser of the amount available for that activity during fiscal year 2007, increased by the amount of inflation as specified in section 619(d)(2)(B) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1419(d)(2)(B)) or the percentage increase in the funds appropriated under section 611(i) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1411(i)).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FERGUSON

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order, and I would ask that the Clerk read the amendment. We don't have a copy.

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

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON:

Page 84, line 24, after the aggregate dollar amount insert "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 92, line 17, after the first dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer this amendment to this important bill that would add an additional \$50 million to help American students who require special education.

First, I want to commend the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for their outstanding efforts to recognize that insufficient funds for special education that are so desperately needed in this country, I know that in committee they added an additional \$335 million to IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. But having talked to and listened to the stories from teachers and educators and parents from my district and elsewhere who work in special education in my home State of New Jersey, I believe we must try to do even more, and we can certainly do more to recognize the important needs of these particular students and these particular programs.

Mr. Chairman, Congress, in 1975, enacted the landmark IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, which mandated that every student, including those students who have special needs or disabilities will receive a quality and appropriate public education. The law also committed the Federal Government to contribute 40 percent of special education costs, which are often several times higher than the cost of educating other students.

Washington, of course, has never met this long-standing, but unfulfilled, commitment to aid States in paying for special education. And as a former teacher, I know firsthand the value of education for every student and the importance of ensuring that every child, including those who have disabilities, experience the thrill of learning.

School administrators and teachers and parents all across my district tell me that more special education funding is needed to meet the growing demands in our schools. As teachers seek to improve academic standards and accountability, increased Federal special education funding is critically important to help schools to meet these important obligations to special education students and their families.

Washington, as we know, has never met that 40 percent funding threshold. And while Federal education funding has increased by more than 258 percent between 1995 and 2006, this year it still only represents 17.2 percent of the cost of serving students with disabilities.

My home State of New Jersey is a national leader in special education. Parents with kids who have special needs and disabilities literally move into our State. They come to New Jersey, particularly parents who have children

with autism, they literally move to New Jersey so their kids can enroll in our State's special education programs.

This year alone, New Jersey education officials estimate that they're going to spend more than \$4 billion in combined Federal, State and local funds to administer special ed programs to almost 250,000 students. Of course there's more than 7 million students nationwide who qualify for these programs.

Mr. Chairman, I have been in this House for 6½ years. And I know that certain years funding levels for special education have been increased and other years they have not been increased. It can be fairly characterized as kind of going in fits and starts. Some years we've made big and new investments, and other years, frankly, we haven't.

Six years ago, when I first came to this House and to this Chamber, the first bill I ever introduced in this body was a bill that would fully fund our special education classrooms. I did it with the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY). He and I have worked together, and I know many others have worked together, to work to fully fund our special education classrooms. Indeed, today I remain and I am the lead Republican sponsor of legislation right now that would fully fund our special education classrooms. But despite many of our best efforts, we have not reached that goal yet. And I know that the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and the ranking member, Mr. WALSH from New York, they have made extraordinary efforts toward this goal as well.

The spirit of this amendment, my amendment, is to make for this year one additional effort to move us in the right direction. Like many of you, I've been in these classrooms. I've observed some of our special needs kids in action. I've seen the heroic efforts of their parents and their teachers and the administrators who work so hard to give them the chance at success in life that they really need and deserve.

We've done some to help them. And this bill today, frankly, does even more. But thanks to the efforts of Chairman OBEY and Mr. WALSH, and others, I really know we are working hard toward this goal. But I respectfully ask that we try to do just a little bit more this year, and by approving this amendment we will be able to do that.

I ask my colleagues respectfully to support this important amendment so that we can say we did everything we probably could to help these students who need that extra chance in life.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman continue to reserve?

Mr. OBEY. I withdraw my reservation of the point of order and move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply ask the House one question: Do we really know everything that we need to know about how children learn? Do we really know enough about how children learn to guarantee that every child will perform to their maximum ability and potential? I think the answer to that is obvious: we obviously don't.

