



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 2004

No. 89

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Dr. Keith Boone, Pastor, First United Methodist Church, Rockwall, Texas, offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, You call us to do the right thing for the right reasons, that from sea to shining sea we may experience the joy of freedom, and the benefits of our labor.

We are a Nation under You, O God, under Your grace and under Your judgment.

We are a blessed Nation, but confess we squander many of the resources You so freely give us.

May we live in such a way that our behaviors match our beliefs.

Grant us courage to speak for those who are voiceless, to seek justice for the powerless, and to stand as a beacon of compassion before a dark and desperate world.

May we be mindful and thankful for those whose sacrifice allows us an abundance of blessings.

Above all, may we honor our heritage, embrace the present, and discern the future You would will for our Nation.

In Your Holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BONNER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BONNER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4635. An act to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

WELCOMING DR. KEITH BOONE, PASTOR, FIRST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for having my pastor here to pray over this Congress and to pray over the Nation. Keith Payne Boone is a native of Dallas, Texas, a graduate of my alma mater Southern Methodist University. He has Methodist in his veins from head to toe. His grandfather was the legendary Bolton Boone who headed up the Golden Cross. It was the first ecumenical charity. I was a member of that board some 50 years in Dallas. Keith was not around at that time, but he is a leader in the Methodist Church of Rockwall, Texas. The Dallas News carried, I think 3 months ago, that Rockwall County was the fastest-growing county in the United States. That is how fast our church is growing with the great pastor.

I thank Pastor Keith Boone, my friend, friend of my family, Mary Ellen and my entire family, friend of Methodists, Baptists, and all denominations alike in Rockwall. Thank him for the prayer. Thank him for what he has done, what he is doing, and what he will do for this Nation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize 10 one-minutes on each side.

DRILLING IN ANWR

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this week is the first week in summer. Gasoline prices are high as we enter into the summer driving season. So energy independence should be a goal of this Congress. Worldwide demand for petroleum has increased in the last decade, but the growth in production has been relatively flat.

The inevitable result is higher prices at the gasoline pump. The reality is it takes a long time to go from an oil field to a gas station. We have lost considerable time in that regard.

In 1995 in the 104th Congress, H.R. 2491 would have allowed oil exploration and drilling in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge. The Department of Energy has estimated that between 1 and 1.3 million barrels of oil a day could be derived from this source. Unfortunately, this legislation was vetoed by the previous administration. And that was nearly 10 years ago. Given a timeline of 7 to 14 years for building a pipeline, it is time that we could scarcely afford.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to ANWR. The vast coastal plain is unsuitable for habitation during the summer months because of its marshy consistency. The people who live in ANWR are counting on this Congress to do the right thing and allow them, the rightful owners of these mineral rights, to begin developing the resources that were granted to them upon statehood in 1959.

As we say in Texas, "Time's a wastin'."

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4895

INCREASING DEBT AND OVERPROMISING

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wore my Adam Smith tie this morning because today we are going to talk about some ways that might help us give discipline to ourselves on how much money we spend and how much overpromising we do.

Two areas. One, I am from a farm in Michigan. That is where we usually try to reduce the mortgage so our kids have a little better chance. In this Chamber and in the Senate and the White House, what we have been doing for the last 20 years is increasing the debt. Every year for the last 20 years the debt subject to the debt limit has been going up. Plus, we have been overpromising in Medicare, Social Security. The unfunded liability is a huge burden on our children.

So, hopefully, today we can join together to help give ourselves discipline on overspending by changing the law.

ECONOMY

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, just 3 short years ago when this administration took over, there was \$236 billion surplus, 22 million jobs had been created, and the country was experiencing its lowest drop in poverty in a decade. Now, all those trends have reversed themselves.

Today the unemployment rate is 30 percent higher. 8.2 million people are looking for work, and more jobs are disappearing in our country every day. Outsourcing, sending good manufacturing jobs out of our country.

I am from the State of Michigan. We have lost over 200,000 jobs and 136,000 of those in the manufacturing sector. Something must be done. We must take care of American citizens first. People are paying more for their food, for their clothing, for their gasoline. We have got to do something about this.

Let us invest in America and American families. Health care is a debacle. We can fix that. America needs new leadership. Make sure you get out and extend your right.

BEAUFORT FAMILY TREE FARM SERVES AS A NATIONAL MODEL

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Burris family of Beaufort, South Carolina, upon receiving the 2003 South Carolina Environmental Awareness

Award for their Cypress Bay Plantation, one of the best tree farms in America.

The entire family, which includes Dr. "Skeet" Burris, his wife Gail, and their sons Hank, Andy, Ben, Tony and Charlie, have themselves worked the 1,600-acre tree farm in Hampton County since 1986.

They have won many awards including the South Carolina Tree Farm of the Year in 1995, National Outstanding Tree Farmers of the Year award in 2000, and Private Conservationist of the Year in 2001.

Today, the beautiful lands of Cypress Bay Plantation contain well over 200,000 trees teeming with wildlife, and are used to educate local children on the environment.

I ask all my colleagues to join me in commending the Burris family for their commitment to environmental excellence.

In conclusion, may God bless our troops; and we will never forget September 11.

VETERANS PROGRAMS ARE BEING UNDERFUNDED

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, over 200 years ago, our Founding Fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to the untested ideas of liberty, equality, and democracy. But today as a new generation of veterans is being created in Iraq and Afghanistan, Republicans are underfunding the programs that are vitally important to our veterans by passing a budget that underfunds veterans health care by \$1 billion and rejecting Democratic efforts to fully fund VA health care.

What is even worse is that this will not stop this year because the Bush administration's plan for the 2006 budget includes a \$900 million cut in funding for veterans health care. And this will conveniently not come into effect until after the election.

No Republican has come forward and rejected the Bush administration's latest proposals to cut veterans programs. Not one. This is outrageous.

Democrats are fighting to honor veterans by honoring their sacrifices. Why are the Republicans making our sons and daughters fight bravely on the battlefield and come home and fight the government for their benefits?

THE LIBERAL MEDIA BIAS OF CBS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month we learned of more good economic news about the expanding economy. 947,000 new jobs created in March, April, and May alone. One

might think that almost a million new jobs in 3 months constitutes big news, but it was not big news on "CBS Evening News."

"The CBS Evening News" spent 20 seconds glossing over the creation of nearly a million new jobs. CBS then aired a 2-minute report about 1,300 people being laid off in Ohio. The laying off of 1,300 workers and their families at any time is sad. I have hope and faith that those families will soon be back on their feet. But for CBS to bury the good news about a million new jobs and magnify the bad news of 1,300 layoffs smacks of partisan media bias. Twenty seconds for good economic news, 2 minutes for bad economic news. If it is not liberal media bias, I do not know what is.

ARE WE BETTER OFF?

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration has demonstrated a complete failure to plan for our operations in Iraq and a complete failure to plan here at home. One has to ask, Are we better off than we were 4 years ago?

When President Bush took office, we had a \$236 billion budget surplus and the Nation had created 22 million jobs over the previous 8 years.

□ 1015

The number of uninsured had decreased for the first time in 12 years, and the country had the lowest poverty rate in 20 years.

Today, 8.2 million are Americans looking for work; 1.8 million private sector jobs have been lost. The number of uninsured has increased by 3.8 million, and gas prices are at a 23-year high. Household income has decreased by almost \$1,500, and college tuition is up by 28 percent. This is absolutely not acceptable, and it is not something that just happened.

President Bush had only one economic policy when he took office and he had only one today, tax cuts for those who need them least.

FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS

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

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, if the American people have somehow stumbled on to C-SPAN this morning, trying to find either Oprah or Regis, let me urge you to set your VCRs because later today you are going to get a chance to see the fundamental difference between our side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle.

You see, our friends on the other side have suppressed their appetite to raise your taxes long enough, and just like

that chain smoker who has to go to the drawer and find that little addiction, they are coming back to it again today with a proposal to raise your taxes \$18.9 billion.

This tax increase would not be to go to support our troops in the war on terror. It would not be to cut the deficit or to pay down the debt. No, it would be to spend more money on social programs to the tune of \$150 billion over the next decade.

If you set your VCR and you ever want to know the difference, play it over and over again, and if you happen to lose the tape, you can just play "Nightmare on Elm Street" because that is what this tax hike would do to the American people.

BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S ECONOMIC POLICIES AND THE IMPACT ON TEXAS

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about how Texas families and workers are struggling to survive during this administration's handling of our economy.

While Democrats here in the U.S. House of Representatives have been fighting to stop the exportation of American jobs and create more jobs here at home, the administration has chosen a completely different path.

In my State of Texas, we have lost over 175,000 manufacturing jobs. Health insurance premiums have increased by 65 percent since the beginning of the Bush administration. The cost of a college education has increased by 28 percent in the State since the beginning of the current administration. Household income has decreased by \$204 over the past 2 years. 808,000 have joined the ranks of the uninsured in Texas since the beginning of this administration.

How long are we going to sit here and just talk about each other instead of addressing these issues?

As the law-making body, Mr. Speaker, of a system created to serve, protect and enhance American ideals, liberty and longevity, we must rebuild our economy, put families first before corporations and stop the rampant outsourcing of our jobs overseas.

BROWARD COUNTY FUNDING

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the Urban Area Security Initiative grants. The Department of Homeland Security awards these grants to urban areas based on credible threat information, population density, and critical infrastructure.

Broward County, which is in my district, has been designated an embarrassing and unacceptable 10 percent of

this homeland security money by the city of Miami who has kept the rest.

Mr. Speaker, Broward County is the home of 1.6 million people. It also houses Port Everglades, which is home to 19 cruise lines. It also houses a large petroleum tank farm, which is the sole provider of fuel for 12 south Florida counties, including Miami Dade. The port employs 10,000 people and generates \$1.7 billion in business activity and \$545 million in wage annually.

Broward also has an international airport, which is located within close proximity of both Port Everglades and the petroleum tank farm. Broward County remains an extremely vulnerable terrorist target, and it must be treated as such.

So I am here to voice my unwavering support for the Department of Homeland Security to create a new urban area for Broward, as well as Palm Beach County.

This is my second consecutive day to come to the floor about this issue. I am speaking for my constituents and will continue to do so until this outrageous offense by the city of Miami is corrected.

THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, California's the fifth largest economy in the world. One would think that the Republican administration would be paying attention to the economic indicators in California and realize that all is not well in the economy.

Since President Bush took office, 1.9 million jobs have been lost. Californian unemployment remains above the national average, and one in 10 persons in my District is unemployed. Jobs that have been created are low-paying and do not provide benefits such as health care and other important benefits.

There is a direct link between getting a good education and getting a good job, but the ability to get that good education has been undermined by the inability to adequately fund the best higher education system in the United States, the California higher education system, because students are now being turned away. Eligible to get in, all the tests, all the ability to get in, but no room in the inn. Why? Because this administration has failed to adequately fund the Pell grants and Perkins loans for students to make education accessible.

During the 1980s, we learned that voodoo economics did not stimulate the economy. Neither is hoodoo economics stimulating the economy today.

