but the reality is there are places in the country that are still adversely affected.

I went through Nome, Alaska, last summer coming back from ANWR. One of the OB doctors there said, boy, I hope you get this bill done because we need an anesthesiologist here and we cannot afford the liability premiums. It's true what you do obstetrics without an anesthesiologist? He said, if someone needs a C-section, we put them on a plane to Anchorage. Anchorage is an hour and a half away, and I am given to understand there is bad weather from time to time in Nome, Alaska. I fail to see how we are furthering the cause of patients' safety by allowing this situation to continue.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately we have a President right now who will sign medical liability if we will get that bill passed. I am not supposed to mention the name of his opponent, but I do not believe his opponent will do that because he has been absent, or voted “no” when that bill came up in the Senate.

HOW PHYSICIANS WILL BENEFIT FROM NEW PRESCRIPTION DRUG LEGISLATION

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the Medicare prescription drug bill and one of the other great benefits that has come to our Nation, and that has been in the physician payment arena.

First, this law will block the impending physician payment cuts that were scheduled for 2004 and 2005, as well as give physicians increases of 15 percent for the next 2 years. In Illinois where we are losing physicians because of medical malpractice issues, having a provision that keeps doctors in Illinois is very, very critical. As a result of overturning the cuts and increasing the payments, Illinois stands to keep 400 million for Illinois physicians and the patients they serve. The geographic payment adjuster has been set at 10 in 2004 through 2006, which affects how physicians are paid in different regions of the country. The agreement also provides for physician scarcity bonus payments from 2005 to 2007. These grants go to those who practice in areas where there is a shortage of physicians.

Mr. Speaker, there is a shortage of physicians in Illinois because of medical malpractice, and physicians are leaving the State. At least in the Medicare prescription drug bill, there is help for keeping some of those.

TAX RELIEF FOR FAMILIES AND SMALL BUSINESSES

(Mr. REHBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, this spring as we complete another tax season, families and small businesses have reason to celebrate. Thanks to our $350 billion tax relief bill which the President signed into law last year, working taxpayers are getting back more of their hard earned money. Families now have more money to put food on the table, pay their mortgages, and pick up school supplies for their kids. These families know the truth about taxes, that it is their money, not Washington's money that their money has helped put the economy back on track. This relief has given families and working taxpayers a smaller tax bite, an increase in the child credit to $1,000, and yet another reduction in the marriage penalty. No wonder families this year have reason to celebrate.

I am happy to report for the first time in a long while unemployment is down in my home State of Montana. The jobless rate is now just 4.6 percent. Why? Because government does not create an economy, businesses do, one job at a time.

BUDGET RESOLUTION

(Mr. PORTMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say I am looking forward to voting on the budget later today. This budget is a good document because it does what we know works to get the deficit under control. First, it restrains spending, extremely important. Second, it allows the economy to continue to grow, as my friend from Montana just talked about, by not raising taxes on the American people. Significantly, the budget also provides for the prescription drug benefit this Congress passed late last year. After spending 5 years talking about it, a lot of rhetoric, a real political football, we finally on a bipartisan basis provided prescription drug benefits in a meaningful way. What numbers will we be relying on in the budget? We will rely on the Congressional Budget Office, as under the rules of the House we are required to do. There has been a lot of discussion about what numbers we should use. Of course we are going to use the Congressional Budget Office as we must. There are other estimates out there. Some may be right, some may be wrong; but this Congress is doing the right thing by providing a prescription drug benefit and providing under the rules of the House for the right estimate of those costs.

HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

(Mr. CHOCOLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues that we face as a Nation today domestically is the rising cost of health care. The most effective way to address that issue is to return more ownership and control of health care coverage. That is exactly what the health savings accounts created under the bipartisan Medicare bill do. HSAs are portable accounts that allow individuals to save and withdraw dollars for health care needs and medical expenses not covered by their insurance. Individuals own the accounts and the savings can be carried over year after year and from job to job, and people can build wealth into their retirement.

By offering individuals ownership and control of their health care coverage, we return control to the patients; and that is exactly where it should be. Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleagues who have voted to support the bipartisan Medicare bill which will help reduce medical expenses and improve the health care system in America.

BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the budget today, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will talk about their budget for America, which includes repealing tax cuts we fought hard for but their quote-unquote repeal is nothing more than job-killing tax increases on American workers. Period. Their alleged “plan” would blow America's economic engine. It would be like hitching a heavy trailer to the back of a motor scooter. I cannot think of a better way to turn it into a dead weight, a useless vehicle that would take us nowhere. Job-destroying tax increases are like a trailer full of bricks that will stop this economy dead in its tracks.

Mr. Speaker, let us pass a budget that strengthens our national defense, a budget that grows our economy, a budget that creates jobs, a budget that will get rid of Washington waste and excessive spending. We have that opportunity today, Mr. Speaker. Let us take advantage of it.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 393, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 574 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 574

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, refer to the House resolutions of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for
Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LaHood). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. Hastings) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. Hastings of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LaHood). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. Hastings) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. Hastings of Washington. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 574 is a structured rule providing for the consideration of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2005. This resolution makes in order those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution which may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and a Member designated in the report, shall be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. Hastings) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. Hastings of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LaHood). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. Hastings) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. Hastings of Washington. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 574 is a structured rule providing for the consideration of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2005. This resolution makes in order those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution which may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report, except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment.

The rule further provides, upon the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, for a final period of general debate not to exceed 3 hours and divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. Finally, the rule permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to offer amendments in the House to achieve mathematical consistency and provides that the concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2005, H. Con. Res. 393, provides for $2.4 trillion in total Federal spending for the next fiscal year and sets us on course to cut the deficit in half in 4 years. The resolution provides for total discretionary spending of $818.736 billion in fiscal year 2005. Discretionary defense spending is at the President's requested level of $402 billion. The resolution also accommodates the President's requested increase in homeland security, minus a 15 percent offset savings. The non-defense, non-homeland and security spending is held level for fiscal year 2005. The resolution also responsibly provides for up to $50 billion in fiscal year 2005 for additional costs related to operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Total veterans spending is increased by $1.2 billion for the next fiscal year, and the resolution does not include any of the fees proposed in the administration's budget.

It should be noted, also, Mr. Speaker, that no new mandatory spending is provided for in this resolution. Reconciliation instructions are included directing the Committee on Ways and Means to report a bill by October 1 that prevents a tax increase over the next 5 years. Without a change in the law, expiring provisions in the 2001 and 2003 tax relief bills would result in a tax increase on Americans beginning next year. The resolution also accommodates changes needed to write permanently into law the $1,000 child tax credit, the marriage penalty relief, and setting the lowest income tax bracket at 10 percent. Additional reconciliation instructions direct five House committees to report bills by July 15 of this year to eliminate fraud, waste, and abuse from government programs over the 5 years of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of both the Rules and Budget Committees, I would like to congratulate Chairman Dacier on a fair rule allowing for open debate and Chairman Nussle for producing a budget that is focused on defense, economic growth, and our Nation's long history as a land of opportunity. Simply put, Mr. Speaker, this budget is about creating jobs, and responsible planning. American families do not have unlimited bank accounts. They have budgets, and they prioritize how they spend and save their money. The Federal Government must set budgets and prioritize spending as well.

This budget continues our commitment to defense and homeland security as the Federal Government's number one responsibility, just as our Founding Fathers intended. It provides for increased funding to help secure America's borders, defend against biological attacks, protect our critical infrastruc- ture, and train and equip our first responders. And it takes a comprehensive, responsible approach to protecting our Nation, winning the war on terror and preparing our military for future security threats and challenges.

Mr. Speaker, by avoiding tax increases and protecting the child tax credit and relief from the marriage tax penalty and relief for lower-income workers, our budget continues the policies that are helping our economy to recover.

Our economy is growing, not as fast as I would like, but it is headed in the right direction, and we need to keep it on track that way. Our debt continues to decline, and our budget will stop this growth dead in its tracks. I believe in balanced budgets, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud to have served in the House when Republicans put that policy into effect in 40 years. But I do not believe in balancing the budget by simply shifting the burden to American workers, families, and business owners in the form of tax increases. Our budget is focused on allowing the Committee on Appropriations to make the responsible spending choices and fund the highest priorities within the overall framework established by this resolution.

We provide for full funding of the Medicare law to provide seniors' help in paying for their prescription drugs for the first time ever. We continue the yearly increases in education spending and fund the No Child Left Behind Act so that our children are better prepared for the future, and we provide an additional $1.2 billion for veterans' health care.