There is no great political constituency for educational research. But you know it's a funny thing, in any field of endeavor, research is what separates bull gravy from intelligent approaches to issues. That's what research does: it helps lead one to a right understanding of a problem.

What this amendment is, frankly, it's another television ad. What this amendment does is to pretend that it does no damage to education by eliminating \$50 million out of the educational research budget. It then puts it into special education.

We have a lot of posing for holy pictures on this floor by Members who are trying to escape the fact that the White House is asking them to vote against this bill because the White House claims there is too much money in the bill when, in fact, every single one of these amendments demonstrates that our own Republican Members know that there is not enough money in this bill to fund programs like special education unless you make damaging cuts to other portions of the bill. And I would suggest that we not do that.

The President cut special education in his budget by \$291 million. We have added \$800 million in the committee bill to that, and we're \$509 million over last year.

I would also point out that this is a 10 percent cut, if this amendment passes, in the research account. And I would point out that this amendment would cut the National Center for Education Statistics, which is the premier educational statistical operation in the country. This amendment would even cut Federal research funds for special education. Do we really know so much about the needs of special education kids that we're going to cut that research? I don't think so.

I think the responsible vote is "no," and I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. 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 New Jersey will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

REHABILITATION SERVICES AND DISABILITY RESEARCH

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.), the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), and the Helen Keller National Center Act (29 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.), \$3,279,743,000: *Provided*, That \$30,452,000 shall be used for carrying out the Assistive Technology Act of 1998.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, again I reserve a point of order, and I would ask that the Clerk read the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

Page 85, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,279,000)".

□ 1445

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise right now to offer what really is a modest amendment with the hopes of returning some degree of discipline to the annual appropriation process. When the President submitted his budget request, he proposed the elimination of a number of programs that were duplicative and unable to demonstrate effectiveness or otherwise not worthy of the priority of spending American taxpayers' money.

Generally speaking, with the savings achieved from eliminating ineffective programs, we can use it to do things such as pay off the debt or support programs that have a proven track record of success. I guess that last line I should reiterate: To support programs that already have a track record of success.

As I also often do, I will refer this back and make the analogy back to the American families' budget. This is really no different from what American families do every month at the proverbial dinner table. Think, for example, when it comes to TV. If a family is paying for both cable TV and DirecTV, or what I have in my house, Dish TV, chances are that they would probably decide which service suits them best as a family, and then cut one or both of the other services out. You only need one service coming into the house; cable, Direct, Dish or what have you. That is what a family would do; prioritize them.

Mr. Chairman, given the content of our spending bills, if the Federal Government were a homeowner and how the Federal Government operates now, well, it would pay for both the cable TV, the Dish and DirecTV, and the cable at the same time, satellite, all three or four coming into the house.

If the Federal Government were a family and they continued to operate as they do right now, they would prob-

ably decide that they were going to have gas heat in their house and oil heat in their house and electric heat in their house and wood heat as well. It would probably pay to dig for its own water and have a well in the backyard, all the while continuing to pay for city water coming into the house from the front.

That, unfortunately, is how the Federal Government operates itself. I think it is time to change. We do a disservice to the American people by not eliminating duplicative and ineffective programs. It proves that the Federal Government is unaccountable. By increasing the size of the U.S. budget, it takes that money, again, out of the family budget by sending it to Washington as tax dollars.

So the amendment that I am offering now would only reduce this by \$2.3 billion, out of a \$607 billion appropriation. I used the paper before while I was sitting here trying to figure out how much of a percentage of that is. That is a .0002 percentage point reduction. I think what it does do, more importantly, is to make a statement that there are truly areas within the Federal budget where money can be saved.

What my amendment does is restore funding to the level requested in the President's budget. The administration zeroed this account out because it duplicates other Federal programs. The Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers, the MSFW, Program provides discretionary grants to make comprehensive vocational rehabilitation services available to migrant and seasonal farm workers with vocational disabilities. Now, if I ended right there you would think, well, what is wrong with that?

