

## CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 2005 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 2004 amount, the 2005 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 2005 follow:

[In thousands of dollars]

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2004 .....	\$37,048,446
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2005 .....	32,189,925
House bill, fiscal year 2005 .....	33,085,401
Senate bill, fiscal year 2005 .....	36,128,460
Conference agreement, fiscal year 2005 .....	33,085,460
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2004 .....	-3,962,986
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2005 .....	+895,535
House bill, fiscal year 2005 .....	+59
Senate bill, fiscal year 2005 .....	-3,043,000

HAROLD ROGERS,  
BILL YOUNG,  
FRANK R. WOLF,  
ZACH WAMP,  
TOM LATHAM,  
JO ANN EMERSON,  
KAY GRANGER,  
JOHN E. SWEENEY,  
DON SHERWOOD,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

THAD COCHRAN,  
TED STEVENS,  
ARLEN SPECTER,  
PETE V. DOMENICI,  
MITCH MCCONNELL,  
RICHARD SHELBY,  
JUDD GREGG,  
BEN NIGHTHORSE  
CAMPBELL,  
LARRY CRAIG,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4567,  
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider a conference report to accompany H.R. 4567; that the conference report be considered as read; and that all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration be waived.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, might I inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky if the conference report we have today as it relates to Homeland Security, his word was, 2 days ago, titles I through V absent VI, I guess we were talking about, is it identical as to what our agreement was of several days ago?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the conference report that is

being filed is precisely as it was when we left conference.

Mr. SABO. So, Mr. Speaker, there have been no changes or additions or deletions?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Correct.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

So let me be explicit. Does that mean that there is no change whatsoever from the decision made in the conference when the conference approved A-76?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

□ 1330

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield under his reservation, I at this point do not plan to object, but under the reservation of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), I just want to make one point. I referred earlier to what is happening in this House, when we see decisions made by subcommittees routinely overturned when somebody does not like them. I do not want to object, because this bill is a serious matter involving homeland security, but I must note that we are cooperating procedurally on this side of the aisle, even though this conference was gavelled to an end in a manner which prevented me from being able to get a vote on the matter that I discussed earlier on the previous bill, and in my judgment that was a slap in the face, not just to me, but to every member of the conference on both sides of the aisle who were prepared to support that motion.

I think that when this House routinely allows votes to be reversed, as they were on the Medicare bill weeks ago, or when they allow conference committees to block what is clearly the action of the majority will in the subcommittees, then this House might as well not operate at all. We might as well just wire our respective buttons to our respective party leaders' offices and go get a steak somewhere for the remainder of the year.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear that the A-76 provision has not been arbitrarily removed. I wish I could say the same thing with respect to the extension of the milk program to which I referred several weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, I will not object to consideration of the bill.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous

order of the House, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4567) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see immediately prior proceedings of the House of today.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 4567, and that I may include tabular material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my intention is to be brief, and I hope that the debate today is brief because of the hour and the day of the week and the day of the session.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to present to the body the second-ever conference report for the Department of Homeland Security. This agreement provides \$32 billion for the Department. That is \$1.1 billion above the current level and \$496 million over the President's request. These amounts exclude the \$2 billion supplemental provided in September for Hurricanes Charlie and Francis, as well as the \$6.5 billion in supplemental funding formally included in as part of this bill for Ivan and Jeanne. Including these funds, the Department will receive \$38.5 billion in fiscal year 2005.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not mention my concerns over attempts to add extraneous matters to this bill. I appreciate the desire by some people to attach legislative riders to appropriations bills. After all, appropriations bills are must-do legislation. However, these attempts, and in particular the actions taken by the other body to add extraneous matter, have led to unnecessary delays in the consideration of this bill that funds important homeland security programs.

My colleagues might be interested to know that FEMA is running out of money. Despite the \$2 billion given to FEMA just 4 weeks ago, the pot is almost empty, practically drained dry. There is an unprecedented amount of work to be done in the country because

of Hurricanes Charlie, Francis, Ivan and Jeanne, and, simply put, without some very creative accounting, FEMA would be out of money today.

I am pleased that the Military Construction conference agreement includes emergency funds to help Florida, especially, recover from the devastation of the recent hurricanes, providing an additional \$5.6 billion for those efforts.

Mr. Speaker, in just one year, the Department of Homeland Security has made tremendous progress. More work obviously needs to be done, but the Department, I think, is clearly on the right track, identifying our vulnerabilities, matching them to threats and putting out guidance on ways to protect our homeland. The conference agreement builds upon the successes of the past year and includes initiatives to move us closer to our goals of prevention, preparedness and response.

In the interests of time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight just a few of the items included in the proposed agreement, items I know are of interest to all of the Members.

First, there is \$4 billion in the bill for our first responders. The agreement strikes a balance between funding high-risk communities and providing support for States and localities to achieve and maintain minimum levels of preparedness.

The bill includes \$1.1 billion for the basic formula grants and \$1.2 billion to improve security in our urban and most populated areas.

There is \$9.8 billion in the bill for border protection and related activities, including \$145 million for new inspection and detection technologies. There is \$340 million for the U.S. Visit Program, and there is \$1.1 billion for detention and removal operations on our borders. The conferees provide \$26.5 million in new funding to provide 750 additional beds for detainees, permit removal of 5,000 additional deportable aliens, and reduce the risk that such aliens will be released into our communities while they await deportation.

This funding will also advance our efforts to create smart borders that keep terrorists out without stemming the flow of free commerce or legitimate travel into and from the country.

Thirdly, the conference agreement supports security for all modes of transportation, including \$5.1 billion for the Transportation Security Administration, with \$673 million for our Federal air marshals program. There is \$118 million in the bill for air cargo screening, which we hear so much about. This money will support the hiring of 100 new air cargo inspectors, the development of new cargo screening technology and the expansion of canine enforcement teams. The bill also requires TSA to triple the number of cargo inspections on passenger aircraft.

Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker, in case someone may have questioned

what I said. This bill requires the Transportation Security Administration to triple the number of cargo inspections on passenger planes.

The agreement also funds several initiatives for rail security, including \$150 million for grants to high threat rail systems, hiring and deploying rail security inspectors and canine teams to screen for explosives and furthering intelligence-related activities.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there is \$1.1 billion for science and technology, targeting the research and development of technologies to detect biohazards and nuclear detection technology for cargo. We also continue to fully fund R&D for anti-missile devices aimed at commercial aircraft.

Finally, there is \$894 million for the information analysis and infrastructure protection. That is a mouthful, but it is to complete an inventory of critical infrastructure in the country, enhance current communications between Federal, State and local homeland security personnel, interoperability, if you will, and to assist local communities as they put protective measures in place to protect our hometowns.

Mr. Speaker, the important work of the Department of Homeland Security cannot be emphasized enough. I believe this conference agreement builds on the progress of the past year and substantially furthers the protection of our homeland. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee will soon bid farewell to our Congressional Fellow, Lt. Ben Nicholson, who has served the Committee on Appropriations over the past three years in two different Subcommittees.

Lt. Ben Nicholson has been detailed to the Committee from the United States Coast Guard since 2001. He served initially with the Transportation Subcommittee; spent a year helping establish the new Transportation-Treasury Subcommittee; and this year came to work with the Homeland Security Subcommittee. Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee had never had a detailee from the Coast Guard. Lt. Ben Nicholson was a pathbreaker for the service in that role, and he performed admirably. He did everything we asked of him, with pinpoint accuracy and usually ahead of time. I would also add that he served the Committee during interesting times, perhaps more interesting than he imagined when he accepted the job. Eight months after he began, the 9/11 terrorist attacks occurred. Immediately after that, the anthrax attacks occurred. He assisted the Committee in overseeing the establishment of the Transportation Security Administration, including key analysis, which demonstrated the overstaffing of screening personnel in smaller airports. He made sure that shipbuilding loans for the Maritime Administration were contingent upon management improvements in the contracting and oversight process. And he properly evaluated, and helped us provide for, critical facility repairs at MARAD's James River Reserve Fleet, which was devastated by Hurricane Isabel last year. Ben's maritime experience and background were simply invaluable to our Committee.