Mr. Speaker, I recently returned from Iraq, and that trip served as a close-up reminder of the hard work and sacrifices made by those who serve in the Armed Forces. We made our promises to veterans, and those promises must be kept. Our budget provides for these priorities, strengthens our defense, and puts us on track to cut the deficit in half in the next 4 years, with declining deficits in the future, and is accomplished without raising taxes on the American people.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying resolution. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Frost. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. (Mr. Frost asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)
Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, Economics 101 tells us that if we spend more than we make, we quickly find ourselves in a hole. And as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) often says when asked about the Federal deficit, the first thing to do when you find ourselves in a hole is stop digging. Well, Mr. Speaker this country has been digging for 3 straight years, and the result is a very, very deep hole.

The President projected a surplus of $432 billion for fiscal year 2005. But the Republican budgets of the past 3 years have changed a few things. We now face a deficit of $521 billion this year; a debt accumulation of $1.2 trillion over the last year, this year, and the next; and deficits will continue as far as our forecasts go. That is a dangerous trend, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell the Members why.

Budget deficits and the ensuing debt are bad for the economy. They are bad for the economy. That is a view almost all economists share. The result is a very, very deep hole. And as the gentleman from Texas that I have no further requests for time. Perhaps the 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, despite their rhetoric, Republicans do not want to deal with the problem of the deficit. They would rather hide behind budget gimmicks and accounting tricks to hide the true cost of their agenda.

The budget that is before us today does not reflect the fiscal reality of our Nation today, Mr. Speaker. That is because it omits a number of large expenditures that are sure to exist, including funding for the war in Iraq after fiscal year 2005 and the cost of making the President's tax cuts permanent. All of these have been repeatedly advocated, but which is conspicuously missing from their budget. Republicans also assume billions of dollars in unspecified cuts that will never be enacted.

At best, the Republican budget will dig our Nation deeper into debt, leaving us with a $377 billion deficit in 2005, spending the entire $1 trillion Social Security surplus from 2005 to 2009, and leaving America with deeper deficits than for any time in our history. I am (Ms. HOOLEY).

Mr. Speaker, I advise the gentleman from Texas that I have no further requests for time. Perhaps the 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I advise the gentleman from Texas that I have no further requests for time. Perhaps the 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, despite their rhetoric, Republicans do not want to deal with the problem of the deficit. They would rather hide behind budget gimmicks and accounting tricks to hide the true cost of their agenda.

The budget that is before us today does not reflect the fiscal reality of our Nation today, Mr. Speaker. That is because it omits a number of large expenditures that are sure to exist, including funding for the war in Iraq after fiscal year 2005 and the cost of making the President’s tax cuts permanent. All of these have been repeatedly advocated, but which is conspicuously missing from their budget. Republicans also assume billions of dollars in unspecified cuts that will never be enacted.

At best, the Republican budget will dig our Nation deeper into debt, leaving us with a $377 billion deficit in 2005, spending the entire $1 trillion Social Security surplus from 2005 to 2009, and leaving America with deeper deficits than for any time in our history. I am (Ms. HOOLEY).

Mr. Speaker, I advise the gentleman from Texas that I have no further requests for time. Perhaps the 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I advise the gentleman from Texas that I have no further requests for time. Perhaps the 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, despite their rhetoric, Republicans do not want to deal with the problem of the deficit. They would rather hide behind budget gimmicks and accounting tricks to hide the true cost of their agenda.

The budget that is before us today does not reflect the fiscal reality of our Nation today, Mr. Speaker. That is because it omits a number of large expenditures that are sure to exist, including funding for the war in Iraq after fiscal year 2005 and the cost of making the President’s tax cuts permanent. All of these have been repeatedly advocated, but which is conspicuously missing from their budget. Republicans also assume billions of dollars in unspecified cuts that will never be enacted.

At best, the Republican budget will dig our Nation deeper into debt, leaving us with a $377 billion deficit in 2005, spending the entire $1 trillion Social Security surplus from 2005 to 2009, and leaving America with deeper deficits than for any time in our history. I am (Ms. HOOLEY).

Mr. Speaker, I advise the gentleman from Texas that I have no further requests for time. Perhaps the 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, despite their rhetoric, Republicans do not want to deal with the problem of the deficit. They would rather hide behind budget gimmicks and accounting tricks to hide the true cost of their agenda.