HONORING FATHER'S DAY

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

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday was Father's Day. This is a day specifically set aside to reflect and honor fathers.

Being a father is not something that should be taken lightly. A study by child psychologist Michael Lamb demonstrates exactly how important the presence of a father is in the development of a child. It found that a strong bond between a father and a child has a positive effect upon the development of the child.

It is a statistical fact that children with involved loving fathers are significantly more likely to do well in school, have healthy self-esteem, exhibit empathy and pro-social behavior. These children are also more likely to avoid high-risk behavior such as the use of drugs, truancy and criminal activity, than to children who have uninvolved fathers.

Mr. Speaker, even though the time to celebrate Father's Day has come and gone, the importance of being a father never diminishes. I rise today to recognize the caring and loving fathers for all they do for their families and also encourage them to continue to fulfill their role in the family.

HIGHWAY BILL EXTENSION

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we passed a fourth extension of the highway bill that expired last fall. That is all fine and good, but no longer can we leave the States holding the bag because of a veto threat from the Bush administration and a reluctance by the Republican leadership to lend the necessary investment that industry, commerce and the workers of this Nation want in our infrastructure.

Investment in our infrastructure spells jobs. Tell me what is wrong with a bill that creates jobs. One would think that Mr. CHENEY and Mr. Bush would jump on a chance to create jobs.

Since the first day the Cheney-Bush leadership took over in Washington, 9.9 million private sector jobs have been lost. Today, 8.2 million people are looking for work, and 4.7 million people are working part-time for economic reasons.

Unfortunately, this highway bill has fallen victim to political differences within a divided Republican party. Even though we have had enough support to pass this bill since last year, the divided Republican party has held up passage of a fully funded bill for months.

The President opposes congressional Republicans from both the House and the Senate. House Republicans are divided against each other. The President has even gone against his own Department of Transportation when they say what is necessary for investment in infrastructure in this country.

TAX CUTS AND JOB GROWTH

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, look at all of these new jobs: 1.4 million since August 2003. Mr. Speaker, this recovery is further proof that cutting taxes and reducing the burden of government on American citizens and businesses stimulates economic growth, as President Reagan understood so well.

In fact, there is one very telling statistic. In the last 100 days, there have been over 1 million jobs created. Let me restate that, 1 million jobs in 100 days.

This is a true sign of the times, a time of prosperity and opportunity. President Bush was correct in his policy to cut taxes to stimulate economic growth, and now we have substantial job growth.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, it is time to make these tax cuts permanent. I know of 1.4 million people and counting who most certainly would agree.

THE CONTINUED IMPROVING STATE OF OUR ECONOMY

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the numbers from the month of May reveal that the American people are improving their lives under the leadership of George W. Bush and the Republican Congress.

Two-hundred-and-forty-eight thousand jobs were created in May, and more than 1 million jobs have been created over the last 100 days. The unemployment rate is down to 5.6 percent. This is lower than the averages in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. Homeownership has risen to the highest level ever at 68.6 percent. Real disposable personal income is up 3.9 percent. Consumer confidence is up and business investment in equipment and software is up at an annual rate of 14 percent, and the stock market is up 18 percent.

Now, some Republicans may try to take all the credit for the economic growth we have been witnessing. However, we can only take credit for freeing up the American people from the burdens of high taxes and government intrusion. We Republicans removed those barriers, and the economy improved due to the ingenuity and the entrepreneurial spirit of the American people.

IRAQ'S FUTURE

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

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, June 30 is not the beginning of the end of Iraq, as some would

want us to believe but, rather, the beginning of their future.

There is no doubt that challenges lay ahead, but I am optimistic about Iraq's future. I am optimistic because just 15 months ago, Saddam Hussein was a threat to the world and Iraqis had no voice.

Today, thanks to the brave and selfless sacrifices of American and coalition troops, Saddam is no longer in power and millions of Iraqis are shaping their own destinies by participating in Iraq's political process.

The Iraq people are showing tremendous courage as they face enemies of freedom. Neither the will of the Iraqis nor the coalition will be deterred by violence and terror.

Mr. Speaker, next week Iraq officially becomes a sovereign Nation, and I am optimistic because this is no doubt that a free Iraq will be a decisive blow to terrorism and a victory for the civilized world and the security of America.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4663, SPENDING CONTROL ACT OF 2004

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 692 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 692

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4663) to amend part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to extend the discretionary spending limits and pay-as-you-go through fiscal year 2009. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment 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, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except that upon adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute, only the last amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be in order. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted.

The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). 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 gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1030

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 692 is a structured rule providing 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The rule waives all points of order against the bill and its consideration and makes in order only those amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution.

The rule further provides that the amendments printed in the report shall be considered 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, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Finally, the rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report, except that upon adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute, only the last amendment printed in the report shall be in order. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, as the only Member of the House serving on both the Committee on Rules and the Committee on the Budget, I have become increasingly convinced of the need for significant changes in the congressional budget process, particularly with respect to the spending side of the budget ledger. Enactment of H.R. 4663 would make major strides toward providing the House with the tools needed to enforce spending discipline in a time of unacceptable high Federal deficits.

Like many Members, I wish the bill reported went even further, but it is an important first step. For that reason, I am pleased that the Committee on Rules has made in order a long list of proposed amendments to provide the House with multiple opportunities to strengthen the base bill.

At the heart of the bill are proposals to reinstate spending caps on discretionary spending, consistent with the

levels set forth in the budget resolution, and a 2-year extension of the pay-as-you-go, or PAYGO, requirements for mandatory spending. It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that this latter provision requires that bills increasing entitlement spending must be offset by reductions in other spending and not by raising taxes.

The bill also provides that any breach of either of these spending disciplines would result in automatic spending cuts known as "sequesters."

Finally, the bill takes the responsible approach to the sometimes legitimate need for "emergency" spending by permitting such measures only when they result from circumstances that are truly unanticipated, temporary, and are needed for the preservation of life, property, or national security. The bill also requires that future spending projections no longer assume that these one-time "emergency" spending levels will continue in future years.

Mr. Speaker, the congressional budget process was a badly needed reform back in 1974; and while it served us well in that time period, it can serve us better. This bill is an important step towards that goal; and, accordingly, I encourage Members to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, early this morning the Committee on Rules passed a lopsided rule packed with Republican amendments. It is shocking that of the 19 amendments made in order, only one Democrat amendment and one bipartisan amendment are in order. Senior Democrats were shut out, while the rule makes the amendments of junior Members in order on the Republican side. The rule provides for one-sided debate on H.R. 4663. The House will be allowed to discuss and vote on Republican amendments, but Democratic ideas and amendments have been virtually excluded in the important debate on budget process reform.

Mr. Speaker, the question before us is whether or not the current budget process creates a product that embodies our budget policies and our priorities. The Federal Government has gone from having historic surpluses of \$5.26 trillion to having historic deficits of \$2.3 trillion. If we are unsatisfied with a budget, are policies or the budget process to blame? Should the budget process enforcement mechanism be policy neutral or should the process force or enable Congress to make policy decisions?

Earlier this spring, the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process of the Committee on Rules

held a series of hearings on these questions. The message that came out of the hearings seemed to be, I thought, that the budget process is not at fault. Its structural flaws in the budget process did not produce Federal budgets with massive debt. Instead, the budgets are products of policy choices. The issue is not the mechanisms we employ. The real issue is that people are now unhappy with policy choices made over the last 3½ years. This concern is bubbling up as criticism over the budget process, turning process, not policy, into the villain.

Since the adoption of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, many reforms have been proposed and tried. Bi-annual budget, joint budget resolution, sequestration, caps on discretionary spending, caps on entitlement spending, pay-as-you-go requirements, constitutional amendments, and other ideas were part of previous discussions, and part, again, of the current budget reform debate. We all know that caps on discretionary spending and PAYGO requirements on mandatory spending and tax cuts, which is an important point, worked well in the 1990s.

The underlying legislation is fatally flawed in that it leaves future tax cuts unchecked and applies PAYGO only to mandatory spending. The historic deficits are in large part the product of the tax cuts, which primarily benefit the wealthiest Americans. The Congressional Budget Office has said that the \$2.3 trillion deficit has been caused by the tax cuts and the associated debt services.

During the second subcommittee hearing, budget expert Stan Collender offered this advice: enacting a new budget process without first developing the consensus necessary to make it work will be perpetuating a political hoax. You will be promising results the process cannot possibly deliver, allowing the process to be used to justify policy changes that will not otherwise seem appropriate and allowing policymakers to hide behind both procedural votes that, at best, will be confusing and, at worst, completely indecipherable.

The body is sharply divided, Mr. Speaker; and there is no consensus on budget reform. This debate is not an academic exercise. Changes to the process will affect millions of Americans. Caps on mandatory spending will dramatically choke vital programs, like Medicare, Medicaid, veterans benefits and student loans. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule so that all ideas, not just the majority suggestions, may be considered and debated.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), a senior member of the Committee on the Budget and a leader in the budget reform process in the House.

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

This is an important debate, Mr. Speaker, so I hope that Members are paying attention. The real power of the purse rests with us here, in the people's House. I am proud of what we did through most of the 1990s. When we came here, when I was elected in 1994 and came here in the spring of 1995, I remember we had some meetings with some of the economists and people from the Congressional Budget Office. And we have to go back and remember what was happening in America. We were running deficits every year of \$250 billion and more, and we can all point fingers and blame this and blame that; but at the end of the day, we were spending more than the taxpayers were sending in, and America wanted us to do something about this.

At one of the meetings we were at, we had some economists saying, if Congress does not get serious about balancing the Federal budget, that by the time my children got to be my age they would be paying an effective tax rate to the Federal Government of over 80 percent, just to pay the interest on the national debt.

Now, I come from a rural district, and I think most folks from rural communities understand this, because it really has been part of the rural ethic, particularly those who are farm families, to pay off the mortgage and leave the kids the farm. What we have been doing is we were literally selling the farm and leaving our kids the mortgage. We knew that it was not just bad public policy; it was fundamentally immoral.

So what we did is we began to limit the growth in Federal spending, and I am proud to report that from 1995 until the year 2000, the Federal budget was growing at a slower rate than the average family budget. That, combined with a fairly strong economy, we literally went from a \$250 billion shortfall every year to a \$250 billion surplus.

In fact, just 3 years ago, the Congressional Budget Office told us that we could look forward to surpluses in the Federal Treasury over the next 10 years of \$5.4 trillion. Now, that same Congressional Budget Office today is telling us that we can look forward to deficits of \$1.6 trillion over the next 10 years. The only thing we can really say about the Congressional Budget Office's forecasts is that they are both wrong.

What we do know that is right is that over the last several years we have allowed Federal spending to grow at a rate double what it grew through most of the 1990s. And part of the reason that happened is we allowed some of the budgetary rules to expire, the things that control the growth in Federal spending.