On the Homeland Subcommittee, we have benefited from the experience Lt. Nicholson gained as a Coast Guard Officer, in particular his insights into the operations of a complex military organization that is combined with a large domestic agency. He has superb analytical skills that have been critical in our review of a \$32 billion budget request and in developing complex spreadsheets that synthesize funding issues into easily understood documents we have used in hearings, closed briefings, in Full Committee, and on the floor. His infectious energy, his focus, and superb analytic and technical skills have also helped keep the momentum for this bill moving forward. His high standards of professionalism and thoroughness are beyond reproach, and his contributions have been highly valued.

Through all of this, Ben maintained the decorum and professionalism that we have all come to expect from our military officer corps, and he has represented the Coast Guard with the highest integrity and competence. Lt. Nicholson has served me, this Subcommittee, the Transportation-Treasury Subcommittee, and the House well. We are sorry to see him leave, and will miss him as our colleague—but are glad to count him as a friend. Each of us on the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee wish Ben all the best as he moves forward in his career, where we anticipate seeing great things of him in the coming years.

I am grateful for his contributions.

Mr. Speaker, the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee will soon bid farewell to our Congressional Fellow, Brian Dunlop, who has served the Committee on Appropriations over the past 2 years in two different Subcommittees.

Mr. Dunlop will soon be leaving to resume duties as a senior Special Agent for the U.S. Secret Service. Special Agent Dunlop came to the former Treasury-Postal Subcommittee during the summer of 2002, and has proven himself indispensable to the smooth functioning of the Committee during the intense period surrounding the planning for, and inauguration of, the new Homeland Security Department and the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee. His strong understanding of organizational dynamics, of operational issues and real-world, real-time considerations for building a successful new Department contributed significantly to the success of this subcommittee. Brian brought to the appropriations process clear, thoughtful analysis and mature judgment developed in his successful career in criminal investigation and protective operations. He has clearly mastered the technical issues and folkways of the appropriations process and he undoubtedly has as good a working knowledge of the nooks and crannies of the Department of Homeland Security as anyone working there.

Special Agent Dunlop has provided insight into sensitive law enforcement and security matters involved in setting up and overseeing DHS in its capacity as the newest member of the Intelligence Community. In this capacity, he facilitated the work of this Subcommittee by developing detailed analyses, preparing classified briefings, writing easy to understand fact-sheets and briefing packages on extremely technical issues; and developing and implementing complicated oversight travel for the Subcommittee. Brian has also been the "go to" man when the Subcommittee required answers on crosscutting law enforcement issues,

such as coordinating the security efforts of multiple agencies during high threat periods; as well as developing consistency in professional standards, training, and gun use policies throughout DHS.

Brian was instrumental in evaluating the need to deploy Infrastructure Protection personnel to states and localities, whose responsibility will be to work with the public and private sector to implement security measures to protect critical infrastructure. His analysis and

recommendations will have lasting effects, as protective security advisors will now be on site in every state in order to better secure our nation's infrastructure.

Throughout his service here, Brian has shown unqualified professionalism, perception, and the great combination of a keen sense of humor, a cool head, and a modesty rarely seen on Capitol Hill. Special Agent Dunlop has served me, this Subcommittee, and the House well. We are sorry to see him leave,

and will miss him as our colleague—but are glad to count him as a friend. Each of us on the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee wish Brian all the best as he moves forward in his career, where we anticipate seeing great things of him in the coming years.

I am grateful for his contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY - FY 2005 (H.R. 4567)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY</b>						
<b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS</b>						
Departmental Operations						
Office of the Secretary and Executive Management.....	80,317	102,623	80,227	82,206	85,034	+4,717
Office of the Under Secretary for Management.....	130,210	302,864	129,356	245,579	151,153	+20,943
Office of the Chief Financial Officer.....	---	---	13,000	---	13,000	+13,000
Office of the Chief Procurement Officer.....	---	---	7,734	---	---	---
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	---	---	60,139	---	275,270	+275,270
Total, Departmental operations.....	210,527	405,287	290,456	327,785	524,457	+313,930
Department-wide technology investments.....	183,784	226,000	211,000	222,000	---	-183,784
Office of Inspector General						
Operating expenses.....	58,318	82,317	82,317	82,317	82,317	+23,999
(By transfer).....	(22,000)	---	---	---	---	(-22,000)
Total, Office of Inspector General.....	(80,318)	(82,317)	(82,317)	(82,317)	(82,317)	(+1,999)
Total, title I, Departmental Management and Operations:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	452,629	713,604	583,773	632,102	606,774	+154,145
(By transfer).....	(22,000)	---	---	---	---	(-22,000)
<b>TITLE II - SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS</b>						
Office of the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security.....	8,058	10,371	10,371	8,864	9,617	+1,559
U.S. Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology	328,053	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	+11,947
Customs and Border Protection						
Salaries and expenses.....	4,367,430	4,577,491	4,609,441	4,463,960	4,531,119	+163,689
Harbor maintenance fee collection (trust fund)....	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	---
Rescission.....	---	---	---	---	-63,010	-63,010
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	4,370,430	4,580,491	4,612,441	4,466,960	4,471,109	+100,679
Automation modernization.....	438,520	449,909	449,909	449,909	449,909	+11,389
Air and marine operations.....	---	---	---	---	257,535	+257,535
Construction (border patrol).....	89,830	91,718	91,718	91,718	91,718	+1,888
Total, Direct appropriations.....	4,898,780	5,122,118	5,154,068	5,008,587	5,270,271	+371,491
Fee accounts.....	(1,044,327)	(1,079,004)	(1,100,551)	(1,079,004)	(1,079,004)	(+34,677)
Total, Customs and border protection.....	(5,943,107)	(6,201,122)	(6,254,619)	(6,087,591)	(6,349,275)	(+406,168)
Immigration and Customs Enforcement						
Salaries and expenses.....	2,138,358	2,370,906	2,377,006	2,413,438	2,438,494	+300,136
Rescission.....	-54,000	---	---	---	---	+54,000
Federal air marshals.....	622,704	612,900	662,900	662,900	662,900	+40,196
Federal protective service.....	424,211	478,000	478,000	478,000	478,000	+53,789
Offsetting fee collections.....	---	-478,000	-478,000	-478,000	-478,000	-478,000
Automation modernization.....	39,764	39,605	39,605	39,605	39,605	-159
Air and marine operations.....	208,960	257,535	257,535	267,535	---	-208,960
Construction.....	26,617	26,179	26,179	26,179	26,179	-438
Total, Direct appropriations.....	3,406,614	3,307,125	3,363,225	3,409,657	3,167,178	-239,436
Fee accounts.....	(273,000)	(225,375)	(225,375)	(250,375)	(200,000)	(-73,000)
Total, Immigration and customs enforcement.....	(3,679,614)	(3,532,500)	(3,588,600)	(3,660,032)	(3,367,178)	(-312,436)
Transportation Security Administration						
Aviation security.....	3,724,112	4,238,184	4,270,564	4,386,083	4,323,523	+599,411
Maritime and land security.....	261,449	29,000	65,000	44,000	48,000	-213,449
Credentialing activities.....	---	67,000	67,000	67,000	67,000	+67,000
Intelligence.....	13,520	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	+480
Research and development.....	154,285	154,000	174,000	181,000	178,000	+23,715
Administration.....	424,679	539,852	524,852	534,852	519,852	+95,173
Aviation security capital fund.....	---	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(+250,000)
Subtotal, Transportation Security Administration (gross).....	4,578,045	5,042,016	5,115,416	5,226,935	5,150,375	+572,330