The budget that is before us today does not reflect the fiscal reality of our Nation today, Mr. Speaker. That is because it omits a number of large expenditures that are sure to exist, including funding for the war in Iraq after fiscal year 2005 and the cost of making the President’s tax cuts permanent. All of these have been repeatedly advocated, but which is conspicuously missing from their budget. Republicans also assume billions of dollars in unspecified cuts that will never be enacted.

At best, the Republican budget will dig our Nation deeper into debt, leaving us with a $377 billion deficit in 2005, spending the entire $1 trillion Social Security surplus from 2005 to 2009, and leaving America with deeper deficits than for any time in our history. I am (Ms. HOOLEY).

Mr. Speaker, I advise the gentleman from Texas that I have no further requests for time. Perhaps the 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, despite their rhetoric, Republicans do not want to deal with the problem of the deficit. They would rather hide behind budget gimmicks and accounting tricks to hide the true cost of their agenda.

The budget that is before us today does not reflect the fiscal reality of our Nation today, Mr. Speaker. That is because it omits a number of large expenditures that are sure to exist, including funding for the war in Iraq after fiscal year 2005 and the cost of making the President’s tax cuts permanent. All of these have been repeatedly advocated, but which is conspicuously missing from their budget. Republicans also assume billions of dollars in unspecified cuts that will never be enacted.
Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, budgets are about priorities, and I believe that the priorities outlined in the current Republican budget plan are not the priorities of the people of this country.

This Republican budget is a blueprint to protect tax cuts for the wealthy at the expense of everything else. I disagree very strongly with the approach being taken by the Republican leadership. This budget plan is bad for America. It is bad for our most vulnerable citizens. It is bad for our economy. It is bad for our war on terrorism, and it is bad for our future. The Republican budget resolution will inflict terrible damage on American families.

This budget cuts $358 million from health programs in the year 2005. It cuts environmental protection programs by $6.4 billion over 5 years. It fails to provide needed funding for veterans' health care. It underfunds homeland security programs. It fails to include the promised funding for No Child Left Behind. It makes college more expensive for our families by freezing the maximum Pell grant and cutting funding for Perkins loans.

I am also dismayed that this budget fails to provide adequate funding for our food aid programs around the world. Winning the war on terrorism will take more than dropping bombs on people. Food aid is one of the best things we can do to boost the image of the United States in other countries. It is a way to win friends and to demonstrate to the world what we are for. This bipartisan resolution heads in exactly the opposite direction, and it is wrong.

And it is outrageous that the Republican leadership refuses to talk straight with the American people about the issue of the budget deficit. For better or worse, the budget resolutions presented in this House have become partisan documents. As I said, perhaps better than anything else, these budgets reflect the priorities of the two parties.

I understand that, for the most part, the Republican leadership believes that every problem can be solved by throwing bigger and bigger tax cuts at the wealthiest Americans and corporations. But it used to be that the Republican Party also stood for fiscal responsibility. I am a liberal Democrat, but I must say that I learned a lot during the debates of the 1980s and early 1990s. I learned that controlling the deficit is not only important to a strong economy; it is essential. And I give a lot of credit to some of the people on the other side of the aisle and especially to the Blue Dog Democrats, who were among the first to bang the drum of deficit reduction.

What happened to the Republican Party? Where have all those people gone who used to care about the deficit? This Republican budget resolution will increase the deficit by $247 billion over the next 5 years. I have to believe that whether one is a liberal or a moderate or a conservative, they will find this budget fiscally irresponsible.

And it has huge consequences, not only for future generations, but also for the most important task of this generation: winning the global war on terrorism. It becomes harder and harder to take the offensive against terrorism when we are mired in debt, and the Committee on the Budget refuses to include any budget process reform like the so-called pay-as-you-go rules to deal with the problem.

Now we are told that how we pay for things is a separate discussion, and we will have a debate on pay-as-you-go mechanisms next week or the week after or a month later or whenever. Well, that makes no sense. Imagine if you went to the bank today, but I will figure out how to pay for it next month; the bank would throw you out on the street. But that is the way the Republican leadership has chosen to operate.

By contrast, the Democratic budget proposal offers real budget enforcement rules. In fact, all of the alternative proposals do so: restoring pay-as-you-go mechanisms next week or the week after or a month later or whenever. Well, that makes no sense. Imagine if you went to the bank today, but I will figure out how to pay for it next month; the bank would throw you out on the street. But that is the way the Republican leadership has chosen to operate.