Well, according to the OMB, here is the problem: This program serves the exact same population and provides the exact same services as another separate Federal program already is doing, and that is the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants Program. The acronym is VR. The authorizing legislation for the VR State Grants Program contains provisions in it to ensure that State VR agencies must reach out and serve all individuals with disabilities within the State. That includes minorities and unserved and underserved populations.

So what this means is that under the MSFW program, which is what we are talking about here, the Federal Government is in essence micromanaging, if you will, what essentially is a State and local government issue that is provided Federal funds through the VR program. The VR State Grants Program in the bill already is expanded by \$36 million on top of the increases that were there before in the fiscal year 2007 levels.

So there is little need to be spending an additional \$2.3 million on, yet again, a separate program that does essentially the same thing. The government, you see, does not need to buy both cable TV and satellite TV at the same time. The government does not need to

be providing funding for programs that do the exact same thing.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order and would move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his point of order.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if anybody remembers these words: "Whatsoever you do for the least of your brethren, you do for Me." I wonder if anybody remembers those words?

This amendment is truly amazing to me. This amendment is offered by a Member of the House, who, like me, any time he has an ache or a pain or a toothache or is having a bad day, can trot down to the Attending Physician and have the doctors and the nurses check us over to make sure that we are in peachy keen shape. But what does this amendment say? This amendment says to some of the poorest people in the country, our migrant and our farm workers, sorry, you can't have vocational rehabilitation services if you've got a physical problem.

I would like to ask every Member of this House, have you ever picked cucumbers during the summer? Have you ever picked beans? Well, I have. I can tell you it is darn hard work. I used to represent a county by the name of Waushara County—wall to wall irrigation and crops like cucumbers and beans. I used to watch those migrant workers come in and work their tails off to get a few bucks.

Are we really so stingy? Are we really so utilitarian that we are willing to say to workers like that, sorry, Members of Congress are important, so they can get taken care of whenever they have got a physical problem. But oh no, don't you dare waste the taxpayers' money when it comes to some poor devil in the migrant stream or when it comes to their family or kids.

You want to vote for this amendment? You go right ahead. Count me out.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment, because fundamentally what we are charged with doing here is being responsible with hard-earned taxpayer money. As the gentleman from New Jersey said, it is not responsible to pay for two programs that do the same thing, which is why the administration in its review looked at this program, which is wonderfully named, perfectly appropriate, has a wonderful mission, but the provisions of this program are being accomplished elsewhere in the Federal Government.

Now, it may be hard for the Chair of the Appropriations Committee to be-

lieve that there is some duplication in the Federal Government, but it is not hard for the citizens of the Sixth District of Georgia to believe that there is duplication. The name of the program that accomplishes this same end is the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants Program.

The goal of the gentleman from New Jersey, I don't believe, is to eliminate the ability to have appropriate programs for migrant and seasonal farm workers. That is not the goal at all. The goal is to responsibly spend hard-earned taxpayer money in accomplishing the appropriate priorities of the Federal Government. So to have anybody come to the floor and say that anybody who would support this amendment desires to end the programs for migrant and seasonal farm workers is simply not true and not the case, and it doesn't appropriately represent the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, I commend him for his desire to make certain that we do not provide duplicative services which are wasteful, wasteful of hard-earned taxpayer money.

I am pleased to yield to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

To answer the question of the gentleman, yes, I have picked vegetables and I have worked on a farm and I have thrown bales of hay and I have worked in the sweltering heat of greenhouses picking vegetables as well. So, yes, I do have that experience. So, yes, I do know of what I speak, to some extent, but never to the extent, I am sure, of the chairman or some of what the people go through in these situations.

The chairman also makes reference to words about being stingy. You know, it is awfully easy, it is awfully easy, to be a generous individual if you are using somebody else's money, and basically that is what Congress does every single day of the year. We come to the floor with the appropriation bills railing about how much more we are spending than last year and saying how generous we are, when in fact these are not our dollars. Despite the statement of the gentleman from Alaska at the last debate, these are the taxpayers' dollars coming in.