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY - FY 2005 (H.R. 4567)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
<b>Offsetting fee collections:</b>						
Aviation security fees.....	-2,070,000	-2,223,000	-1,823,000	-1,823,000	-1,823,000	+247,000
Credentialing fees.....	---	-67,000	-67,000	-67,000	-67,000	-67,000
Subtotal, offsetting collections.....	-2,070,000	-2,290,000	-1,890,000	-1,890,000	-1,890,000	+180,000
<b>Total, Transportation Security Administration (net).....</b>						
	2,508,045	2,752,016	3,225,416	3,336,935	3,260,375	+752,330
<b>United States Coast Guard</b>						
Operating expenses.....	4,347,256	4,833,220	3,967,220	4,063,220	3,953,220	-394,036
Defense function.....	337,994	340,000	1,204,000	1,090,000	1,204,000	+866,006
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-106).....	23,183	---	---	---	---	-23,183
Rescissions.....	-71,000	---	---	---	---	+71,000
Subtotal, Operating expenses.....	4,637,433	5,173,220	5,171,220	5,153,220	5,157,220	+519,787
Environmental compliance and restoration.....	16,900	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000	+100
Reserve training.....	94,440	117,000	113,000	117,000	113,000	+18,560
Acquisition, construction, and improvements.....	961,492	942,550	936,550	1,062,550	982,200	+20,708
Rescissions.....	---	---	-33,000	---	-16,000	-16,000
Subtotal, Acquisition, construction, and improvements.....	961,492	942,550	903,550	1,062,550	966,200	+4,708
Alteration of bridges.....	19,136	---	16,400	15,400	15,900	-3,236
Research, development, test, and evaluation.....	14,912	---	---	18,500	18,500	+3,588
Subtotal, U.S. Coast Guard discretionary.....	5,744,313	6,249,770	6,221,170	6,383,670	6,287,820	+543,507
Retired pay (mandatory).....	1,020,000	1,085,460	1,085,460	1,085,460	1,085,460	+65,460
Total, United States Coast Guard.....	6,764,313	7,335,230	7,306,630	7,469,130	7,373,280	+608,967
<b>United States Secret Service</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	1,130,570	1,159,125	1,179,125	1,159,125	1,172,125	+41,555
Operating expenses (rescission).....	---	---	---	---	-750	-750
Acquisition, construction, improvements, and related expenses.....	3,558	3,633	3,633	3,633	3,633	+75
Total, United States Secret Service.....	1,134,128	1,162,758	1,182,758	1,162,758	1,175,008	+40,880
<b>Total, title II, Security, Enforcement, and Investigations:</b>						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	19,047,991	20,029,618	20,582,468	20,735,931	20,595,729	+1,547,738
Appropriations.....	(19,149,808)	(20,029,618)	(20,615,468)	(20,735,931)	(20,675,489)	(+1,525,681)
Emergency appropriations.....	(23,183)	---	---	---	---	(-23,183)
Rescissions.....	(-125,000)	---	(-33,000)	---	(-79,760)	(+45,240)
<b>TITLE III - PREPAREDNESS AND RECOVERY</b>						
<b>Office for State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	---	---	41,432	25,000	3,546	+3,546
State and local programs.....	3,267,608	3,061,255	3,423,900	2,845,081	3,086,300	-181,308
Firefighter assistance grants.....	745,575	500,000	650,000	700,000	715,000	-30,575
Emergency management planning grants.....	---	---	---	180,000	180,000	+180,000
Total, Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness.....	4,013,183	3,561,255	4,115,332	3,750,081	3,984,846	-28,337
Counterterrorism fund.....	9,941	20,000	10,000	10,000	8,000	-1,941
<b>Emergency Preparedness and Response</b>						
<b>Office of the Under Secretary for Emergency Preparedness and Response</b>						
Preparedness and Response.....	3,430	4,211	4,211	4,211	4,211	+781
Preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery.....	223,673	208,499	210,499	231,499	239,499	+15,826
Operating expenses (rescission).....	-3,000	---	---	---	-5,000	-2,000
Administrative and regional operations.....	166,015	146,939	203,939	146,939	202,939	+36,924
Defense function.....	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	---
Subtotal, Administrative and regional operations.....	166,015	196,939	203,939	196,939	202,939	+36,924
Public health programs.....	481,144	34,000	34,000	34,000	34,000	-447,144

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY - FY 2005 (H.R. 4567)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Radiological emergency preparedness program.....	---	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000
Biodefense countermeasures.....	884,749	---	---	---	---	-884,749
Advance appropriations.....	4,703,000	---	---	---	---	-4,703,000
Advance appropriations, FY 2005.....	---	2,528,000	2,528,000	2,528,000	2,528,000	+2,528,000
Subtotal, Biodefense countermeasures.....	5,587,749	2,528,000	2,528,000	2,528,000	2,528,000	-3,059,749
Disaster relief.....	1,789,380	2,151,000	2,042,380	2,151,000	2,042,380	+253,000
(Transfer to Office of the Inspector General).....	(-22,000)	---	---	---	---	(+22,000)
Red Cross (emergency appropriations).....	---	---	---	70,000	---	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-106).....	500,000	---	---	---	---	-500,000
Emergency rescission (P.L. 108-199).....	-225,000	---	---	---	---	+225,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-303).....	2,000,000	---	---	---	---	-2,000,000
Subtotal, Disaster relief.....	4,064,380	2,151,000	2,042,380	2,221,000	2,042,380	-2,022,000
Disaster assistance direct loan program account: (Limitation on direct loans).....	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	---
Administrative expenses.....	557	567	567	567	567	+10
Flood map modernization fund.....	198,820	200,000	150,000	200,000	200,000	+1,180
National flood insurance fund:						
Salaries and expenses.....	32,663	33,336	33,336	33,336	33,336	+673
Flood mitigation.....	77,809	79,257	79,257	79,257	79,257	+1,448
Offsetting fee collections.....	---	-112,593	-112,593	-112,593	-112,593	-112,593
(Transfer to Mitigation grants).....	---	(-20,000)	---	(-20,000)	---	---
(Transfer to National flood mitigation fund).....	(-20,000)	---	(-20,000)	---	(-20,000)	---
Subtotal, National flood insurance fund.....	110,472	---	---	---	---	-110,472
National flood mitigation fund (by transfer).....	(20,000)	---	(20,000)	---	(20,000)	---
National pre-disaster mitigation fund.....	149,115	---	100,000	---	100,000	-49,115
Mitigation grants.....	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	---
(By transfer).....	---	(20,000)	---	(20,000)	---	---
Subtotal, Mitigation grants.....	---	(170,000)	---	(170,000)	---	---
Emergency management performance grants.....	178,938	---	---	---	---	-178,938
Emergency food and shelter.....	152,097	153,000	153,000	153,000	153,000	+903
Cerro Grande fire claims.....	37,837	---	---	---	---	-37,837
<b>Total, Emergency Preparedness and Response.....</b>	<b>11,351,227</b>	<b>5,625,216</b>	<b>5,425,596</b>	<b>5,718,216</b>	<b>5,498,596</b>	<b>-5,852,631</b>
<b>Total, title III, Preparedness and Recovery:</b>						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	15,374,351	9,206,471	9,550,928	9,478,297	9,491,442	-5,882,909
Appropriations.....	(8,399,351)	(6,678,471)	(7,022,928)	(6,880,297)	(6,968,442)	(-1,430,909)
Emergency appropriations.....	(2,500,000)	---	---	(70,000)	---	(-2,500,000)
Advance appropriations.....	(4,703,000)	(2,528,000)	(2,528,000)	(2,528,000)	(2,528,000)	(-2,175,000)
Rescissions.....	(-3,000)	---	---	---	(-5,000)	(-2,000)
Emergency rescissions.....	(-225,000)	---	---	---	---	(+225,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	---
(Transfer out).....	(-42,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(+22,000)
(By transfer).....	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	---
<b>TITLE IV - RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING, ASSESSMENTS, AND SERVICES</b>						
* Citizenship and Immigration Services						
Operating expenses.....	234,733	140,000	160,000	140,000	160,000	-74,733
Immigration examination fee account.....	(1,564,000)	(1,571,000)	(1,571,000)	(1,546,000)	(1,571,000)	(+7,000)
Total, Citizenship and immigration services.....	(1,798,733)	(1,711,000)	(1,731,000)	(1,686,000)	(1,731,000)	(-67,733)
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center						
Salaries and expenses.....	154,506	158,440	183,440	181,440	177,440	+22,934
Acquisition, construction, improvements, and related expenses.....	37,137	37,917	37,917	42,917	44,917	+7,780
Total, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center..	191,643	196,357	221,357	224,357	222,357	+30,714
Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection						
Management and administration.....	124,263	162,064	132,064	157,064	132,064	+7,801