By contrast, the Democratic budget proposal offers real budget enforcement rules. In fact, all of the alternative proposals do so: restoring pay-as-you-go mechanisms next week or the week after or a month later or whenever. Well, that makes no sense. Imagine if you went to the bank today, but I will figure out how to pay for it next month; the bank would throw you out on the street. But that is the way the Republican leadership has chosen to operate.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, budgets are about priorities, and the Republican budget proposal before us has the wrong priorities for America. It is that simple. I urge my colleagues to defeat the Republican budget and to support a more thoughtful and realistic approach. And I would also urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Yesterday I brought the same amendment to the Committee on Rules; and, to the majority, the real problem is the extension of the pay-go rules. And in doing so, they denied this House the opportunity to debate one of the most successful budget enforcement mechanisms that we have at our disposal.

Today we will be over $10.4 trillion in debt by the year 2009. Pay-go would allow us to rein in control over our debt and our deficits. Pay-go would mandate that we actually pay for the legislation that we pass. Pay-go would force the Congress to recognize that there are fiscal consequences to our actions. That is a wake-up call that we desperately need because, lately, Congress has been pretending that there are no consequences. We have been spending more than we have. We have been cutting taxes with abandon. We have squandered a $256 billion surplus like it was monopoly money. Unfortunately, there is no such thing as a get-out-of-debt-free card, we cannot pass go, and we cannot collect $7 trillion.

Now, our surpluses are gone and our deficits are predicted to be $521 billion, a $700 billion reversal in just 3 short years. That is not a surprise. We have been living far beyond our means, and a deficit explosion was the inevitable result.

The surprise is that some folks still do not believe it is a problem, and it is the unwillingness of these few people to acknowledge this problem that is preventing the rest of us from fixing the problem.

Our colleagues in the Senate get it. They see that a $521 billion deficit does matter. They realize that it is not a good idea to finance tax cuts and spending increases by letting places like China, Japan, and the OPEC nations buy almost $800 billion of our debt. They understand that their voters did not send them here to come up with fancy budget tricks that amount to little more than shell games and smoke and mirrors. Our colleagues in the Senate voted by a bipartisan majority to include an amendment identical to mine in their budget resolution: pay-go on both tax and spending legislation. The House needs to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, we need to hold ourselves to the same budgeting standards that we hold every family in this country. Whether we are increasing spending or decreasing revenue, we need to pay for it. We need to pay as we go.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this fiscally irresponsible rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Budget had a very extensive markup
the opportunity to vote on this responsible and reasonable proposal. Three years ago the budget deficit was shrinking and the economy was robust and growing; but, as Members have stated today, the leadership of the Republican Party has turned a balanced budget into record deficit spending. And here they go again, pushing a dangerous budget that will spiral the deficit out of control.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I just do not see how we can continue this reckless, unchecked, and absolutely gargantuan growth in our national debt. I believe deficit spending is a serious threat to our economy. The numbers are so high and out of control, they have almost lost their full impact. Republicans are throwing trillions of dollars around like it is pocket change. But it is not pocket change, Mr. Speaker; it is a staggering number, and it can crush any chance our Nation has of an economic recovery.

We must put something in place to halt the out-of-control deficit, and I think the Thompson-Moore pay-as-you-go amendment is a step in the right direction. A "no" vote on the previous question will let the American people know once and for all which Members know the difference between responsible spending, and fiscal restraint.

"Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials at this point in the RECORD, and I urge Members to vote "no" on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Previous Question for Rule for H. Res. 574, H. Con. Res. 393—FY 05 Concurrent Budget Resolution

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution the amendment specified in section 3 shall be in order without intervention of any point of order as though included in the first amendment in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative Thompson of California or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

Sec. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as amended by Amendment to H. Con. Res. 393, as reported, offered by Mr. THOMPSON of California.

At the end of title IV, add the following new section:

SEC. 2—PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE CONCURRENT BUDGET RESOLUTION

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any of the following periods:

(1) The first year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) The period of the first five fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) The period of the five fiscal years following the first five fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) DIRECT-SPENDING LEGISLATION.—

(1) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section and except as provided in paragraph (2), the term "direct-spending legislation" means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects a direct-spending legislation for any fiscal year. Amended by Act of 1996.