There was a farmer who told me several years ago, we were talking about the deficit, and he said, you know, the problem with you guys in Washington

is you do not quite get it. The problem is not that we are not sending enough money to Washington. The problem is you spend it faster than we send it in. He probably expressed it more accurately and more simply than any of us would like to admit.

What we want to do today, and this is an important event and these are important votes, we want to bring back some of the rules that controlled Congress with regard to spending. One of them is PAYGO. That means if you want to have a new program, you have to figure out a way to pay for it. And I do not think that is too much to ask. The other is setting up some spending caps.

Let me give some ideas why I think that is important. Over the last several years, we have passed some pretty good budgets, some very tough budgets here in the House of Representatives. Back in fiscal year 2002, for example, our budget resolution which we passed here in the House called for spending \$661 billion in what we call discretionary spending. But by the time we were done negotiating with the Senate, we ended up spending \$734.6 billion. Well, in the next year we said in the House budget resolution that we would agree to spend \$759 billion in discretionary spending. But before the year was over, we actually spent \$849 billion. Last year, our budget resolution called for spending \$784.5 billion. But when all the numbers were in and the spending was done and the conference committees at last had concluded, the number actually was \$873 billion.

Pogo was right. We have met the enemy, and he is us.

I think there was a certain amount of hubris that, well, we have done a pretty good job of balancing the budget over the 5- or 6-year period. We had actually paid down over a half trillion dollars of publicly held debt, and I think we began to think we did not need these budget rules any more. I am here to say that I think we were wrong, and we have to get back to some of those rules.

This is a very important debate. I support this rule. I know there will be people who will say, well, we did not get to offer our amendment, or this amendment was not made in order. But I think we are going to have a very vigorous debate over the next several hours on the rule and the bill. Mr. Speaker, I hope later I will have a chance to visit more about the rule and the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota, who just noted that between 1995 and 2000 government spending grew more slowly than did the economy as a whole and that we, in the process, paid off almost \$.5 trillion in debt.

I very much appreciate the endorsement of the economic policies of the Clinton administration. It is too bad

that those policies were reversed by the incumbent administration.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), who is the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget.

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

□ 1045

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, this is called the Spending Control Act of 2004. The last time I looked, the Republicans control the House, Republicans control the Senate, and Republicans control the White House. So it begs the question, why can they not control spending? Why do we need this piece of legislation to control spending?

As one looks at the bill and asks that question, another question arises: Why does this bill have nothing to do with revenues? Basically what this bill would do is affect discretionary spending for 2 years, not 5, and put in place a PAYGO rule, a pay as you go rule which applied to mandatory spending, entitlement spending increases but not to tax reductions.

Do we disagree on the problem before us? Absolutely not. We have got a problem. The best evidence of the problem was signaled this week when we had a defense appropriations bill in which was buried a provision that will increase the debt ceiling over the next several years by a substantial sum of money.

Let us look first at what has happened over the last several years on the watch of the Bush administration with respect to the debt that we have accumulated, the mountainous debt that we are building up now. The best indicator of that is where does the debt ceiling stand? There is a statutory ceiling on the amount of debt we can incur. When President Bush came to office, it was \$5.95 trillion. Within a year, he had to increase that by \$450 billion. Last year he had to increase it by, get this, \$984 billion. The other day they increased it by \$650 billion, to \$8.74 trillion once it finally passes the Congress.

That is the record of the last 4 years, three increases in the debt ceiling in 4 years, from \$5.9 trillion to \$8 trillion and this is the bad news: It does not stop here. The Congressional Budget Office tells us looking at the President's budget out over the next 10 years, as they are required by law to do, that if we follow the policies laid down by the Bush administration, the debt of this country will grow in 2014 to \$13.6 trillion. That is where the debt ceiling will have to be taken in order to accommodate their fiscal policies.

What does this bill propose with respect to this problem? As it turns out, very, very little. Before going any further, it is worth reminding everybody what happened in the 1990s. It can be

done. If you put your shoulder to the wheel and the President supports it and the leadership of the Congress supports it, we can bring the deficit to heel. We did it in the 1990s. We went from a deficit of \$290 billion at the end of fiscal year 1992 to a surplus of \$236 billion in 1998. Just as a reminder from 1997 to 2000 on the watch of the Clinton administration, we reduced the debt of this country by \$362 billion. If you added fiscal year 2001, which was basically the Clinton budget, we reduced the debt by more than \$400 billion. What a fiscal reversal we have seen in the last 4 years.

What does this bill propose to do? Essentially it proposes to clamp down on that wedge of the budget called domestic non-homeland discretionary spending. That is, discretionary spending from which we have backed out international spending and from which we have backed out homeland security, because in both of those categories, they foresee substantial increases, but they are going to bring all the force of their efforts to bear on this wedge of the budget which constitutes 16 percent of the budget.

Let us ask the question, is this where the problem arises, in this segment called domestic non-homeland discretionary spending? This is what has happened over the last three fiscal years to that particular account: \$383 billion in 2002, \$382 billion in 2003, \$383 billion in 2004. The problem does not arise here. But this is where they go for a solution. On the other hand, look what the solution is. The President proposes to take domestic non-homeland security resources down to \$376 in 2005. That is a reduction of \$7 billion. Actually it is hard to do but in truth, we have got a deficit this year of between \$400 billion and \$500 billion, you have only dented the problem once you have done it.

This is where the problem lies. If you want to look at spending, which this bill does not do, over the last 4 fiscal years, 90 to 95 percent of the increase in discretionary spending has occurred in defense, homeland security and our response to 9/11. But this bill ignores that particular aspect of the problem. And where is the rest of the problem? When the Bush administration held their tax cuts out to us and when they were passed, they told us this is the path that revenues will follow, between \$1 trillion and \$1.1 trillion. This is where revenues, income taxes, have actually gone over that period of time, largely responsible to their tax cuts.

And this is what has happened to spending generally. Spending generally has gone up in the Bush administration. Revenues have gone down. Spending, however, is still as we can see from this chart below the historic norm for the last 25 years. Revenues, on the other hand, are at an all-time low. Personal income taxes as a percentage of GDP are at their lowest level since the early 1950s. So revenues are low, spending is high, and this bill unfortunately

does nothing about the problem at hand.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to some of the things that our colleague the gentleman from South Carolina has just said. Much of what he said, I do not disagree with. But there is something I think we need to clarify for all of the Members. Even if we had a balanced budget last year and this year, we would have to raise the debt ceiling. That is something I think it is hard for many Members and frankly I think most Americans. They wonder how in the world can that be. It is kind of a complicated thing to explain but even in a very strong economy with surpluses, we would probably have to raise the debt ceiling. The reason is this. When money comes into the Social Security trust fund, there are only two things they can do. They can either pay benefits or they can buy government bonds. When they buy government bonds they in effect drive up the debt. I know that is hard for people to understand, so yes, we are going to have to raise the debt ceiling, but even if we were balancing the budget we would have to do that.

I would also like to at least remind Members that things did change a lot in this country on September 11, 2001. I think we all know that. We all have to be cognizant of that and it has changed the priorities of how we spend money. Is that an excuse to allow other Federal spending to be going up? No. And have we been a little too profligate with the Defense Department and homeland security? My opinion would be yes. We have allowed our emotions to get the better of us and we have just said, we will spend more money and maybe we will be safer. I am not sure that is the answer. I am not sure that having 50 guards at every airport entrance makes us all that much safer and that is an argument and a debate we should have.

The debate today is how much are we going to allow Federal spending to go up, and is there really a good reason to allow the Federal budget to grow at a rate twice the rate of the average family budget?

The numbers we were talking about, from 1995 until 2000, the Federal budget went up at an average rate of about 3.2 percent. Since that time, we have allowed the Federal budget to grow at a rate of 6.4 percent. That assumes that we will enforce the numbers that we passed in this year's House budget resolution and that is really what we are debating today; that is, it is one thing to pass a budget, it is another thing to make certain that we enforce the budget.

There will be two great issues we are going to discuss today that I think are important. First of all, are we going to enforce the budgets that we pass here in the House of Representatives? We

are the keepers of the public purse. I think we ought to enforce that budget. The second thing we are going to debate today is changing the process by which we derive a budget. The process today all leans towards more spending. In fact, I think the Wall Street Journal did a beautiful editorial last week which really underscored that point. Everything we do here, and frankly that is what we do, is we spend the public's money, but all of the rules today tend to make it easier to spend more money. What we want to do is level the rules so that at least we have a counterbalance to all of that pressure to spend more money.

I might just say this. We all have different reasons, and some say it is the tax cuts, but I would remind people that we cut taxes in almost every year during the 1990s, and we did it under PAYGO and spending cap rules. It can be done. We just have to find offsets for those. And we did. In fact, most of the supplemental spending bills that we passed we found offsets for those. It can be done. It means making some tough choices, but I always remind my colleagues, our constituents did not send us here just to make the easy choices. They sent us here to make tough choices. We are going to make some tough choices today in terms of whether we really mean what we say about holding the line on Federal spending and whether or not we are going to level the playing field in terms of the rules by which we make our budgets. This is an important debate.

The debate about raising the debt ceiling is clearly an important debate, but I think we have to be clear. Even if we had a balanced budget, because of the surpluses coming in in the Social Security trust fund, we would still have to raise the debt ceiling.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor very disappointed because once again the majority has chosen not to allow the Blue Dogs to have our amendment considered. I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington, why did his committee allow 19 amendments, most of which should be offered by the minority party, but are being offered by the majority party? Why did he not allow the Blue Dogs to have 5 minutes, 10 minutes, a simple up and down vote on our proposal?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. As the gentleman knows, I would respond to my friend from Texas, our committee has to make a lot of difficult decisions sometimes with the number of amendments that

are brought in. Sometimes we have to make choices that are going to dis-appoint some Members. My friend from Texas has been here, and I confess that maybe he has been disappointed more than once.

Mr. STENHOLM. I take back my time from the gentleman. I appreciate the honesty in which he comes forward and with a straight face attempts to say why they denied us a chance. They can find time for 19 amendments, most of which are a joke. The rhetoric sounds good. The gentleman from Minnesota just spoke, there is a lot he and I can work together on. What we offered in our amendment is a chance to work together on something, but we are constantly denied and why? Because if they allowed our amendment on the floor, there is bipartisan support for it and it might have a chance to pass.

Any resemblance to democracy in this House is purely coincidental with the running of it by the current leadership in the House. Purely coincidental. I ask my colleague why they denied our amendment but allowed 19 others. We heard the answer.

The rule before us presents us with a false choice. Let me remind everyone, Republicans control the House, Republicans control the Senate, Republicans control the White House. The only thing Republicans cannot control is spending. Spending has gone up more in the last 3 years than in the previous 8. And when you talk about spending, I have been here 25 years. Spending has gone down by one-half of 1 percent as a percent of gross domestic product since I was elected in 1978. Revenue has gone down by 5 percent. That creates the deficits. I agree with the gentleman who just spoke a moment ago. Raising the debt ceiling would have to be done. But we should never raise it without putting a change in the manner in which our economic program is working that will just continue to have the debt ceiling going on as far as the eye can see. That makes no sense.