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY - FY 2005 (H.R. 4567)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Enacted
Assessments and evaluations.....	710,084	561,758	722,512	577,758	761,644	+51,560
Defense function.....	---	140,754	---	140,754	---	---
Subtotal, Assessments and evaluations.....	710,084	702,512	722,512	718,512	761,644	+51,560
Total, Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection.....	834,347	864,576	854,576	875,576	893,708	+59,361
Science and Technology						
Management and administration.....	43,908	52,550	68,586	52,550	68,586	+24,678
Research, development, acquisition, and operations....	868,844	579,749	1,063,713	630,647	1,046,864	+178,020
Defense function.....	---	407,000	---	386,000	---	---
Subtotal, Research, development, acquisition, and operations.....	868,844	986,749	1,063,713	1,016,647	1,046,864	+178,020
Total, Science and Technology.....	912,752	1,039,299	1,132,299	1,069,197	1,115,450	+202,698
Total, title IV, Research and Development, Training, Assessments, and Services: New budget (obligational) authority.....	2,173,475	2,240,232	2,368,232	2,309,130	2,391,515	+218,040
TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Section 518:						
Customs user fee extension.....	---	---	---	-370,000	---	---
Federal Air Marshals.....	---	---	---	50,000	---	---
Air and Marine Interdiction.....	---	---	---	200,000	---	---
SLGCP, non-profit assistance grants.....	---	---	---	50,000	---	---
Firefighter Assistance grants (Sec. 33).....	---	---	---	50,000	---	---
EMPG.....	---	---	---	20,000	---	---
Total, Sec. 518.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Section 519:						
Customs user fee extension.....	---	---	---	-414,000	---	---
CBP, salaries and expenses.....	---	---	---	150,000	---	---
ICE, salaries and expenses.....	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
SLGCP, State and local programs, rail grants.....	---	---	---	128,000	---	---
EMPG.....	---	---	---	36,000	---	---
Total, Sec. 519.....	---	---	---	---	---	---
Section 526:						
CBP, salaries and expenses.....	---	---	---	-1,000	---	---
Total, title V, General Provisions: New budget (obligational) authority.....	---	---	---	-1,000	---	---
TITLE VI - EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE						
Crop disaster assistance (sec. 601) (emergency appropriation).....	---	---	---	2,464,000	---	---
Crop insurance (sec. 601) (emergency appropriation)....	---	---	---	15,000	---	---
Livestock assistance (sec. 602) (emergency appropriation).....	---	---	---	475,000	---	---
Tree assistance (sec. 603) (emergency appropriation)....	---	---	---	20,000	---	---
Total, title VI, Emergency Agricultural Disaster Assistance: New budget (obligational) authority.....	---	---	---	2,974,000	---	---
Grand total, Department of Homeland Security:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	37,048,446	32,189,925	33,085,401	36,128,460	33,085,460	-3,962,986
Appropriations.....	(30,175,263)	(29,661,925)	(30,590,401)	(30,556,460)	(30,642,220)	(+466,957)
Emergency appropriations.....	(2,523,183)	---	---	(3,044,000)	---	(-2,523,183)
Advance appropriations.....	(4,703,000)	(2,528,000)	(2,528,000)	(2,528,000)	(2,528,000)	(-2,175,000)
Rescissions.....	(-128,000)	---	(-33,000)	---	(-84,760)	(+43,240)
Emergency rescissions.....	(-225,000)	---	---	---	---	(+225,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	---
(Transfer out).....	(-42,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(+22,000)
(By transfer).....	(42,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(-22,000)

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first let me congratulate the chairman on his work in presenting this bill to us and thank all the staff, both on the minority and majority, for their work in putting this bill together. This is a complicated bill and involved lots of hard work and many, many hours. I and all the Members appreciate the work they do for us.

I will vote for this bill, but not with a great deal of excitement. One thing one can say for this bill is that it represents a very significant improvement on the President's budget. I find it rare that any of the budgets that come from the President that relate to homeland security reflect much of what I hear in the popular media and in the popular discussion by the President and other members of the administration. Their proposals rarely reflect a point of view that homeland security is one of the highest priorities of our country.

Clearly, we made some improvements, and we have spent billions of dollars. My own judgment, however, is that the Department is much better on press releases than they are on accomplishments. Maybe they have an impossible task in terms of putting 22 different agencies into one agency in this period of time, but I still find that agency loaded with confusion, loaded with management problems, spending an incredible amount of time putting the basics together, shuffling boxes, trying to find out where money is, where money is not, all-of-a-sudden hiring freezes because somebody did not keep track of money. The basics are not there. So I think they have lots of work yet to do to focus their attention really on solving what is a significant problem in this country.

I have expressed at various times some of my specific concerns where I think they are significantly underfunding homeland security in the country, and I will not repeat those today. Let me just, however, raise one concern.

We clearly are moving backwards in funding first responders in this country.

□ 1345

Our total funding for first responders in this bill is less than it was last year. That simply does not make sense. There are some very specific programs that are being cut. One that I find very important is the Metropolitan Medical Response System, a program that predated the Department of Homeland Security, and it is being cut by around \$20 million, close to a 40 percent cut. That simply does not make sense.

But for all the Members, I think they should be particularly concerned over what is happening with the formula-based grants program in this bill, and then further complicated by the Intelligence bill that we passed yesterday in the House and the bill that passed the

Senate. Currently, the formula-based grants which flow to the States on the basis of population and for which they made plans on how they should be expended is \$1.690 billion. That program is being reduced by close to \$600 million in this bill, to \$1.1 billion, a deep cut in formula funds that flow to the States, who it is going to hurt; and at the same time, we are upping the Urban Area Security Initiative by close to \$200 million. But we are fundamentally taking money away from smaller States and from rural areas to fund the increase in the Urban Area Initiative Grant program.

Then, that is further complicated by the bill that passed the House yesterday; and it is my understanding the bill that passed the Senate. They would further reduce the formula grant back to only a basic guarantee to the States, a minimal amount, and leave everything else at the discretion of the Secretary. How the Secretary intends to distribute that fund, we do not know. We have asked and they have no answers.

So I would just suggest to all, to all of my colleagues who come from more rural areas, come from smaller-sized States, they are facing a disproportionate cut in local first responder funding in this bill in either the House or Senate Intelligence bills passed, and they will face an even deeper cut in the funding for local first responders, and I just simply think that is wrong.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We would not be here at this point in time without the gentleman whom I yield to next. This full chairman of our committee has been marvelous in this bill in helping us through. I believe this is the last of the appropriations bills that this full committee chairman will, in effect, manage before this body; and I know that he is enormously pleased with the passage, or soon to be passed, I am sure, of the MILCON bill that includes aid for his home State.

Mr. Speaker, we all owe a great debt of gratitude to this great public servant who has put up with all sorts of devilishness during the development of this bill, among others.

So I yield such time as he may consume to the honorable gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I take this time to say that these are the last appropriations matters that we will deal with prior to the election. But I want the Members to know that when we come back in November, we and our counterparts in the Senate will have worked during the break to try to provide for the rest of the appropriations bills, that have not been completed in an omnibus package that we hope will be able to conclude the business of the 108th Congress.

As we prepare to do that, I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of this Subcommittee on Homeland Security, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking member.

This is an extremely important piece of legislation. They have done a really great job. I can tell my colleagues that there have been many, many obstacles, and they have worked really hard around those obstacles, and they have produced a good product.

But none of this could have happened, and none of what we just did earlier on the Military Construction bill or the hurricane supplemental, without tremendous staff. When it is all said and done, and the Members have their debates and their arguments and have made decisions, there is an awful lot of staff work that has to be done to help make that happen, and then to produce the product that we write and consider on the floor.

I want to mention specifically the staff director and the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, Jim Dyer; the full committee staff just across the hall from here, John Blazey, Dale Oak, Therese McAuliffe and John Scofield, and the others who work in the front office, Diann Kane, Sandy Farrow, John Howard and Jane Porter. Martin Delgado also had a big part of this supplemental on agricultural issues. Rich Efford was very heavily involved and responsible for much of the success in our transportation areas. Debbie Weatherly worked on Interior, and Kevin Cook on Energy and Water.