(2) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this section, the terms "direct-spending legislation" and "revenue legislation" do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget;

(B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act of 1990.

(c) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this rule. It is a reckless budget that will spiral the deficit out of control. And here they go again, pushing a dangerous budget that will spiral the deficit out of control.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this closed rule and the underlying resolution. Yesterday afternoon, 35 amendments were offered during the Rules Committee hearing. Democrats offered amendments to increase funding for the No Child Left Behind Act, veterans' healthcare, job-training programs, environmental cleanups, military survivor benefits, port security, first responders, affordable housing, and many other important domestic priorities.

However, of the 35 amendments offered, only four are made in order by this rule. As the current chairman of the Rules Committee once said, "If a rule isn't open, then it's closed." By the definition of the gentleman from California, this rule is closed, and I oppose it.

As my colleagues have already noted, we live in a trying time when fiscal constraints are overwhelming. The ongoing costs associated with an unprovoked war in Iraq have only added to the Bush recession, which the National Bureau for Economic Research has noted first began in March 2001. Our problems were exacerbated when the Bush tax cuts were signed into law. These tax cuts squandered raging surplus and have driven America's economy into the ground.

The Republican budget proposal is a reckless disregard of the obvious. It further increases our deficit and abandons the social contract, the social contract this body has signed with the American people.

The Republican budget neglects America's children, seniors, and veterans. It undermines our domestic priorities by billions, including veterans benefits, our education system, and perhaps most importantly during this dangerous time in history, homeland security.

To pay for their tax cuts, Republicans lay the groundwork for $2.2 billion in cuts to the Medicaid program. With these cuts, states will
be forced to cover shortfalls in Federal commitments. At the same time, millions of America’s poorest will find themselves homeless and uninsured with nobody to turn to.

Making a bad budget worse, the Republican proposal has the audacity to suggest that spending in Iraq will not be necessary beyond the upper limit. Nothing could be farther from the truth. This budget is as dishonest as the President’s claims which got us into Iraq in the first place.

Even though I will oppose their budget, at the least, the Republic Study Committee is honest about what it’s doing.

Consideration of the budget resolution provides both parties with the opportunity to outline their priorities. Democrats will come to the floor today and offer our priorities to the American people. Our proposal is fiscally and socially responsible, while maintaining all of our international and domestic commitments.

Over the next 5 years, the Democratic budget provides nearly $10 billion more for Republicans for appropriated education programs, $6.6 billion more for veterans’ programs, and $5 billion more for homeland security.

We provide a realistic short- and long-term outlook for America’s budget, and we ensure that domestic spending remains consistent with the costs of inflation. Democrats do all of this at the same time we balance the budget and cut the deficit.

Additionally, Members of the Congressional Black Caucus will offer our own budget. Our proposal is equally responsible and realistic. With an eye on funding for America’s schools, veterans, healthcare, and job training programs, the CBC budget reflects the consciousness of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, today’s debate is far less about politics than it is about priorities. After 6 hours of debate on the majority’s budget proposal, it is clearer than ever: Republican priorities are not American priorities.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule so that we may proceed to debate the four substitute amendments as well as H. Con. Res. 393.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rules of the House, the ayes have it.
The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 94 (One Hundred Eighth Congress), the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies:

- the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST),
- the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), and
- the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD).

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1501(b)(1)(C), title XV of Public Law 108-136, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, appoints the following individual to serve on the Veterans’ Disability Benefits Commission:

- Mr. Charles J. Joekel of Washington, DC.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

ANannouncement by the Speaker Pro Tempore

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the remainder of this session will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

Bureau of engraving and printing security printing Act of 2004

The Speaker pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3786.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Speaker pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. CONYERS, ENGEL and WEXLER, as above recorded.

(Roll No. 89)

YEA—422

NAY—10

Mr. ROTHMAN, Mrs. McCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. WYNN, Ms. WOOLEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GEPPERTH, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. SHOOF, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Messrs. BERRY, BALLANCE, CONYERS, ENGLE and WEXLER changed their vote from "yay" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Speaker pro tempore. The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2584. An act to provide for the conveyance to the Utoil Atoll local government of declassified National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration ship, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

1. 121B. An act to provide for Presidential support and coordination of interagency ocean science programs and development and coordination of a comprehensive and integrated United States research and monitoring program.

2. 223L. An act to reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program through June 30, 2004, and for other purposes.