So it is easy to be generous with other people's money. What we here as Members of Congress should therefore do is consider ourselves in a position to be wards of that money, protect it and make sure that it goes to the most effective places.

I refer you now to a statement from the administration with reference to this program to point out the necessity of cutting the funding here and making sure there are funds in similar programs. The administration states this: "This program was established as a demonstration project," a demonstration project, "in the mid-1970s, and it is no longer needed to demonstrate the

benefits of these strategies to serve underserved populations such as migrant and seasonal farm workers. Many of the same States have received continued funding over the last 30 years and should be able to effectively serve this population under the VR State Grant Program," that program that has continued to be funded in this underlying legislation, that VR program that sees a \$36 million or \$37 million increase in the funding.

The gentleman from Georgia, when he speaks to what his constituents feel, I wonder what his constituents would feel when they are told that we have a demonstration project established back in 1970 and we are still following that demonstration project to see whether or not it is necessary to run the program.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments. The point about the demonstration project precisely gets to the point of so many of these programs. We do a poor job as a Federal Government in looking at programs that we put in place as pilots or demonstration projects to determine whether or not their effectiveness has been met.

I will have an amendment in a little bit that addresses a program whose mission and goal has been achieved and yet it continues to have money coming from the Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

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

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to address myself to the two gentlemen from New Jersey and from Georgia with a question: Have you ever administered and run a school, a title I school, that has an ESEA program? No.

Mr. Chairman, it is really easy to criticize and throw darts at projects or even employment, if you will, when you have no idea of what you are talking about. I was a principal of two elementary schools. Both were title I schools. Both had ESEA funding. The Federal law at that time, it is probably still in existence, said that Federal funding cannot supplant local funding.

So if you are saying that this is duplicative, it isn't. It is supplementary. It is to enhance the programs that are already existing. And the Federal Government has the responsibility to help programs and help youngsters in this country.

It is common knowledge that the State has the primary responsibility of education in their States, but the Federal Government has responsibility also. And in their good judgment in the past when they established the ESEA programs, they saw the need to help States fulfill their responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, it is probably easy to poke holes into something you don't know anything about. It is probably even easier to criticize something when you have no experience and no one is going to challenge that.

□ 1500

Mr. Chairman, I am here to challenge their premise, and would ask my colleagues not to support this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I didn't want to interrupt your comments, so I waited to be yielded time here just to respond to your statements through the Chair.

No, I have not ever administered or run a school. For that matter, I imagine that out of the 435 Members of Congress, there are probably one or two or three who have ever run or administered a school. And I would hate that to be the barometer or the test that we would have to take before we could ever propose an amendment, vote on an amendment, or even consider legislation that comes before the House. If that were the case, programs like the VR program would never be established in the first place. If the test is whether a Member of Congress has experience in it to propose a new program or expand a program, there is not enough educators here or people who have run title I schools to get the backing of legislation in the first place. So I would question the gentleman's premise.

Now the gentleman on the other hand questions our basic premise for supporting this amendment. Our basic premise is that you don't have to actually run the school to know that perhaps the best way to serve a particular segment of our country is to make sure that the dollars go to programs that are up and running and do serve that program.

The administration has looked at this and has seen that the program in place that we are talking about now has been in place since 1970 as a demonstration project. "Demonstration," the word itself connotes the fact that this is temporary in nature.

Since that time, we have the VR program, which I pointed out earlier, maybe the gentleman did not hear my testimony, the VR program handles these same services. In fact, it says: "The activities needed to successfully serve the migrant and seasonal farmwork population do not differ from those that benefit a much wider group of VR consumers." For example, the outreach activities in churches and community centers may be effective for identifying farmworkers with dis-

abilities, what this amendment deals with, but they also assist in identifying other persons with disabilities who visit these places. The hiring of bilingual counselors will assist all consumers who are monolingual in a non-English language, whether they are farmworkers or not. And the provisions of the transportation services for rural areas will benefit all rural residents, whether farmworkers or not.