Others who have been important to the emergency supplemental, include Kevin Roper on Defense; Tim Peterson on VA-HUD; Carol Murphy on military construction and whose bill became the vehicle for the hurricane supplemental. And Michelle Mrdeza on homeland security, Mike Ringle on commerce and justice, John Shank on foreign operations, and Craig Higgins on Labor-HHS, all have been important on the supplemental. Additionally, all of the staff of our subcommittees and Rob Nabors, who is the chief clerk for the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and I am sure that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will supply the list of all of his staff have been important to this work. We would like to recognize all of them because they have done a really great job.

This is a good bill. After we vote on this Homeland Security bill, and when we vote on the Military Construction bill and the hurricane supplemental, I hope that then everyone will leave here in a relaxed mood and have a very safe journey home to do whatever it is they are going to do to campaign for reelection. I thank all of you for the support that you have given us. I really appreciate it.

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

Let me just say as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I think there is no one on that committee that



all of the Members have greater respect for than the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). He amazes me to the degree that he keeps his calm and cool. While all of us scurry about with great excitement and angst, the person who stands there calmly and coolly and keeps our committee functioning is the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). I have just incredible respect and admiration for the work that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has done these last 6 years as Chair of the committee. All of us have disagreements on policies and issues, but the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has made it a pleasant committee to serve on, and I think all Members just thank the gentleman from Florida, deeply.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Ranking Member SABO), the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ranking Member OBEY) for their work on producing this conference report. I am pleased that the report contains more funding than was requested by the President.

However, it is clear that this conference report does not contain the level of resources needed to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security, our Border Patrol agents, our airport security workers, our port directors, and our first responders urgently need in order to make America safe.

This failure has occurred despite vigorous efforts to strengthen the bill. The ranking member of the House Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and the ranking member of the Senate committee, Senator BYRD, attempted to add \$2 billion to the conference report for critical homeland security needs; but, regrettably, they were defeated on a 9 to 8 vote.

We are at war against al Qaeda. Osama bin Laden declared one year after 9/11 that his goal is to kill 4 million Americans. Business as usual is not an option. Our terrorist enemies are not waiting. We must do all we can as fast as we can to protect this country.

The administration tells us regularly that al Qaeda may attack us anywhere, any time, and admits that we are not as safe as we must be. The bipartisan 9/11 Commission issued that same warning.

Faced with the reality of an imminent threat of another terrorist attack, the President requested only a 4.6 percent increase, about \$1 billion, in our homeland security funding for this fiscal year. We spend that much in Iraq every week. In last night's debate, the President declared that he has tripled homeland security funding since 9/11. That \$20 billion increase, however, is

only 2 cents out of every dollar of Federal discretionary spending.

The gap between the rhetoric of protecting the homeland and the reality of protecting the homeland is wide indeed.

The fiscal policies and priorities of the President and the Republican leadership are a record of wrong choices while America is at war. While the President expresses pride in spending \$20 billion more on homeland security last year than we spent in the year of 9/11, the President's tax cuts gave the top 1 percent of American taxpayers, those making over \$1 million, four times that amount of tax cuts, all the while America is at war.

The reckless fiscal policy that has been pursued by the Republican leadership has resulted in our government borrowing \$422 billion last year alone. This is half of all of the money we appropriated to fund the entire government last year.

For the first time in American history, we have sent young men and women into war while passing the burden of paying for it to the next generation.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we have not taken strong enough action in the wake of 9/11 to make our country safe from terrorist attack. Here are a few examples: America is not safe when we fail to install sufficient numbers of radiation detection monitors at all of our ports of entry. America is not safe when we fail to screen 100 percent of the cargo that travels on passenger planes. America is not safe when over 24,000 illegal immigrants from countries other than Mexico are caught, but released into our communities because the Department of Homeland Security lacks funding for detention space.

America is not safe when we screen only 5 percent of the 7 million cargo containers that enter our country each year for weapons of mass destruction. America is not safe when the government has only enough anthrax vaccine in our stockpile to inoculate 500 people. America is not safe when our Nation's first responders lack the equipment they need to talk to one another in the event of an emergency. America is not safe when the Department of Homeland Security's own Inspector General concludes that 3 years after 9/11 we still lack an integrated, comprehensive terrorist watch list. And America is not safe when our border inspectors and our police officers do not have access to the full range of information held by our government on terrorist suspects.

We all know that it is only a matter of time before al Qaeda strikes us again. Can we say in all honesty that we have made America as safe as we need to be if we increase our investment in protecting the American people here at home by no more than what we spend in 1 week in Iraq?

It is all about choices, and there can be no doubt that the American people will hold us accountable for the choices we make.

We are at war against al Qaeda. Usama Bin Laden declared 1 year after 9/11 that his goal is to kill 4 million Americans. "Business as usual" is not an option. Our terrorist enemies are not waiting. We must do all we can—as fast as we can—to protect our country.

The administration tells us regularly that al Qaeda may attack us anywhere, anytime—and admits we are not as safe as we must be. The bipartisan 9/11 Commission issued the same warning.

Faced with the reality of imminent threat of another terrorist attack, the President requested only a 4.6 percent increase—about \$1 billion—in homeland security funding for this fiscal year—we spend that much in Iraq every week. In last night's debate, the President declared that he has tripled homeland security funding since 9/11. That \$20 billion increase, however, is only 2 cents out of every dollar in fiscal discretionary spending.

The gap between the rhetoric of protecting the homeland and the reality of a real commitment to protect the homeland is wide indeed.

The fiscal policies and priorities of the President and the Republican leadership are a record of the wrong choices while America is at war.

While the President expresses pride in spending \$20 billion more on homeland security last year than in the year of 9/11, the President's tax cuts gave the top 1 percent of American taxpayers—those making more than \$1 million a year—four times that amount—all while America is at war.

This reckless fiscal policy has resulted in our government borrowing \$422 billion last year alone—this is over one-half of all the money we appropriated last year to fund our entire government.

For the first time in American history, we have sent young men and women into war while passing the burden of paying for it on to their generation.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we have not taken strong action in the wake of 9/11 to make our country safe from terrorist attack. Let me give you some examples:

America is not safe when we secured less nuclear material in Russia and around the world in the two years after 9/11 than in the two years before 9/11.

America is not safe when we fail to install radiation detection monitors at all ports of entry and other critical sites.

America is not safe when we fail to screen 100 percent of the cargo that travels on passenger planes.

America is not safe when over 24,000 illegal immigrants from countries other than Mexico are caught but released into our communities because the Department of Homeland Security lacks detention space. Two years ago, on its website, al Qaeda took note of our porous borders.

America is not safe when we screen only 5 percent of the 7 million cargo containers that enter our country each year for weapons of mass destruction.

America is not safe when 120,000 hours of terrorist-related wiretap information lies untranslated at the FBI.

America is not safe when the government has only enough anthrax vaccine in our stockpile to inoculate 500 people.

America is not safe when we fail to aggressively deal with the threat of biological weapons by pursuing a "Manhattan Project" to

shorten the time between the discovery of a "bug" and the development of a drug or vaccine to counter it.

America is not safe when cities like Chicago and New York have only 1 health care worker vaccinated for smallpox for every 40,000 people, and some States have only a couple of dozen health care workers vaccinated against smallpox to enable them to respond to a smallpox attack.

America is not safe when our Nation's first responders lack the ability and the equipment they need to talk to one another during an emergency.

America is not safe when the Department of Homeland Security's own Inspector General has concluded that 3 years after 9/11 we still lack an integrated, comprehensive terrorist watch list.

America is not safe when our border inspectors and police officers do not have access to the full range of information held by our government on terrorist suspects.

America is not safe when we fail to protect the thousands of chemical plants that could serve as "pre-positioned toxic weapons of mass destruction" if hit with explosives by terrorists.

America is not safe when we fail to prevent the rise of future terrorists by supporting the voices of moderation in the Arab and Muslim world through economic, educational, and cultural partnerships.

America is not safe when we fail to keep our focus on Usama bin Ladin and al Qaeda—the enemy responsible for the attacks of 9/11.