Some of us would like to work with you but we are constantly denied the opportunity to come before this body and have a vote. What we asked for is pay as you go that applies to both spending and to revenue. If you are going to spend more, you have got to cut someplace else. We agree with the President, President George W. Bush's spending limits for 2 years. We agree. There is no argument on spending. But there is an argument on deficits. And with all due respect, if you want to cut taxes, you have got to cut spending. Do not just talk about it. Do not just come and make the speeches we are going to hear all day today about how tough we are going to be on spending. You are in the majority. Anybody offering some of those amendments you are offering, you ought to be doing it. Nobody is keeping you from doing it. You have got the votes. You can do anything you want if you have got the votes. But what do you do?

You bring 19 amendments to the floor that you used to offer when you were in the minority party, and I agreed with you. I agreed with you on many of those. But now you are in the majority and I disagree with the manner in which you are running this House. But that is a right of the majority. All we asked for is a chance to have our idea debated and through the wisdom of, oh, well, you are going to disappoint some from time to time, there are folks on your side that agree with us and you deny them the right to vote with us.

□ 1100

That is shameful. Applying pay-as-you-go rules to tax cuts does not prevent Congress from cutting taxes, and do not say that over here. You know it is not true. It makes great sense, please a lot of folks, I suppose. But all it says is if we are going to reduce our revenues, we need to reduce spending by the same amount. Do it. Do not just come to this floor and spend 12 hours debating some of the silliest amendments that we could have if you are serious about doing something. If we really want to do it, let us do it like we did in 1990, like we did in 1997, when we had bipartisan support for doing something about the deficit.

The hand is still here on this side. I wish somebody over there would take it just once before this year is over.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

And I would like to say to the last speaker the hand was reached out on an amendment and the last speaker took the hand and that is why he and I have an amendment on the floor today on a very important item. So while all the minority's amendments were not made in order, there are a couple of amendments that were bipartisan that he and I have. And I hope that he does not count among the silly amendments the one that he and I have.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, and I appreciate that fact, and I do not consider all of the amendments silly. I consider some of them very silly, but the one that I am agreeing with him on I do not consider silly.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the clarification.

Mr. Speaker, let me frame what this is all about. What are we doing here today? What we are trying to accomplish here today is to clean up this silly budget process we have here in Washington. All of us have different ideas on how to fix this system.

There are some differences in philosophies. We heard the gentleman talking about the PAYGO, their version of PAYGO, our version of PAYGO, that the basis of that philosophical difference is we do not believe fiscal discipline in Washington should come from tax increases. We believe fiscal discipline in Washington should come from spending cuts. And when we have the PAYGO system, much like what we have had in the past, history already shows that it puts a bias in the law for tax increases, not spending cuts.

So what we want to accomplish, because we believe this, we want the discipline, we want the inertia, we want the pressure to be on controlling spending, not raising taxes. There is the big philosophy difference.

But going down the road of the system we have here in Washington, Mr. Speaker, I would argue that we have this thing in place since 1974; and since 1974, Washington has had a horrible record of getting its handle on our budgets, when Republicans ran things and when Democrats ran things. For a while in the 1990s, we did a pretty good job, but since then we have not; and I would argue that.

We are doing well in many years, but when we look at a system, for example, that allows some appropriations to come to the floor, say, adding \$50 million for a rain forest museum in Coraville, Iowa, and if we want to come to this floor and pass an amendment so that we can do so on behalf of our taxpayer constituents to say I do not think we should pay \$50 million for a rain forest museum in Coraville, Iowa, I have an amendment to strike that proposal. We could pass that amendment. But by the rules of this institution from the 1974 Budget Act, that \$50 million would have to be re-spent somewhere else in the Federal Government. It could not be saved. That is ridiculous. That is just one example of how crazy this budget system is that we have today.

Another crazy example of these rules is when we pass budgets, and we really work hard on passing these budget resolutions, as soon as we pass these budget resolutions, they amount to nothing more than mere guidelines. They are not actual, enforceable budgets. They do not take the force of law.

What we propose today, through an amendment and through a couple of substitutes, is that when we actually pass a budget here, it means something. We stick to it. We enforce it. It is honest. It is going to work. It is going to happen. That is not what happens today.

So we want to have a budget process that is done at the beginning of the budget process where the President signs it into law, and because the budget becomes law, it therefore is enforceable so that we can make sure we stick to the budget, that we plan the finances of this country so that we can factor in all the things we need to

think about: the level of taxation, the level of debt, the deficits, getting ready for the baby boomer retirement, all of those things so that when we actually pass a budget, it works and it is enforceable. These are not really crazy ideas. These are commonsense ideas to bring common sense to a budget system that is broken.

I would challenge anyone to come to the floor and argue on behalf of this current budget system to say that this is the epitome of common sense, that this thing works right as it should. We have not changed this system since 1974. It is high time we changed it. We are going to have a lot of amendments to try to do that. We are going to have some big substitute votes on big bills to do that. This is the product of a collaborative work. It is a product of Democrats and Republicans. It is a product that needs to come to this floor. It is a product that needs to pass into law so that we bring common sense back to our budget process.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Rochester for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the Democratic substitute.

It would have made incredible common sense to deal with the budget reform before voting on the budget. But that kind of common sense regularly escapes the majority, and that is why there has been a 4-month impasse on their budget between the two Chambers, their party.

The truth is this Congress has been on a recess on dealing with the crisis that is facing the American people for the last year dealing with health care costs, college costs, and retirement savings problems. You are scared to be honest with the American people about the fact that you have been on a recess. But given how they feel about this Congress and given the fact that they have given you a failing grade so far, none of these Hail Mary passes is going to confuse them about where you are and what you have done in addressing their health care crisis, their college education crisis, and their savings crisis.

This bill ignores the advice of Chairman Greenspan, who said it would be a grave mistake to let go of the PAYGO budget rules. This bill even ignores the advice of the gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the Committee on the Budget, who said just 2 years ago the PAYGO rules contributed to obtaining the deficits. The chairman voted for those rules in 1997. That vote ensured that we made choices, lived within our means, and were accountable for what we do. Maybe with maturity over the last 2 years, he has decided to change his view on that. It is possible. Or maybe like the rest of us, he got the disease that is rampant in Washington

where one is firm in one's opinions, but very flexible on one's principles. That is a possibility too.

The 1990s were good economic times. We created 22 million jobs, raised income for all levels, had more access for the uninsured to health care. College was more accessible to more Americans, and savings were up. We balanced the budget and accumulated surpluses reaching nearly \$300 billion. And what we did not do was say that every tax cut is good or every tax cut is bad. We made choices. We made choices on spending.

In the 1993 budget, we cut taxes for the middle class, and we also reduced spending. In 1997 we cut taxes for people earning \$100,000 and, yes, gave them the first-ever \$500-per-child tax cut. And we made choices by investing in children's health care, investing in the environment, investing in Medicaid, and also investing in people's retirement and strengthening our Social Security system.

But your economic plan has led to \$3 trillion in additional debt, an annual budget deficit of \$500 billion, 44 million Americans without health insurance, 2 million more middle-class families who have moved from the middle class to poverty, and the highest rate of foreclosures in the last 3 years on personal bankruptcy. You have turned your back on what worked in the 1990s.

And let me add one additional point. The majority party in the 1990 budget did not vote for it. It took Democratic votes that put us on the path to fiscal discipline. The majority party in 1993 contributed not a single vote that built on the 1990 agreement that also reduced the deficit and put us on the path to a balanced budget. You did not become a player in deficit discipline until 1997 with that agreement, which was the last yard.

So let us not rewrite history here. Some of us do not have a foggy memory of what happened in the 1990 agreement, the 1993 agreement. We made choices and difficult choices, and some sat on the sidelines and were really good critics.

Mr. Speaker, this so-called budget process bill says hands off when it comes to making the tough choices, and it says that we do not have the political courage to make those choices.

We must make choices when it comes to tax cuts and spending and be honest with the American people, but it takes both to deal with putting our fiscal house back in order.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), a member of the Committee on the Budget and also a leader on budget reform.

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

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

I think this is an incredibly important debate that this House needs to

have today. Not only is it a critically important debate to have; but, frankly, it reduces itself down to a very simple debate to have. Simple perhaps, not easy.

The simple proposition is this: Do we believe there should be any limit to government? It is a very simple proposition. Do we believe that there should be any limit to government whatsoever?

Many in this body do not believe it. Many do, however. Many know the struggles and challenges that families face. Some of us believe that it is time to protect the family budget from the Federal budget.

Since I have been alive, the Federal budget has grown seven times faster than the family budget when measured by median worker income. Seven times faster. I believe that is an unsustainable and unconscionable growth rate.

The government is now spending over \$20,000 per American household for only the fourth time in the entire history of our Nation and for the first time since World War II. That figure is up from \$16,000 per household just 5 short years ago, just 5 short years ago. This represents the largest expansion of the Federal Government in 50 years. At what point do we say enough is enough? I know the Founding Fathers believed in limited government. The question is do we believe in limited government?

There is going to be a bill. There are going to be a number of substitutes. There are going to be a number of amendments. But all of them are going to reduce down to two simple propositions: Should the family budget be protected from the Federal budget? Do we believe in limited government? And second of all, once we pass a budget, will we abide by that budget? Will we live by that budget like American families do each and every day? Because we cannot have unlimited government and unlimited opportunity.

Many of us believe strongly that we must have unlimited opportunity. It would be wonderful if all of this government spending magically turned into love and happiness and kindness; and, indeed, there is much great work done by the Federal Government. But, indeed, there is also much waste and much fraud and much abuse and much duplication. And I fear until we limit, limit, the growth of government, that this body will not take the steps necessary to protect the family budget from the Federal budget and root this out.

Up until recently, Medicare would routinely pay three, four, five times as much for a wheelchair as the VA did and had for years. Why? Because one would competitively bid and the other would not. The Department of the Interior maintains approximately 31,000 Web sites, almost one for every two employees. Does this meet the reasonableness test? I do not believe so.

In the last year of the Clinton administration, HUD spent over 10 percent of

their budget, \$3 billion, paying out payments to people who did not even qualify for the program. We spent over \$800,000 for one toilet in one national park, and it did not even work.

My point is we are just scratching the surface here. When we begin to look at the 10,000 Federal programs spread across 500, 600 government agencies, we discover that they routinely waste 5, 10, 15, perhaps 20, percent of their taxpayer-funded budgets and have for years.

This money is not free. It is not ours. It belongs to the families of America. And when we take it away from their kitchen tables to fund our programs, what are we taking away from them? Maybe the opportunity for them to buy a computer, a home computer, to further the education of their children. Maybe it is that first downpayment on a home. Maybe it is a couple months of child care.

We must limit the size, the scope, the power, and the expense of the Federal Government. And this is what this legislation is all about. So no matter how many different ways people try to obfuscate it and try to make it confusing and cumbersome, it boils down to one simple proposition: Do we believe in limited government, or do we not believe in limited government? And that is why we need this rule for this very critical debate to go forward.