The bottom line is, our basic premise is, if you are going to serve a segment of the population, in this case individuals with disabilities and migrant farmworkers, let's do so, but let's do so with programs that are already up and running and have a track record. That is what this underlying bill does. It even does it with spending \$36 million more. I think we can make sure that program runs and eliminate the duplicative program.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I will just add one thing as I have been listening to the general debate here.

It seems that quite often on this floor, particularly on the other side of the aisle, that we measure how much we care about something by how much money we spend on it. If that was the measure of everything, Paris Hilton would be the most well-adjusted kid on the planet.

It is not just how much we spend, but it is whether it is effective. It is whether it is duplicative, as we are alleging in the case of this program. It is whether it is getting the job done.

It doesn't do any good for anybody to spend money that is duplicative or that isn't effective or that wastes a lot of money along the way. That is not good for anybody. So whether it is this program, frankly, or any others, we should, in this House and on this floor, realize that we are stewards of the taxpayers' money, not just spenders of the taxpayers' money, and we should ensure that it is being well spent, not just totally spent.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

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

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. 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 New Jersey will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

For carrying out the Act of March 3, 1879 (20 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), \$17,573,000.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

For the National Technical Institute for the Deaf under titles I and II of the Education of the Deaf Act of 1986 (20 U.S.C. 4301

et seq.), \$60,757,000, of which \$1,705,000 shall be for construction and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That from the total amount available, the Institute may at its discretion use funds for the endowment program as authorized under section 207 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 4357).

GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

For the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School, the Model Secondary School for the Deaf, and the partial support of Gallaudet University under titles I and II of the Education of the Deaf Act of 1986 (20 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.), \$109,952,000: *Provided*, That from the total amount available, the University may at its discretion use funds for the endowment program as authorized under section 207 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 4357).

CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.), the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (20 U.S.C. 9201 et seq.), and subpart 4 of part D of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ("ESEA") (20 U.S.C. 7249), \$2,046,220,000, of which \$1,247,220,000 shall become available on July 1, 2008, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009, and of which \$791,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2008, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That of the amounts made available for the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, \$8,000,000 is for the postsecondary career and technical institutions under section 117 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 2327): *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided for Adult Education State Grants, \$71,622,000 shall be made available for integrated English literacy and civics education services to immigrants and other limited English proficient populations: *Provided further*, That of the amount reserved for integrated English literacy and civics education, notwithstanding section 211 of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (20 U.S.C. 9211), 65 percent shall be allocated to States based on a State's absolute need as determined by calculating each State's share of a 10-year average of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services data for immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence for the 10 most recent years, and 35 percent allocated to States that experienced growth as measured by the average of the 3 most recent years for which United States Citizenship and Immigration Services data for immigrants admitted for legal permanent residence are available, except that no State shall be allocated an amount less than \$60,000: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available for the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, \$7,000,000 shall be for national leadership activities under section 243 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 9253) and \$6,638,000 shall be for the National Institute for Literacy under section 242 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 9252): *Provided further*, That \$93,531,000 shall be available to support the activities authorized under subpart 4 of part D of title V of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7249), of which up to 5 percent shall become available October 1, 2007, and shall remain available through September 30, 2009, for evaluation, technical assistance, school networks, peer review of applications, and program outreach activities, and of which not less than 95 percent shall become available on July 1, 2008, and remain available through September 30, 2009, for grants to local educational agencies: *Provided further*, That funds made available to local educational agencies under this subpart shall be used only for activities related to establishing smaller learning communities within large high schools or small

high schools that provide alternatives for students enrolled in large high schools.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 64 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

Page 87, line 1, strike the comma and insert "and".

Page 87, line 3, strike "and" and all that follows through the first comma on line 5.

Page 87, line 5, after each dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$93,531,000)".

Page 88, line 13, strike the colon and all that follows through page 89, line 3, and insert a period.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the amendment because unless she does, we have no idea what the amendment is.