We can provide the resources necessary to improve our military counterterrorism capabilities, invest in smart, effective homeland security measures, and win the hearts and minds of people in the Arab and Muslim worlds—we can win the war against our terrorist enemies. But—it will require the right choices and the right priorities.

We all know that it is not a matter of "if" but "when" al Qaeda will strike again.

Can we say that we have made America safe when we increase our investment in protecting the security of the American people by no more than what we spend in one week in Iraq? It's all about choices, and there can be no doubt that the American people will hold us accountable for the choices we make.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I recognized earlier the Committee staff. But after thinking about it, there is one staffer that I really need to make special mention of, and that is Mr. Doug Gregory who is very important to everything that I do here. He is very loyal, he is very smart, he is very faithful, he is very industrious; and I depend on him for an awful lot. He is very special, and he has been a very important member of my staff for 36 years, and this is Douglas Gregory of my district in St. Petersburg, and a professional member of the appropriations staff.

□ 1400

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY)

who is a very valuable member of our subcommittee.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

I realize we all are on our way out of town, and it is important we get moving, so I will be very brief and I will attempt not to be too provocative. But I urge the membership to strongly support this piece of legislation for a couple of very important reasons.

One, as the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) pointed out, FEMA money is running out and, as well, if we think about that in terms of what we need to do to make sure that we continue the momentum towards developing a safer, more secure homeland security, this bill needs to get done before we break for the election.

I recognize that there are a lot of tough choices here. I recognize that there are a lot of disagreements over where exactly we ought to be prioritizing the expenditures here, but I view this as an evolving, accommodating balance.

I want to salute the chairman of the subcommittee for his great work here. We have had our disagreements, but the chairman has always been there, and he has moved this bill substantially towards a system that I think can evolve into a system that allows the Federal Government to respond to the threats where they most exist.

We can bemoan what is left to be done, but this bill actually goes out and begins to take and continues to take substantial strides towards getting us to the place we need to be. We need to recognize that either structurally or technically or, frankly, politically in this town we may not be ready to do all the things we need to do, but this bill moves us way along the line. I want to salute the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for that, as well the ranking member on the subcommittee.

We do not agree on the first responders money as well, but this bill does important things. And as one who comes from New York, a place that was attacked, this bill needs to get passed so that New York can continue to do the great work it does to protect this Nation and that city.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply make two points. I recognize that this bill is some \$800 million above the amount that was requested originally by the President, and for that, I congratulate the subcommittee; but if anyone in this House thinks that this is an adequate response to the threat that faces us, they are smoking something that is not legal.

The fact is that we have immense homeland security needs that are not being met. And the fact is also that despite his public protestations to the contrary, the President for 3 years in a

row has strenuously resisted adequate funding for homeland security. Starting with the first meeting that I had with him in the White House after 9/11 when, before the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) or I could even get a word out of our mouths explaining to him what some of the additions were that we thought needed to be provided, before we could even get a word out of our mouths, the President said, I just want you to know that if you appropriate one dollar more than I have asked for I will veto the bill.

So much for an open mind.

I really believe that with respect to adequate funding levels for homeland security that the President's conduct itself is a security risk, because we have immense needs that are not being met. This Congress on a bipartisan basis has consistently tried to meet those needs, and we have been consistently reined in by a White House which, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) indicated, by a White House that thinks it is much more important to provide four times as much money to people who make a million bucks by way of tax cuts than to provide larger increases for homeland security funding.

Now, reasonable people can disagree, but those are my views, and I hope that we are not proven to be right by future events.

I just want to make one other point. I referred earlier to an important matter which was not included in this bill despite the fact that the Senate conferees voted by majority vote to include it and despite the fact that we had a majority of House conferees who favored that same provision.

I do not mind losing. I lose every day. There is nothing wrong with losing, and I can certainly accept that provided that the process that is used to determine the outcome is fair. But when it is not fair, as it was not in this case, when the process is not fair, then it leaves one to want to oppose the basic bill that is before us.

I am not going to do that because these matters are too important; but I do want to suggest that sometime, somewhere, it would be nice if committee judgments were allowed to stand rather than having the House leadership insist that they be overturned because they were not consistent with the dictates of that House leadership.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I reluctantly urge support for this bill. Again, I recognize the committee has tried to meet its responsibilities, but we are being hemmed in by a President who prefers to put money in the pockets of millionaires before putting adequate resources into the budgets that would provide greater port security, airport security and all the rest.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a very hard-working member of our subcommittee.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time. I will be very, very brief.

I would only like to congratulate our great chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), and our ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) on a very difficult bill that is one that we cannot fail on. We have to be successful as far as our homeland security.

I would also like to acknowledge the great work of the staff that has done a very good job and worked very, very hard on this bill.

I rise in support of this conference agreement and urge my colleagues to do the same. I want to commend Chairman ROGERS, Mr. SABO and the subcommittee staff for their work in putting this homeland security bill together.

The process of structuring this appropriations bill to address the operational needs of the 22 agencies and departments under the Homeland Security Department has, once again, been a difficult one. I suspect it will be difficult again next year, in part, because we are funding a mission that has many dimensions, and for which there are few absolutes.

As I have watched and participated in this process, I have come to the conclusion that our approach to funding homeland security has been measured and judicious. We have not thrown good money after bad, but rather made difficult choices.

There are some in this House who want to put more money in this bureau or that agency. Some of those Members are well-intentioned, while others simply want to create a political issue by forcing Members to make a choice between spending more money on the one hand, or appearing to be less than responsible on homeland security issues on the other. This is a false choice. In the future, we would do ourselves a favor by avoiding the temptation to politicize the funding of this important function.

I hope that as we go forward in the FY-06 cycle, we will recognize that there is much room for honest debate on the subject of homeland security funding. However, none of our constituents is served well by gaming this funding debate, and certainly the mission of protecting the homeland is not served well by this approach.

As we go forward in the area of homeland security, we will continue to make progress in sorting out priorities. We will continue to benefit from the ideas and knowledge of State and local officials from our districts around the country, and from the innovations of DHS officials. That collective wisdom will serve us well.

The process we went through this year for homeland security represented an improvement over last year. Going forward, we will improve over this year. I think because, once again, we carried out our duty to appropriate these funds in a measured way, we will improve on the FY-06 process.

Again, I want to commend the chairman and the ranking minority member, Mr. SABO, and urge the Members to support this conference report.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot close this debate without thanking some people. My colleague on the other side of the aisle has been marvelous to work with. He is demanding about the facts, but he is agreeable in working with us on the bill. I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) especially for his great work on this subcommittee, as he does in other parts of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of this House was very, very instrumental as late as the early hours of this morning in trying to remove snags that might prevent this bill from being placed on the floor, and I have to publicly compliment the Speaker and thank him for taking the personal interest that he did in helping us to move the passage of the bill to the floor. I can say the same for the majority leader.

We had a tough snag that the other body had placed in the way of this bill's coming to the floor, and as late as 2 o'clock this morning, the Speaker of the House and your majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) were up there working in their offices on the telephones to make this day possible. I have to publicly compliment them on doing a great job to help us.

Mr. Speaker, finally, let me say thanks to this great staff. We would not be here without them. They do the hard work. They are up all night doing the tedious work. My chief of staff, Michelle Mrdeza, has just been terrific in making this day possible and making the subcommittee work. As did Stephanie Gupta and Jeff Ashford and Tom McLemore and Terry Tyborowski and Kelly Wade, and Brian Dunlop and Ben Nicholson. These last two, Brian from the Secret Service, a fellow with us, and Ben Nicholson, a fellow from the Coast Guard, have been with us all this year and they will be rotating off this assignment now. I want to publicly thank them especially for their service with us on this subcommittee.

I want to thank my chief of staff, Will Smith, and Beverly Pheto of the minority staff, who has been especially helpful. We would not be here without them, Mr. Speaker, and I think we should publicly thank them for the great work they do.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Members for being understanding of the difficulties in putting this bill together. We are trying to fund some 53,000 units of local public safety, as well as all the other myriad of things that go into funding this 22-agency new department in its second year. I want to thank the Members for being understanding and supportive and helpful in making that possible.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my great disappointment that members have chosen not to include a two-year extension of the Milk Income Loss Contract Program in the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill the House passed today.