I know, from listening to the debate on the other side, what we will hear all day. We will hear about Draconian cuts in the budget. As I read the legislation, government is still going to grow under every single amendment. Government will still grow. All we are saying is that maybe, just maybe, the government budget should not grow faster than the family budget.

And we hear so much about how tax relief is causing these massive deficits.

□ 1115

Well, it is interesting, when we actually look at the numbers, and last year's budget, which was a 10-year budget, we had almost \$27 trillion of spending compared to \$350 billion of tax relief. Now, if we buy into the opposition's argument, that tax relief represents a government expenditure, if we do the math, we figure out that the tax relief is roughly 1.5 percent of the spending. We could take it all the way and make no dent in the challenge whatsoever.

I continue to be perplexed why people who talk so much about their concern for the deficit will focus all of their rhetoric on 1 percent of the challenge and ignore 99 percent of the challenge, which is on the spending side. And, by the way, tax relief is proven to be part of the solution and not part of the problem.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

If the American people want to buy more of what we just heard, they are going to get a chance in November. But if they want to really think about the fiscal future of this country, then think about how we have moved from hundreds of billions of surpluses to hundreds of billions of deficits. Think about what Treasury Secretary O'Neill said in his book when he raised the concern about this deficit spending by the majority and by the Republican party.

He said that Vice President CHENEY said, oh, do not worry about deficits. It did not hamper Reagan, when we quadrupled the national debt. Now we are raising the debt limit 3 times, up to \$3 trillion, so that our children and our grandchildren will have to pay for the cost of our expenditures.

And he said well, we do not want to have PAYGO affect tax cuts, we just want it on the spending side because it is philosophical. Well, it was philosophical about whether the earth was flat or not, or round. The facts are stubborn things, Reagan said, and I remember that. Because when we think about the real facts: 44 million Americans without health insurance, millions without jobs, a 50-year high on mortgage foreclosures, an historic high the third year in a row on personal bankruptcies.

This majority has controlled spending and tax cuts for the last 10 years. They come on the floor and want to blame it on what they affectionately refer to as "the other side." Where is the willingness to be accountable, to take responsibility for their own actions?

The majority has decided to take this country on a course of fiscal irresponsibility. What we need to really think about now is whether we want to continue to go in that direction, whether we want to continue to have future generations having to pay for the choices we are making today, or whether we are prepared to pay for our own choices.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I come over here with a degree of sadness, because the rule prohibits the consideration of the Blue Dog substitute on budget enforcement.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) made a speech a while ago that I could not say any better about why the Blue Dog budget enforcement ought to be passed. My other young friend talked about spending. If we want to talk about wasteful spending, let me just talk about it for a second.

In July of 2002, the debt ceiling in this country was raised \$450 billion. On Memorial Day weekend last year, it

was raised another \$980 billion. The other night in the defense bill, we had to raise it again, \$650-plus. In the last 3 years, the debt of this country, the debt ceiling has been raised over \$2 trillion. At 5 percent interest, what we have done following this economic game plan is raise taxes \$100 billion a year every year, and my Republican colleagues want to talk about wasteful spending. I can think of nothing more wasteful than interest, because we get no health care, no military, no education, no nothing.

But it is even worse than that. Years ago, when we heard about the GDP, percentage of GDP and the deficit, they said, do not worry about it. Do my colleagues know who was buying our debt then? Americans. Do my colleagues know who is financing our debt now? Seventy percent of our debt last year was financed by foreign interests.

I am telling all of my colleagues, sooner or later, the hocking of this country to anybody in the world that will buy our paper is going to, if it is not already, become a national security issue. We are going to not only do a generational mugging on our children and grandchildren by what we are doing here now, but we are going to put future policymakers in a position where there will be leverage on them by foreign powers who do not see the world the same way the United States does in such a way that it is going to be a national security problem for them.

I can think of no other better way to control spending than to apply PAYGO to tax cuts. Do my colleagues know why? Because then, when we cut taxes, we have to cut spending. Now, we cut taxes, and I voted for some of them, but we did not cut spending. Spending keeps going up. If we are really serious about cutting spending, apply pay-go to both. Then we will have to cut spending when we cut taxes, and that is what the Blue Dog budget enforcement has in it. Without that, all we are hearing is rhetoric, rhetoric, rhetoric.

It has not worked. It will not work. And I tell my colleagues, when the American people find out what is going on here, I think they are going to be not only disappointed, but appalled.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to some of the things that were just said.

First of all, I happen to believe that PAYGO rules ought to apply to tax cuts, too. But this is all about the politics of the possible, and we cannot get that done this year. So we can take this step this year, this day to begin to constrain Federal spending.

Let me also respond to something else. Our friends on the left cannot have it both ways. They cannot say, well, we need to invest in this program and that program and this program for people, and if we put more money into

education, the argument is we will get it back ten-fold, but we do not want to pay any interest on that money. We cannot have it both ways. Fifty-five percent of what we will spend this year will be for what are called entitlement programs, and many of those entitlement programs were sold as investments in people. Now we are being told, but we get no return on that investment. This is just an expenditure, and it is lost forever.

So as we debate this, I know that people are going to come at this from different perspectives, but let us try to at least be honest with ourselves. We have a system right now, and the rules and the way the system works encourages more and more spending.

The debate today simply is about this: are we going to enforce the budgets that we pass here in the House and are we going to change the rules to give the taxpayers an even break? That is what the debate is about today. We can debate all of those other issues some other day. But we need support on both sides of the aisle to make certain that the American people understand that we are going to enforce the budgets we pass in the House.

We are the keepers of the public purse. We are going to enforce those budgets, and we are going to begin to amend the rules to make it more difficult to spend more than we take in.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, back in 1990, Congress instituted the pay-as-you-go rules with bipartisan support, including the support of the first President Bush. However, those rules were based on the principle that if you are digging yourself deeper into a hole, the first thing you do is stop digging. And the 1990 rules which required that both mandatory spending increases and tax cuts be offset helped keep the deficit hole from getting deeper, and eventually helped produce record budget surpluses.

Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle evidently have completely forgotten this sound concept. The Republican bill we debate here today is a deeply flawed and ineffective version of the earlier pay-as-you-go requirements. Specifically, this legislation lets the Congress keep digging deeper to make the deficit bigger. By covering only mandatory spending, tax cuts would not have to be paid for, and entitlement increases would ultimately have to be paid for by cutting other entitlements. That is Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. In essence, this is the way in which they mask the dismantling of entitlement priorities.

In addition, the measured spending caps would be set at unrealistically low levels, which would lead either to devastating cuts in domestic spending, in education, in health care, in research, or, to the ignoring of the caps. RECORD deficits are not due to discretionary spending. If we eliminated all non-defense discretionary spending, we would not eliminate the anticipated fiscal year budget deficit of \$478 billion, all nondefense discretionary spending. Forget about it. Eliminate it all. We still would not take care of the deficit.

So since most Federal benefits for low and middle class people are provided through entitlement programs, and most government subsidies for high-income individuals and corporations are in the Tax Code, this measure would then turn the policy practice on its head in favor of the affluent and against the low and middle income families of this country.

The bill was designed so that the new spending caps would be set at discretionary spending levels contained in the conference report on the budget resolution, which calls for cutting domestic discretionary programs outside of homeland security by \$77 billion over the next 5 years.

Unlike the caps imposed in the 1990s, the new caps require much deeper cuts and would not be part of a balanced deficit reduction package that puts every part of the budget, every part of the budget on the table and calls for shared sacrifice.

Finally, on this rule, Republicans clearly are afraid of the views expressed on this side of the aisle that everything must be on the table when there are 19 amendments and 17 are Republican, and leading democratic voices who are known in this Congress are not given the opportunity to present on these issues. It is shameful. The rule needs to be voted down, as does the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this rule, but I do not support it. I do not think it is a good rule. I want to explain in just the couple of minutes that I have why that is the case.

First, I think I should make it known, especially to Members on my side of the aisle who have heard recently that I have been opposing budgetary caps, that that is not true. I do not oppose caps on the budget. To the contrary, my colleagues have heard me here on the floor many times saying that I need a budget. I cannot help it that the budget committees cannot get together and give us a real budget, but I need a budget to have discipline in the committee when there are amendments on the floor to raise spending by billions of dollars. So I need a budget with a budget cap.

However, I will not support statutory budget caps. This rule provides for a bill that provides for statutory budget caps. The reason I will not support statutory budget caps is very simple. It goes beyond politics, it goes beyond the House and the Senate. It is the Constitution of the United States that has established checks and balances by separation of powers. The budget process is the responsibility and the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States. Statutory budget caps put the executive branch into the mix. We would be hearing from OMB on a daily basis that they cannot accept this or they cannot accept that; that you are going to have to do it our way, or we will not sign the bill. That is what statutory budget caps are going to do to this process.

The current process is already unworkable. We need real budget process reform, but we need budget process reform that is going to work. And the budget process that we are working under today does not work.

□ 1130

We do not have a budget, and that is an example that the current process does not work. But let me say this: when we have had a real budget resolution, the Committee on Appropriations stays within their cap. Discretionary spending has not exceeded the budget caps since this gentleman has been chairman of the committee.

Where Congress ought to be looking is mandatory programs, because mandatory spending, which is basically two-thirds of all government spending, is the spending that runs us deeper into debt every year.

So I do not think the bill that this rule provides consideration for is a good bill. And I do not intend to support the bill. But I am going to vote for this rule, although I do not really agree with what it does. But in order to get the bill on the floor so the House can work its will, I will vote for the rule, but not for this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote "no" on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to vote on an important substitute amendment that was not allowed under the rule.

This substitute by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON), the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) would reinstate for 2 years the provisions of the Budget Enforcement Act.

It also provides for pay-as-you-go rules for legislation that increases the deficit, sets discretionary spending limits, and calls for a separate vote to consider legislation that would in-

crease those discretionary spending limits or waive the PAYGO requirement.

It is certainly worthy of discussion and a vote in this debate on the House budget process. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership blocked this amendment, and it was voted down in the Committee on Rules early this morning on a straight party-line vote.

When asked why so few or no Democrat amendments were allowed, the Chair of the Committee on Rules said, "Because we are the majority."

Mr. Speaker, there are few Members in this House who have worked as hard and long to improve the budget process and control the deficit, as has the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM); yet he was denied an opportunity after his thoughtful and responsible substitute. Three Republican substitutes were made in order under the rule and 15 other amendments, but the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) was arbitrarily denied.

It seems that every time we get on the floor to do a rule, the other side talks about how fair and balanced their rule is. Well, there is nothing fair and balanced about shutting out of the budget reform debate one of the House's experts on this matter. If one does not support the Stenholm substitute, one does not have to vote for it, but at least let it come before the House for a debate in an up-or-down vote.

I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on the previous question. Let me make it clear that a "no" vote will not stop the House from taking up the Spending Control Act and will not prevent any of the amendments made in order by the rule from being offered. However, a "yes" vote will preclude the House from consideration of the Stenholm substitute, a substitute that would add greatly to this process.