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

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. The amendment that the Clerk is currently reading is not one that I am offering.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, amendment No. 64 is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

For carrying out subparts 1, 3, and 4 of part A, part C, and part E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, \$17,464,883,000, which shall remain available through September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That, in addition, any amount made available for Academic Competitiveness Grants and National SMART Grants under section 401A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a-1) for fiscal year 2007 (in an appropriation for such fiscal year or a preceding fiscal year) that is unobligated at the end of fiscal year 2007 shall be available for Pell Grants for the 2008-2009 award year.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 65 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

Page 89, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$64,987,000)".

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for the confusion. I apologize for rising early.

This amendment is a simple amendment. It addresses the Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership program and would end the funding for

this program, saving \$65 million of hard-earned taxpayer money. The rationale is, as the administration has described and as has been recommended by the Secretary of Education's Commission on the Future of Higher Education, virtually every State operates programs to a much larger degree than the Federal Government that address this very same issue.

As I mentioned just a moment ago when I rose to another amendment, we here in Washington enact all sorts of pilot programs and all sorts of trial programs, and so very often, in fact probably more often than not, we don't go back and look as a Federal Government to see whether or not the goal or the mission of those programs has been accomplished.

Rarely, in fact, I would suggest, do we see if the goal has been accomplished. This is one in which there has been great success. The mission and the goal of the program has indeed been accomplished. It has accomplished its original objective of stimulating all States to establish need-based post-secondary student grant programs. However, beyond the establishment of these programs, the LEAP program, the Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership program itself, does little to encourage States to increase their investment in grant aid for their neediest of students or effectively targets this aid to students who could most benefit from it.

When we do look, when the Department of Education and when the Office of Management and Budget performs its assessment and reviews this program, what it says is, at this point, because the mission has been accomplished, the results of any further funding for this program are clearly not demonstrated. So in an effort to achieve again some fiscal responsibility and in an effort to decrease some of the significant waste that does occur at the Federal level, I encourage my colleagues to accept and vote for the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to figure out what we ought to be calling these amendments that have been offered for 2 days. I have concluded that we ought to call them the congressional rubber-stamp amendments, because what is happening is we are seeing amendment after amendment offered that would simply return these funding levels to the exact level recommended by the President.

Now I see story after story indicating that a good many of my friends on the other side of the aisle are anxious to separate themselves from the President these days, but we have evidently a few members of their caucus who are eager

to embrace virtually every action and every thought that comes from the White House. I find that very interesting.

The President felt we ought to eliminate this program. What does this program do? This program provides \$60 million in grants to States to offer needs-based student scholarships. There are 165,000 students who will benefit from this program, getting scholarships of \$1,000. I would simply ask, does anybody really believe that we are providing enough help for working families to send their kids to college?

The Pell Grant program is the major program upon which we rely in order to help students from lower and middle-income families find enough money to go on to college. When that program was in its heyday in the seventies, it provided over 70 percent of the cost of attending a 4-year public university. It provided help in the form of a Pell Grant to meet that percentage of the cost. Today, it is down to a little over 30 percent of the cost. So we have shifted a huge percentage of the cost to working families.

The President's answer in his budget this year was to move Pell Grants from one side of the budget to the other making it, instead of a discretionary program, a mandatory program and in the process decided he was going to pay for the increase in the Pell Grants by eliminating virtually every other student aid program on the books except Pell and Work Study.

I would suggest if you think that is a good idea, go ahead, follow the President over the cliff and vote to deny these 165,000 students the additional help they need. The money that we invest in student aid is returned to this country many times over. We are in a competitive world. Over 50 percent of the jobs that will be offered in this country in the next 7 years are jobs that will require a higher education, and it seems to me instead of running away from that obligation, we ought to be embracing it. This is a very bad idea. I urge defeat of the amendment.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for obtaining time, and I appreciate the chairman's comments.

Again, the purpose of this amendment is to address wasteful spending. It is a significant responsibility that we have here in the House to make certain that the money we spend, which is hard-earned taxpayer money, is spent wisely. I know there is huge animosity on the other side of the aisle against the President. I think sometimes that animosity actually blinds individuals to some quality work that is coming

from the administration. There are high-quality people who work in the administration, this administration, just like every other administration. In fact, there are high-quality people in the Department of Education and there are high-quality people in the Office of Management and Budget who looked at this problem and said that the goals and the mission of this program have, indeed, been accomplished. It was a wonderful program, served a grand purpose, but the goals and the missions have been accomplished. Consequently, it is appropriate, if we are going to be responsible with hard-earned taxpayer money, to end a program that has accomplished its mission, accomplished its goals, and not continue wasteful Federal spending.