At the same time, however, I want to inject a bit of hope into the discussion, and also cor-

rect some misstatements that have been made—on the floor and elsewhere—about this issue.

We still have time to extend the MILC Program. I, of course, would support doing it today—but we will again have the opportunity to do so in coming months. And it is my hope that other members of this body will see how crucial this program is to farmers and for maintaining our Nation's great dairy tradition—and pass this very important extension.

Some members have stood on this floor and, for blatantly partisan political purposes, blamed the failure to extend the MILC Program on the president. But these critics have two key problems.

First, they have a credibility problem. Some of the loudest critics actually voted against the legislation creating the MILC Program in the first place and have even authored their own legislation that would effectively end the MILC Program. And now they're angry that the program is not being extended? Their feigned anger strains credulity.

Second, they have a truth problem. It is this president who signed MILC Program into law. And it is this president who stood in Wisconsin and pledged his staunch support for the MILC Program. The president is not member of this body and did not make the decision not to include the MILC extension in this bill. Any effort to convince people otherwise should be interpreted for exactly what it is—a cynical partisan ploy designed to affect the election in the key swing state of Wisconsin.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I commend members and staff of the Appropriations Committee for their hard work on the FY05 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act. Securing the resources we need for this country's long term war on terrorism is a formidable task, but one we must accomplish in a bipartisan manner. I support the appropriations bill before us today, yet I am concerned by the levels of funding for first responders, interoperability and port security. These are programs upon which the American people depend to protect our communities.

As the Ranking Member of the Intelligence and Counterterrorism Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, I support the funding needed by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to provide accurate and timely intelligence assessments. Unfortunately, this bill cuts funds for the first responder programs.

First Responders must have the resources they need to do their jobs. I represent the Kansas City, Missouri area, and my firefighters, police and emergency workers tell me that they have trouble communicating with each other because of incompatible equipment. This problem affects first responders throughout the country and is unacceptable.

Missouri has the seventh largest highway system in the nation and the second and third largest railroad terminals in the nation. Port and transportation security is crucial to our Nation's economy. Six million cargo containers enter U.S. ports every year, but only about 5 percent of these containers are ever screened. This appropriations bill fails to adequately fund port security.

Appropriations Committee Ranking Member DAVID OBEY attempted to counter these shortfalls with an amendment to H.R. 4567 that would have created a \$3 billion contingent emergency fund for homeland security. Even

though this emergency funding would be contingent upon the President requesting it, the amendment was rejected by Republicans on the House Rules Committee. We owe it to the American people to make sure that our nation is secure.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Homeland Security Appropriations conference report.

I would like to begin by commending Homeland Security Subcommittee Chairman HAL ROGERS and Appropriations Committee Chairman BILL YOUNG for their efforts to address our Nation's security needs with the unrealistic budget limits that were forced upon them.

I also thank Chairmen ROGERS and YOUNG for including in the Homeland Security conference report several items I requested to address issues of concern I raised during subcommittee hearings with representatives of the Department of Homeland Security. Included in this final conference report, for example, are the following items:

**Security Training**—Congress has done much to address the security of our aviation system since the events of September 2001. However, I was concerned that Congress had not adequately addressed the issue of security training for flight attendants, potentially the last line of defense in the aircraft cabin. The bill directs the FAA to issue regulations for basic security training for flight attendants.

**Port Security Grants**—Another of my concerns was that resources currently dedicated to port security are too often diverted to private shippers at the ports while the port authority received minimal if any funds. This bill states the committee's belief that port security grants, for the 55 ports of national significance, should be based on findings contained within port vulnerability assessments. This means that limited resources for port grants will be used where they are needed most.

**Security Assessments**—In addition, I was concerned that critical security assessments had not been completed. This bill establishes a deadline for the completion of security assessments for the top 1700 critical infrastructure elements and key assets identified by the Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate. This deadline will help ensure security assessments on such items as monuments, landmarks, power plants, highways, and food and water sources will be completed by the Department.

**Independent Districts**—Many of the districts that operate bridges and highways are independent authorities, and as such, their eligibility to apply for certain homeland security grants had been in question. The bill clarifies the eligibility of independent districts, such as bridge authorities, to compete for homeland security grants.

**Immigration Officers**—The bill also includes language I drafted to prevent the Department of Homeland Security from moving forward with the unnecessary and potentially dangerous privatization of key immigration officers at the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services. These officers are responsible for handling classified information used to prevent fraud and the exploitation of our immigration laws. I am pleased that this inherently governmental work will continue to remain the responsibility of trained and experienced federal employees directly accountable to the Department and not to the bottom line of a private company. And I take the opportunity to thank

the ranking member, DAVID OBEY, and ranking member MARTIN SABO of the Homeland Security Subcommittee for their efforts to keep this language in the bill.

In addition, the bill addresses two issues of importance to urban communities such as my own.

First, funding for the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grant program to protect high threat urban areas was more than doubled for a total of \$1.3 billion. These additional resources are critical to our Nation's large urban areas which face a higher terrorist threat than other parts of the country.

Second, state and local emergency managers will benefit significantly from an increase of \$56 million for Emergency Management Performance Grants. In California, emergency managers use these grants to develop plans to help prepare our residents for disasters such as earthquakes, fires, floods, or terrorist attacks. Although Congress has called this grant program "the backbone of the Nation's emergency management system" it has been drastically underfunded for years, and this funding increase is certainly a step in the right direction.

However, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that this Homeland Security Appropriations conference report resolves several of the issues I raised in hearings and increases funding levels in certain accounts, I remain seriously concerned that this bill as a whole underfunds important homeland security initiatives and programs.

I am disturbed that the measure retains the current formula for state-wide grants that continues to underfund the homeland security needs of my home state, California. Over the past several years, the Department of Homeland Security has distributed 60 percent of these formula grants on a per capita basis that does not consider critical infrastructure, vulnerabilities, or the actual risk of terrorist attacks. For example, although California is the most populous state with the most areas deemed at high risk of terrorist attack, it actually receives far less funding on a per capita basis than any other state. In a time of heightened national security and limited local resources, we need to ensure that federal resources are targeted where they will be most productive in fighting the war on terror.

I am also concerned by the deep budget cuts this bill makes to the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services. This bureau is charged with processing work authorization and citizenship applications for immigrants in our country. This bill includes only \$160 million to reduce the backlog of these unprocessed documents, a decrease of nearly \$75 million from fiscal year 2004. These funding cuts simply do not make sense given that during the last 3 years, the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services the last 3 years, the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services has fallen far short of meeting its six month goal for processing citizenship applications. In fact, the backlog of these applications has grown from three million to more than six million nationally. These backlogs send the wrong message to our nation's immigrants who are eager to become full participants in our society, but must wait years before their citizenship applications can be reviewed and processed. I am hopeful that next year the President's budget will request enough funds to realistically address the Bureau's huge case backlog.

And lastly, it is disappointing that the bill reduces to 75 percent the federal contribution given to airports to install state-of-the-art in-line baggage screening equipment. Previously, certain airports had signed letter of intent (LOI) agreements committing the federal government to pay 90 percent of these costs. Reducing the federal contribution creates an additional burden for our communities and their airports. I regret that Congress will not honor our original commitment to pay 90 percent of the costs.

Unfortunately, fully addressing these and other critical national security concerns requires resources that Republican congressional leaders simply do not provide in this bill.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I will support this conference report to provide the resources, although limited, to help make our country safer.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this conference report provides critical funding for our Nation's first responders, for the defense of our borders and our ports, and enhances our transportation and infrastructure security.

While I believe we continue to have critical, unmet homeland security needs, and have supported repeated democratic efforts to increase the funding in this bill, Chairman ROGERS and Mr. SABO have done an admirable job with their allocation, and I support this agreement.

I am particularly pleased with the \$65 million for the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response Firefighters—or SAFER—Program, and I was proud to have worked with CURT WELDON to pass an amendment this summer to provide initial SAFER funding.

This conference agreement's \$65 million in new hiring grants will help bring fire departments to adequate staffing levels and improve the safety of our firefighters and the communities they serve.