So do the right thing, please vote "no" on the previous question. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, again, vote "no" on the previous question.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious issue, and it is one that needs to be debated as we can see by the debate that we have had here simply on the rule. We expect a more vigorous debate as the issues are presented and as amendments are offered.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 692—RULE ON H.R. 4663 SPENDING CONTROL ACT OF 2004

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 as though printed after the amendment numbered 17 in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative Stenholm of Texas 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 follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3973, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. STENHOLM OF TEXAS, MR. MATHESON OF UTAH, MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA, MR. HILL OF INDIANA, MR. MOORE OF KANSAS, OR MR. TANNER OF TENNESSEE

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Living With in Our Means Act of 2004”.

TITLE I—REINSTATING AND STRENGTHENING BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF THE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS.

(a) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—(1) Section 251(c)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting a dash after “2005”, by redesignating the remaining portion of such paragraph as subparagraph (D) and by moving it two ems to the right, and by inserting after the dash the following new subparagraphs:

“(A) for the general purpose discretionary category: \$319,697,000,000 in new budget authority and \$862,247,000,000 in outlays;

“(B) for the highway category: \$30,585,000,000 in outlays; and

“(C) for the mass transit category: \$1,554,000,000 in new budget authority and \$6,787,000,000 in outlays; and”.

(2) Section 251(c)(3) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting a dash after “2006”, by redesignating the remaining portion of such paragraph as subparagraph (D) and by moving it two ems to the right, and by inserting after the dash the following new subparagraphs:

“(A) for the general purpose discretionary category: \$837,271,000,000 in new budget authority and \$853,170,000,000 in outlays;

“(B) for the highway category: \$33,271,000,000 in outlays; and

“(C) for the mass transit category: \$1,671,000,000 in new budget authority and \$7,585,000,000 in outlays; and”.

(b) ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.—(1) Section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.—In fiscal years 2005 through 2009, the total amount of discretionary advance appropriations provided in appropriation Acts shall not exceed \$23,158,000. Any amount enacted in excess of such amount shall be counted against the discretionary spending limits for the fiscal year for which the appropriation Act containing the advance appropriation is enacted.”.

(2) Section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(20) The term ‘advance appropriation’ refers to the following budget accounts or portions thereof that become available one fiscal year or more beyond the fiscal year for which the appropriation Act making such funds available is enacted:

“(A) 89-5428-0-2-0271 (Elk Hills);

“(B) 16-0174-1-504 (Training and Employment Services);

“(C) 91-0900-01-501 (Education for the Disadvantaged);

“(D) 91-1000-01-501 (School Improvement);

“(E) 75-1536-0-1-506 (Children and Family Services (Head Start));

“(F) 91-0300-0-1-501 (Special Education);

“(G) 91-0400-0-1-501 (Vocational and Adult Education);

“(H) 18-1001-0-1-372 (Payment to the Postal Service Fund); or

“(I) 86-0319-0-1-604 (Housing Certificate Fund (Section 8 Renewal)).”.

(c) EXPIRATION.—Section 275 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 note) is amended by striking subsection (b).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 250(c)(4) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by—

(A) striking “the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century and the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2003” and inserting “the Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users”; and

(B) inserting before the period at the end the following new clauses:

“(v) 69-8158-0-7-401 (Motor Carrier Safety Grants).

“(vi) 69-8159-0-7-401 (Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs).”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by—

(A) inserting “(and successor accounts)” after “budget accounts”; and

(B) striking “the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century and the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2003 or for which appropriations are provided pursuant to authorizations contained in those Acts (except that appropriations provided pursuant to section 5338(h) of title 49, United States Code, as amended by the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, shall not be included in this category)” and inserting “the Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users or for which appropriations are provided pursuant to authorizations contained in that Act”; and

(3) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by striking “section 8103 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century” and inserting “section 8103 of the Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users”.

SEC. 102. ADJUSTMENTS TO ALIGN HIGHWAY SPENDING WITH REVENUES.

Subparagraphs (B) through (E) of section 251(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are amended to read as follows:

“(B) ADJUSTMENT TO ALIGN HIGHWAY SPENDING WITH REVENUES.—(i) When the President submits the budget under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, OMB shall calculate and the budget shall make adjustments to the highway category for the budget year and each outyear as provided in clause (ii)(I)(cc).

“(ii)(I)(aa) OMB shall take the actual level of highway receipts for the year before the current year and subtract the sum of the estimated level of highway receipts in subclause (II) plus any amount previously calculated under item (bb) for that year.

(bb) OMB shall take the current estimate of highway receipts for the current year and subtract the estimated level of receipts for that year.

“(cc) OMB shall add one-half of the sum of the amount calculated under items (aa) and

(bb) to the obligation limitations set forth in the section 8103 of the Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users and, using current estimates, calculate the outlay change resulting from the change in obligations for the budget year and the first outyear and the outlays flowing therefrom through subsequent fiscal years. After making the calculations under the preceding sentence, OMB shall adjust the amount of obligations set forth in that section for the budget year and the first outyear by adding one-half of the sum of the amount calculated under items (aa) and (bb) to each such year.

“(II) The estimated level of highway receipts for the purposes of this clause are—

“(aa) for fiscal year 2004, \$30,572,000,000;

“(bb) for fiscal year 2005, \$34,260,000,000;

“(cc) for fiscal year 2006, \$35,586,000,000;

“(dd) for fiscal year 2007, \$36,570,000,000;

“(ee) for fiscal year 2008, \$37,603,000,000; and

“(ff) for fiscal year 2009, \$38,651,000,000.

“(III) In this clause, the term ‘highway receipts’ means the governmental receipts credited to the highway account of the Highway Trust Fund.

“(C) In addition to the adjustment required by subparagraph (B), when the President submits the budget under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 2006, 2007, 2008, or 2009, OMB shall calculate and the budget shall include for the budget year and each outyear an adjustment to the limits on outlays for the highway category and the mass transit category equal to—

“(i) the outlays for the applicable category calculated assuming obligation levels consistent with the estimates prepared pursuant to subparagraph (D), as adjusted, using current technical assumptions; minus

“(ii) the outlays for the applicable category set forth in the subparagraph (D) estimates, as adjusted.

“(D)(i) When OMB and CBO submit their final sequester report for fiscal year 2004, that report shall include an estimate of the outlays for each of the categories that would result in fiscal years 2005 through 2009 from obligations at the levels specified in section 8103 of the Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users using current assumptions.

“(ii) When the President submits the budget under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 2006, 2007, 2008, or 2009, OMB shall adjust the estimates made in clause (i) by the adjustments by subparagraphs (B) and (C).

“(E) OMB shall consult with the Committees on the Budget and include a report on adjustments under subparagraphs (B) and (C) in the preview report.”.

SEC. 103. LEVEL OF OBLIGATION LIMITATIONS.

(a) HIGHWAY CATEGORY.—For the purposes of section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the level of obligation limitations for the highway category is—

(1) for fiscal year 2004, \$34,309,000,000;

(2) for fiscal year 2005, \$35,671,000,000;

(3) for fiscal year 2006, \$36,719,000,000;

(4) for fiscal year 2007, \$37,800,000,000;

(5) for fiscal year 2008, \$38,913,000,000; and

(6) for fiscal year 2009, \$40,061,000,000.

(b) MASS TRANSIT CATEGORY.—For the purposes of section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the level of obligation limitations for the mass transit category is—

(1) for fiscal year 2004, \$7,266,000,000;

(2) for fiscal year 2005, \$7,750,000,000;

(3) for fiscal year 2006, \$8,266,000,000;

(4) for fiscal year 2007, \$8,816,000,000;

(5) for fiscal year 2008, \$9,403,000,000; and

(6) for fiscal year 2009, \$10,029,000,000.

For purposes of this subsection, the term “obligation limitations” means the sum of budget authority and obligation limitations.

SEC. 104. REVENUE ADJUSTMENT.

If an amendment is designated to be used to offset a decrease in receipts for a fiscal year pursuant to section 316(c)(1)(D) or section 317(c)(1)(D) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, then the applicable level of revenues for such fiscal year for purposes of section 311(a) of such Act shall be reduced by the amount of such amendment.

SEC. 105. EXTENSION OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO REQUIREMENT.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—Section 252(a) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by striking “2002” and inserting “2009”.

(b) **SEQUESTRATION.**—Section 252(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by striking “2002” and inserting “2009”.

SEC. 106. REPORTS.

Subsections (c)(2) and (f)(2)(A) of section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are amended by striking “2002” and inserting “2009”.

SEC. 107. EXPIRATION.

Section 275(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by striking “2002” and inserting “2009” and by striking “2006” and inserting “2013”.

SEC. 108. AUTOMATIC BUDGET ENFORCEMENT FOR MEASURES CONSIDERED ON THE FLOOR.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“BUDGET EVASION POINTS OF ORDER

“**SEC. 316. (a) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill or resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or resolution) that waives or suspends the enforcement of section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or otherwise would alter the spending limits set forth in that section.

“(b) **PAY-AS-YOU-GO.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill or resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or resolution) that waives or suspends the enforcement of section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or otherwise would alter the balances of the pay-as-you-go scorecard pursuant to that section.

“(c) **DIRECTED SCORING.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill or resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or resolution) that directs the scorekeeping of any bill or resolution.

“(d) **FAR-OUTYEARS.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill or resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or resolution) that contains a provision providing new budget authority or which reduces revenues which first takes effect after the first five fiscal years covered in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget and would have the effect of reducing the surplus or increasing the deficit in any fiscal year.

“(e) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—(1) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of this section.

“(2)(A) This subsection shall apply only to the House of Representatives.

“(B) In order to be cognizable by the Chair, a point of order under this section must specify the precise language on which it is premised.

“(C) As disposition of points of order under this section, the Chair shall put the question

of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the points of order.

“(D) A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by each Member initiating a point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent on each point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

“(E) The disposition of the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to a bill or joint resolution shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.”

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item for section 315 the following:

“Sec. 316. Budget evasion points of order.”

SEC. 109. REQUIREMENTS FOR BUDGET ACT WAIVERS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) **JUSTIFICATION FOR BUDGET ACT WAIVERS.**—Clause 6 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(h) It shall not be in order to consider any resolution from the Committee on Rules for the consideration of any reported bill or joint resolution which waives section 302, 303, 311, or 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, unless the report accompanying such resolution includes a description of the provision proposed to be waived, an identification of the section being waived, the reasons why such waiver should be granted, and an estimated cost of the provisions to which the waiver applies.”

(b) **SEPARATE VOTE TO WAIVE MAJOR BUDGET ACT POINT OF ORDER.**—(1) Section 905 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h)(1) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of a major budget act point of order as defined in paragraph (2).

“(2) For the purposes of this subsection, the term ‘major budget point of order’ means any point of order arising under any section listed in section 904.

“(3)(A) In order to be cognizable by the Chair, a point of order under the sections referenced in paragraph (2) must specify the precise language on which it is premised.