□ 1515

So I would urge my colleagues, I know that they can be blinded by animosity for the President and for the administration, but I would urge my colleagues to listen to those hard-working individuals in the Federal Government who are looking at these programs and attempting to find cost savings for the American public so that we can prioritize on other programs.

That's what this amendment does. It seeks to be responsible with hard-earned taxpayer money. I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

There is none so blind who shall not see. I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia for coming to the microphones and asking all of us to open our eyes so that we shall see the values of these things, despite the personalities otherwise, and I support the gentleman's amendment from Georgia.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Madam Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia said we can eliminate the LEAP program because missions have been accomplished. The LEAP program is available for the poorest of the poor in this country. It's for people whose family incomes are less than \$20,000. Poverty, unfortunately, still goes on in this country.

People who make less than \$20,000 need help in order to obtain an education to allow them to be competitive and allow our country to be competitive against other countries which are investing dollar after dollar after dollar into educational opportunities for their individuals.

So the mission hasn't been accomplished until we eradicate poverty. So I would really urge Members to look closely at the language in the LEAP program. It also is matched by State

dollars, and I would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back 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.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ARCURI) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAPUANO, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3043) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3043, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during further consideration of H.R. 3043 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 547, notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

Pro forma amendments offered at any point in the reading by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

An amendment by Mr. PASCRELL regarding funding for Traumatic Brain Injury programs;

An amendment by Mr. NADLER regarding eligibility for 9/11 health programs;

An amendment by Mr. NADLER regarding funding for 9/11 health programs;

An amendment by Mr. BARTON of Texas regarding funding for the National Institutes of Health;

An amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey regarding funding for certain autism programs;

An amendment by Mr. HOLT regarding funding for math and science partnerships;

An amendment by Mr. COOPER regarding funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Historically Black Graduate Institutions;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE reducing funding for the Corporation for National and Community Service;

An amendment by Mr. CONAWAY limiting funds for the LIHEAP program until certain conditions are met;

An amendment by Mr. CONAWAY regarding use of reductions made through amendment for deficit reduction;

An amendment by Mr. DINGELL regarding the Deputy Commissioner of the Social Security Administration;

An amendment by Mr. GINGREY limiting funds for Social Security totalization agreements with Mexico;

An amendment by Mr. HARE regarding Critical Access Hospitals;

An amendment by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio reducing funds in the bill by 4.6 percent, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

An amendment by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma or Ms. SHEA-PORTER regarding the Upward Bound program;

An amendment by Mrs. MUSGRAVE reducing funds in the bill by 0.5 percent, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. PRICE of Georgia reducing funds in the bill by 1 percent, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. CAMPBELL of California reducing funds in the bill by 0.25 percent, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. OBEY regarding earmarks;

An amendment by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia regarding funding for student drug testing;

An amendment by Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, or Mr. WELLER of Illinois regarding certain Medicare regulations;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding the Office of Civil Rights at the Department of Education;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding Education for the Disadvantaged;

An amendment by Mr. UPTON or Ms. HARMAN regarding use of Energy Star certified light bulbs;

An amendment by Mr. PENCE limiting funds for Planned Parenthood;

An amendment by Mr. EHLERS regarding funding for math and science partnership programs;

An amendment by Mr. GINGREY or Mr. JORDAN of Ohio limiting funds regarding requirements for HPV vaccinations for school admittance;

An amendment by Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin limiting funds for certain Centers for Disease Control Activities;

An amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey limiting funds for certain international conferences;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa limiting the use of funds to employ workers described in section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa limiting the use of funds to sponsor certain events at the Sundance Film Festival;

An amendment by Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky limiting performance bonuses