The agreement also contains \$650 million for the Fire Grant Program, and while we do not maintain the \$750 million provided the last 2 years, this is a \$150 million increase over the presidents request—an increase that is vital to our firefighters, too many of whom risk their lives on a daily basis to protect our homes and our families without the modern equipment and advanced training they deserve.

Thanks to the equipment, vehicles and improved training provided by fire grants, more than 15,000 departments across America are now better trained and equipped to respond to fires, automobile accidents, natural disasters, or acts of terrorism.

We have an obligation to provide our firefighters with the necessary resources to improve their safety as they risk their lives in our defense every day, and funding for the SAFER and Fire Grant Programs helps us make good on that obligation.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of this important bill, but with great disappointment in President Bush's failure to take affirmative action to support the two-year extension of the Milk Income Loss Compensation (MILC) program to help Wisconsin's dairy farmers survive when milk prices plummet.

Two days ago, President Bush came to Wisconsin to proclaim his support for extending the MILC program for our hardworking family dairy farmers. Today, that provision was stripped by the Republican leadership in Congress from the last bill the House will consider until after the November election.

The Milk Income Loss Contract Program, was established by the 2002 Farm bill, and is the first national dairy program to transcend the usual regional tension that have arisen over past safety net proposals. The MILC provides a basic level of direct support to all dairy operations, regardless of the end use of the farmers' milk, by providing assistance only on the first 2.4 million pounds of production annually roughly equivalent to production of a 130 cow operation.

As a result, nearly 86 percent of all dairy farms in the country, and nearly 90 percent in the Upper Midwest, are fully eligible for assistance under this limit. This counter-cyclical program has provided Wisconsin's struggling dairy farmers with \$413 million in crucial assistance since its inception. Unfortunately, this national safety net for dairy farmers will expire in 2005 if we do not act quickly to extend it.

Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing to have the President say one thing while campaigning in Wisconsin and then do absolutely nothing to get the job done. All it would have required was a one-minute phone call with House Speaker HASTERT asking him to extend this program for an additional 2 years and it would have been signed into law.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 518) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 518

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Saturday, October 9, 2004, or Sunday, October 10, 2004, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, November 16, 2004, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Saturday, October 9, 2004, through Friday, October 15, 2004, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, November 15, 2004, or noon on Tuesday, November 16, 2004, as may be specified in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until such other time on either day as may be so specified, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.*

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after con-

sultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the adjournment resolution will be followed by 5-minute votes on the conference report to accompany H.R. 4200, by the yeas and nays; the conference report to accompany H.R. 4837, by the yeas and nays; and the conference report to accompany H.R. 4567, by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 204, nays 169, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

YEAS—204

Abercrombie	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kolbe
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart, M.	Latham
Akin	Doolittle	LaTourette
Alexander	Dreier	Leach
Bachus	Ehlers	Lewis (CA)
Baker	Emerson	Lewis (KY)
Barrett (SC)	English	Linder
Bartlett (MD)	Everett	LoBiondo
Barton (TX)	Feeney	Lucas (OK)
Bass	Ferguson	Manzullo
Beauprez	Flake	McCotter
Biggart	Forbes	McCrery
Bilirakis	Possella	McHugh
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	McInnis
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	McKeon
Blunt	Garrett (NJ)	Miller (FL)
Boehner	Gerlach	Miller (MI)
Bonilla	Gibbons	Mollohan
Bonner	Gilchrest	Moran (KS)
Bono	Gillmor	Murphy
Boozman	Gingrey	Murtha
Bradley (NH)	Goode	Musgrave
Brown (SC)	Goodlatte	Myrick
Brown-Waite,	Granger	Nethercutt
Ginny	Graves	Neugebauer
Burgess	Gutknecht	Northrup
Hall	Harris	Nunes
Burr	Hart	Nussle
Buyer	Hastert	Osborne
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Ose
Camp	Hayes	Otter
Cannon	Hayworth	Pastor
Cantor	Hefley	Pearce
Capito	Hensarling	Pence
Carter	Herge	Petri
Castle	Hoekstra	Pickering
Chabot	Hostettler	Pitts
Chocola	Houghton	Platts
Coble	Hulshof	Pombo
Cole	Hunter	Porter
Collins	Hyde	Portman
Conyers	Jenkins	Pryce (OH)
Cox	Johnson (CT)	Putnam
Crane	Johnson, Sam	Radanovich
Crenshaw	Keller	Ramstad
Cubin	Kelly	Regula
Culberson	Kennedy (MN)	Rehberg
Cunningham	King (IA)	Renzi
Davis, Jo Ann	Kingston	Reynolds
Davis, Tom	Kirk	Rogers (AL)
Deal (GA)	Kline	Rogers (KY)
DeLay	Knollenberg	Rogers (MI)
DeMint		Rohrabacher

Royce	Smith (NJ)	Walden (OR)
Ryan (WI)	Smith (TX)	Walsh
Ryun (KS)	Souder	Wamp
Saxton	Stearns	Waxman
Schrock	Sullivan	Weldon (FL)
Sensenbrenner	Sweeney	Weldon (PA)
Sessions	Tancredo	Weller
Shadegg	Taylor (NC)	Whitfield
Shaw	Terry	Wicker
Shays	Thomas	Wilson (NM)
Sherwood	Thornberry	Wilson (SC)
Shimkus	Tiahrt	Wolf
Shuster	Toomey	Young (AK)
Simmons	Turner (OH)	Young (FL)
Simpson	Upton	
Smith (MI)	Vitter	

NAYS—169

Ackerman	Green (WI)	Owens
Allen	Grijalva	Pallone
Andrews	Gutierrez	Pascarell
Baca	Harman	Payne
Baird	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Baldwin	Herseth	Peterson (MN)
Becerra	Hill	Pomeroy
Bell	Hinchee	Price (NC)
Berkley	Holden	Rahall
Berman	Holt	Rangel
Berry	Honda	Reyes
Bishop (GA)	Hooley (OR)	Rodriguez
Bishop (NY)	Hoyer	Ross
Blumenauer	Inslee	Rothman
Boswell	Israel	Royal-Allard
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Boyd	Jackson-Lee	Rush
Brady (PA)	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Brown, Corrine	Jefferson	Sabo
Butterfield	John	Sanchez, Linda
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Capuano	Kanjorski	Sanchez, Loretta
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Cardoza	Kildee	Sandlin
Carson (IN)	Kind	Schakowsky
Carson (OK)	Kucinich	Schiff
Case	Lampson	Scott (GA)
Chandler	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Lantos	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Costello	Lee	Skelton
Cramer	Levin	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Cummings	Lofgren	Solis
Davis (AL)	Lowey	Spratt
Davis (CA)	Lucas (KY)	Stark
Davis (FL)	Lynch	Stenholm
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Strickland
Davis (TN)	Marshall	Tanner
DeFazio	Matheson	Tauscher
DeGette	McCarthy (MO)	Taylor (MS)
Delahunt	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Deutsch	McDermott	Tierney
Dicks	McGovern	Turner (TX)
Dingell	McIntyre	Udall (CO)
Dooley (CA)	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Edwards	Menendez	Van Hollen
Emanuel	Michaud	Velázquez
Engel	Millender-	Watson
Etheridge	McDonald	Watt
Evans	Miller (NC)	Weiner
Farr	Moore	Wexler
Ford	Nadler	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Napolitano	Wu
Frost	Neal (MA)	Wynn
Gonzalez	Obey	
Gordon	Olver	

NOT VOTING—60

Ballenger	Hoeffel	Mica
Boehlert	Isakson	Miller, Gary
Brady (TX)	Issa	Miller, George
Brown (OH)	Istook	Moran (VA)
Burton (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Ney
Clay	Jones (NC)	Norwood
Doggett	Jones (OH)	Oberstar
Doyle	Kaptur	Ortiz
Duncan	Kilpatrick	Oxley
Dunn	King (NY)	Paul
Eshoo	Kleczka	Peterson (PA)
Fattah	LaHood	Quinn
Filner	Larsen (WA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Foley	Lipinski	Slaughter
Gallegly	Majette	Stupak
Gephardt	Markey	Tauzin
Green (TX)	Matsui	Tiberi
Greenwood	Meehan	Towns
Hinojosa	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Hobson	Meeks (NY)	Waters