“(B) As disposition of points of order under the sections referenced in paragraph (2), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the points of order.

“(C) A question of consideration under the sections referenced in paragraph (2) shall be debatable for 10 minutes by each Member initiating a point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent on each point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

“(D) The disposition of the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to a bill or joint resolution shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.”

SEC. 110. CBO SCORING OF CONFERENCE REPORTS.

(a) The first sentence of section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended as follows:

(1) Insert “or conference report thereon,” before “and submit”.

(2) In paragraph (1), strike “bill or resolution” and insert “bill, joint resolution, or conference report”.

(3) At the end of paragraph (2) strike “and”, at the end of paragraph (3) strike the period and insert “; and”, and after such paragraph (3) add the following new paragraph:

“(4) A determination of whether such bill, joint resolution, or conference report provides direct spending.”

(b) The second sentence of section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting before the period the following: “, or in the case of a conference report, shall be included in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying such conference report if timely submitted before such report is filed”.

TITLE II—INCREASED AND ACCOUNTABILITY AND INFORMATION IN CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS**SEC. 201. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST COSTS.**

Section 308(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 639(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) containing a projection by the Congressional Budget Office of the cost of the debt servicing that would be caused by such measure for such fiscal year (or fiscal years) and each of the four ensuing fiscal years.”

SEC. 202. ACCOUNTABILITY IN EMERGENCY SPENDING.

(a) **OMB EMERGENCY CRITERIA.**—Section 3 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(1)(A) The term ‘emergency’ means a situation that—

“(i) requires new budget authority and outlays (or new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom) for the prevention or mitigation of, or response to, loss of life or property, or a threat to national security; and

“(ii) is unanticipated.

“(B) As used in subparagraph (A), the term ‘unanticipated’ means that the situation is—

“(i) sudden, which means quickly coming into being or not building up over time;

“(ii) urgent, which means a pressing and compelling need requiring immediate action;

“(iii) unforeseen, which means not predicted or anticipated as an emerging need; and

“(iv) temporary, which means not of a permanent duration.”

(b) **DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES FOR APPLICATION OF EMERGENCY DEFINITION.**—Not later than five months after the date of enactment of this Act, the chairmen of the Committees on the Budget (in consultation with the President) shall, after consulting with the chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations and applicable authorizing committees of their respective Houses and the Directors of the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget, jointly publish in the Congressional Record guidelines for application of the definition of emergency set forth in section 3(1) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

(c) **CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS RELATED TO GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.**—Section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(I) **CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS RELATED TO GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.**—If supplemental

appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism that, pursuant to this subparagraph, the President designates as a contingency operation related to the global war on terrorism and the Congress so designates in statute, the adjustment shall be the total of such appropriations in discretionary accounts so designated and the outlays flowing in all fiscal years from such appropriations.”

(d) SEPARATE HOUSE VOTE ON EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—(1) Rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end the following new clause: “13. In the consideration of any measure for amendment in the Committee of the Whole containing any emergency spending designation, it shall always be in order unless specifically waived by terms of a rule governing consideration of that measure, to move to strike such emergency spending designation from the portion of the bill then open to amendment.”

(2) The Committee on Rules shall include in the report required by clause 1(d) of rule XI (relating to its activities during the Congress) of the Rules of the House of Representatives a separate item identifying all waivers of points of order relating to emergency spending designations, listed by bill or joint resolution number and the subject matter of that measure.

(e) COMMITTEE NOTIFICATION OF EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.—Whenever the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee of either House (including a committee of conference) reports any bill or joint resolution that provides budget authority for any emergency, the report accompanying that bill or joint resolution (or the joint explanatory statement of managers in the case of a conference report on any such bill or joint resolution) shall identify all provisions that provide budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom for such emergency and include a statement of the reasons why such budget authority meets the definition of an emergency pursuant to the guidelines described in subsection (b).

SEC. 203. APPLICATION OF BUDGET ACT POINTS OF ORDER TO UNREPORTED LEGISLATION.

(a) Section 315 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by striking “reported” the first place it appears.

(b) Section 303(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “(A)” and by redesignating subparagraph (B) as paragraph (2) and by striking the semicolon at the end of such new paragraph (2) and inserting a period; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3).

SEC. 204. BUDGET COMPLIANCE STATEMENTS.

Clause 3(d) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(4) A budget compliance statement prepared by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, if timely submitted prior to the filing of the report, which shall include assessment by such chairman as to whether the bill or joint resolution complies with the requirements of sections 302, 303, 306, 311, and 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 or any other requirements set forth in a concurrent resolution on the budget and may include the budgetary implications of that bill or joint resolution under section 251 or 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as applicable.”

SEC. 205. PROJECTIONS UNDER SECTION 257.

Section 257(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

“(7) EMERGENCIES.—New budgetary resources designated under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 251(b)(2)(I) shall not be assumed beyond the fiscal year for which they have been enacted.”

SEC. 206. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE BALANCED BUDGET AND EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT OF 1985.

Part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended as follows:

(1) In section 250(a), strike “SEC. 256. GENERAL AND SPECIAL SEQUESTRATION RULES” and insert “Sec. 256. General and special sequestration rules” in the item relating to section 256.

(2) In subparagraphs (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), and (K) of section 250(c)(4), insert “subparagraph” after “described in” each place it appears.

(3) In section 250(c)(18), insert “of” after “expenses”.

(4) In section 251(b)(1)(A), strike “committees” the first place it appears and insert “Committees”.

(5) In section 251(b)(1)(C)(i), strike “fiscal years” and insert “fiscal year”.

(6) In section 251(b)(1)(D)(ii), strike “fiscal years” and insert “fiscal year”.

(7) In section 252(b)(2)(B), insert “the” before “budget year”.

(8) In section 252(c)(1)(C)(i), strike “paragraph (1)” and insert “subsection (b)”.

(9) In section 254(c)(3)(A), strike “subsection” and insert “section”.

(10) In section 254(f)(4), strike “subsection” and insert “section” and strike “sequesterable” and insert “sequestrable”.

(11) In section 255(g)(1)(B), move the fourteenth undesignated clause 2 ems to the right.

(12) In section 255(g)(2), insert “and” after the semicolon at the end of the next-to-last undesignated clause.

(13) In section 255(h)—

(A) strike “and” after the semicolon in the ninth undesignated clause;

(B) insert “and” after the semicolon at the end of the tenth undesignated clause; and

(C) strike the semicolon at the end and insert a period.

(14) In section 256(k)(1), strike “paragraph (5)” and insert “paragraph (6)”.

(15) In section 257(b)(2)(A)(i), strike “differenes” and insert “differences”.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this matter will be postponed.

REVISING THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AS IT APPLIES IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of June 22, 2004, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 685) revising the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2005 as it

applies in the House of Representatives, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of House Resolution 685 is as follows:

H. RES. 685

Resolved, That the conference report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 95, and the accompanying joint explanatory statement, as made applicable to the House by section 2 of House Resolution 649, shall have force and effect in the House as though such conference report and accompanying statement included the following modifications:

(1) In section 101 (relating to recommended levels and amounts for the budget year):

(A) In paragraph (4) (relating to the deficit), the amount of the deficit for fiscal year 2005 shall be reduced by \$4,675,000,000.

(B) In paragraph (1) (relating to Federal revenues), the recommended level of Federal revenues for fiscal year 2005 shall be increased by \$12,285,000,000 and the amount by which the aggregate level of Federal revenues should be changed shall be increased by \$12,285,000,000.

(C) In paragraph (2) (relating to new budget authority), the appropriate level of total new budget authority for fiscal year 2005 shall be increased by \$14,200,000,000.

(D) In paragraph (3) (relating to budget outlays), the appropriate level of total budget outlays for fiscal year 2005 shall be increased by \$7,610,000,000.

(2) In section 103 (relating to major functional categories):

(A) In paragraph (1) (relating to National Defense (050)), the amount of new budget authority shall be increased by \$1,000,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$740,000,000, to improve the quality of life and provide livable housing for military personnel and their families.

(B) In paragraph (5) (relating to Natural Resources and Environment (300)), the amount of new budget authority shall each be increased by \$825,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$550,000,000, to provide clean water and open spaces for future generations.

(C) In paragraph (6) (relating to Agriculture (350)), the amount of new budget authority shall be increased by \$380,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$330,000,000, to inspect and secure our Nation's food supply and to improve economic opportunities, infrastructure, and the quality of life for rural Americans.

(D) In paragraph (10) (relating to Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500)), the amount of new budget authority shall be increased by \$6,075,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$2,430,000,000, to create opportunities for our children and young adults, and to address the needs of low-income communities and assist the long-term unemployed.

(E) In paragraph (11) (relating to Health (550)), the amount of new budget authority shall each be increased by \$1,370,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$530,000,000, to provide health care for children and others in need, control infectious diseases, foster medical research, and alleviate shortages of nurses and other health professionals.

(F) In paragraph (13) (relating to Income Security (600)), the amounts of new budget authority shall each be increased by \$250,000,000 and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$170,000,000, to help States provide energy assistance to poor and alleviate the impact of refugees on State and local communities.

(G) In paragraph (15) (relating to Veterans Benefits and Series (700)), the amounts of new budget authority shall each be increased by \$1,300,000,000 (for a total of \$2,500,000,000 above the President's request) and the amount of outlays shall be increased by \$1,210,000,000, to maintain quality health care for veterans.

(H) To improve our hometown response capabilities, strengthen our borders and meet our security mandates, amounts of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2005 shall be further modified as follows:

(i) In paragraph (9) (relating to community and regional development (450)), increase new budget authority by \$1,200,000,000 and outlays by \$240,000,000.

(ii) In paragraph (16) (relating to Administration of Justice (750)), increase new budget authority by \$950,000,000 and outlays by \$830,000,000.

(iii) In paragraph (8) (relating to Transportation (400)), increase new budget authority by \$550,000,000 and outlays by \$460,000,000.

(iv) In paragraph (11) (relating to Health (550)), increase new budget authority by \$300,000,000 and outlays by \$120,000,000.

(3) On page 113 of House Report 108-498, the section 302(a) allocation made to the Committee on Appropriations shall be adjusted by modifying amounts in the table titled "Allocation Spending Authority to House Committees for Budget Year 2005—Committees on Appropriations" as follows:

(A) By increasing the amount for "Discretionary Action: General Purpose: BA" and the amount for "Total Discretionary Action BA:" by \$14,200,000,000.

(B) By increasing the amount for "Discretionary Action: General Purpose: OT" and the amount for "After Section 313 Adjustments of Discretionary OT:" shall each be increased by \$7,610,000.

(4) In section 211 (relating to reconciliation in the House of Representatives), by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) REDUCTION IN TAX CUTS FOR TAXPAYERS WITH INCOMES ABOVE \$1,000,000.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall also include in the reconciliation bill reported pursuant to subsection (a) changes in tax laws sufficient to increase revenues by \$18,900,000,000, to be achieved by reducing or offsetting the tax reductions received during tax year 2005 by taxpayers with adjusted gross income above \$1,000,000 for taxpayers filing joint returns and comparable amounts for taxpayers with other filing statuses as a result of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 and the Jobs and Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday June 22, 2004, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI) each will control 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong and, frankly, enthusiastic opposition to this resolution. But I should add I rise in strong and enthusiastic support for its addition to the House calendar this week.

The resolution before us, bravely introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), crystallizes the debate in this country between Republicans and Democrats to a degree rarely witnessed in these days of homogenized, air conditioned, political dis-

course. And for this debate, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin who, even in an election year, has the courage and confidence to know that vigorous partisan debates between conservatism and liberalism are all together good and healthy for American democracy.

What this resolution before us comes down to is two questions: First, are small business taxes in America too high or too low? And, second, does the Federal Government spend too much money or too little?

Now, if you pay attention, you will notice the proponents of this resolution will speak grandly about the needs for shared sacrifice and will assert that this resolution would only impact taxpayers earning more than \$1 million in 2005. It is a clever debating trick, this impression that this tax increase will only get the idle rich to pay their fair share, but it is false. As proponents of this resolution no doubt know, 83 percent of the taxpayers fleeced by this resolution report business income.

Small businesses, Mr. Speaker, sole proprietorships, subchapter S corporations, partnerships, family farms, we are not just talking about the cast of "Friends" here. Instead, we are talking about the people, the entrepreneurs, the risk-takers, the opportunity makers who are creating the jobs that are fueling what is now, beyond dispute, a full-fledged economic recovery. Indeed, these are the exact same taxpayers for whom Democrats just last week proposed cutting taxes. I guess it is just another example of Democrats voting for something before they vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a direct punitive attack against the men and women of American small businesses, against the owners who have risked and invested to compete in the marketplace, against the managers who have generated the economic growth of the last 2 years, and against the new employees who have leapt at the opportunities those owners and managers have created.

Hiking taxes on those small businesses, farmers, doctors, and families would immediately stifle the economic recovery that we are now enjoying, a recovery it must be noted, that is already producing government revenues greater than would have been generated without the Republican tax relief this resolution is trying to undo.

How bad would it be? Estimates suggest damage in the neighborhood of 100,000 lost jobs, \$11 billion in lost GDP, and \$30 billion in lost family income in just the first 5 years. The 12-digit tax increase that is being proposed, therefore, would only serve to increase government revenues by \$19 billion over the next 5 years, and thereby add to the deficits he says he wants to cut, add to them, in fact, by more than \$82 billion in the same time frame.

And as if that is not enough, Mr. Speaker, this resolution, after gutting the economic expansion and failing to generate sufficient government rev-

enue to meet our needs, would then go for the Triple Crown of fiscal suicide, massive spending increases.

I know Democrats often complain that Republicans try to cast them as just tax-and-spend liberals. Well, Mr. Speaker, this resolution only does two things, tax and spend. I would love to call them tax-cutting, fiscally-sound supply-siders, Mr. Speaker, but if a party wants to tax like Mondale, spend like Dukakis, and stagnate the economy like Carter, and the worst thing we call them is liberal, frankly, I think they are getting off pretty easy.

Mr. Speaker, the ideas at the very core of the proposal of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), indeed at the core of the Democrat Party today, is that the government will be making more decisions, and individuals families and small businesses should be making fewer; that Washington should have more money and more power, and the American people, they should have less. That is what the Democrats believe is what this resolution would write into law, and that is why it must fail.

Now, while I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for bringing this, albeit bad idea, to the floor for debate, I must urge all Members to vote "no" and make sure American jobs, economic health, and fiscal security are protected from the bone-crushing futility of liberal economic incompetence.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, the remainder of which is to be controlled by my designee, the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, as the designee of the minority leader, I rise in support of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is bringing to the House floor a debate on how best to make this country stronger and more just. The distinguished gentleman from Texas has just said that this is about raising taxes. One of the worst problems that can happen to you in Washington D.C. is when you begin to believe your own baloney. That is not what this resolution is about.

The situation is very simple: we have a war. That war by next year will have cost us \$250 billion. And the question is, how are we going to pay for it? We have two choices. One is to charge the bill mostly to our kids by raising the deficit, which is what is happening, and along with that making every American pay through the nose with less security for our homeland on our borders, in our ports, in our air ports, less security for veterans who are not receiving adequate health care, less educational opportunity for middle-class families because of budget squeezes, less health coverage for hundreds of thousands of children all over this country, less help for workers who are

out of work; or will we choose the other way, as this resolution seeks to do.

Will we choose to ask the most well-off 200,000 people in this country, less than 1 percent of all taxpayers, will we ask them to make the supreme sacrifice? Those who make more than \$1 million a year, will you ask them to make the sacrifice of limiting their tax cut to \$24,000 on average rather than the \$120,000 average that they will otherwise get under the existing budget of this House? I think the answer is quite clear.

I plead fully guilty to wanting to see the most privileged and blessed people in this society accept a somewhat smaller tax cut in order to provide greater opportunity for others in society to get the basic requirements on education, health care, veterans health care, and the rest.

□ 1145

Now, this resolution is very simple. It raises over \$18 billion by limiting the average size tax cut for persons who make more than \$1 million a year to about \$24,000 a year. That is what the average tax cuts will be for someone who makes between \$500,000 a year and \$1 million. We are asking those that make \$1 million to live by that same amount. That is hardly an outrageous sacrifice.

We then use 25 percent of that money for deficit reduction. We use the remaining \$14 billion to eliminate the real reductions in domestic appropriations that are contained in the President's budget. If this amendment is adopted, we will simply be adjusting education, health, veterans programs and all the rest by the amount that is equivalent to inflation plus population growth. That is all. We would get back to a standstill level on that score.

We put \$3 billion into homeland security. Why? Because the Hart-Rudman Commission told us we have a need of \$190 billion at the local level, and we have only met 15 percent of that need so far. We do it because only 13 percent of fire departments in this country are equipped to handle a full-blown hazardous material attack. We do it because only a tiny fraction of cargo in passenger planes is presently inspected for explosives. We do it because we have some 2,000 fewer people on the northern border protecting our border than the PATRIOT Act told us that we would have. We do it because only 20 of the most important 45 ports in America which ship goods into the United States have adequate inspection systems to make certain that there is not nuclear material or explosive material in ships that come to our shores.

We then put \$1.3 billion into veterans health care so that we can cut the claims backlog of 327,000 veterans so that we can shorten the waiting time of veterans at VA hospitals, so that we can strengthen critical mental health services for returning veterans. We add \$1 billion to military housing because

more than 120,000 of military families in this country serve in lousy housing, and they deserve better.

We put \$5.7 billion into education to close the gap between what this Congress promised it would provide local schools and what it is actually giving them. We put a billion and a half dollars into Title I so that 500,000 more poor kids and disadvantaged kids can get better instruction in reading and math.

We put \$1.2 billion into special education so that local school districts will receive more help from the Federal Government to meet Federal mandates to educate every disabled child. We put \$300 million in in order to help 400,000 more children receive adequate child care and after school care.

We put \$2 billion in so that we can increase Pell grants to help those who otherwise could not afford to go to college. We want to increase the maximum grant by \$450. Pell grants today pay only for 35 percent of the cost of instruction at a 4-year university. Twenty years ago they paid for 75 percent. Can we not do better than that?

Then we use \$200 million to provide additional employment and training opportunities for people who have lost their jobs. We also address a number of other matters. We fund a number of other programs that are high priority programs, as demonstrated by the letters from the minority side as well as the majority side of this House to our own committee, asking that our committee provide funding for these programs.

So that is what we do, and I would ask support for this resolution, and I repeat the same thing that I said when I began. We have one choice. We can either pay for this war by shoving the bill to our kids and by cutting back on educational opportunities, cutting back on veterans health care, cutting back on decent housing for the military, squeezing dangerously our homeland security expenditures, or we can ask the most well-off, the most prosperous people in this country to share a little bit more of the load by limiting the size of their tax cut to \$24,000 rather than the average \$120,000 tax cut they would ordinarily get.

I believe the majority of those people are patriotic enough to say, "Do it, we do not need that extra supersized tax cut as much as this country needs to have its fiber strengthened by providing the investments that I have just talked about." I would urge a "yes" vote for the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute before I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I hear from Members on both sides of the aisle that this is really a waste of time today. It is kind of a silly exercise. We ought to be having appropriation debate on the floor. We

have got appropriations bill that are waiting in line with no prospect of getting them done on time this year, and yet we have got to do this.

I hear from some that this is really an exercise as a price to prevent obstructionism on the floor for consideration of appropriation bills, that if we do not debate that, somebody is going to obstruct the floor.

Regardless, let me say a couple of things. There is a budget. The House has deemed the budget. We await consideration in the other body of the budget, and this is a nonbinding resolution that we are about to talk about for the next couple of hours here instead of talking about appropriation bills, but I guess we are going to go through this exercise.

As the majority leader said, we are going to have some fun because we get to point out our differences, but let us just face it. This is a nonbinding, somewhat silly exercise, but we are going to go through the process and talk about the differences.

Mr. Speaker, in order to do that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman for allowing me to speak this morning, and it is true, this is a non-binding exercise. On the other hand, it is a very important debate, and it is a philosophical difference.

I appreciated the comments from my colleague from Wisconsin talking about the need to get the deficit down. I think what we have learned over the last couple of decades is the only way to get the deficit under control is to grow the economy and restrain spending. We learned it in the 1990s. We are relearning it now, and what is exciting to me is the fact that part of that, which is restraining spending, we are doing with regard to the budget and the budget that the House passed and based on the deeming resolution will keep our spending under control in the House this year. That is very important, keeping spending at about 4 percent, trying to keep it close to what the family budget is is extremely important.

Second, we are growing the economy, and there is an incredible story out there. It is probably the most under-reported story of the year. The only economic indicator that is not improving right now is what we are hearing from the other side of the aisle about the economy. Jobs are increasing, fastest growth in 20 years. The unemployment rate is now 5.6 percent in this country, down from 6.3 percent. That makes it lower than the average unemployment in the vaunted 1990s, in the 1980s or the 1970s. People are going back to work.

Just last month, we created over 225,000 new jobs in this country. We have created over 1.4 million jobs in this country in the last 9 months. People are going to work, and not only are

jobs increasing but they are good jobs. Wages are going up. Wages are going up faster than they did in the 1990s. We are seeing actual take-home pay going up. We are seeing productivity high, inflation low, interest rates are low. We are seeing the economy that is the envy of the rest of the industrialized world.

Part of the reason for that, I believe a big part of it, is that this Congress has taken the right steps in terms of fiscal policy, keeping spending under control and growing the economy by smart tax relief that provides incentives for growth. That is what the Bush tax cuts were all about. That is what is under attack today.

If my colleagues are to vote for the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) amendment, my colleagues are showing that they have a philosophical difference with that. Instead, my colleagues believe that just as the economy has turned, just as jobs are coming back, just as we have seen real growth and real wages, that we ought to be repealing the very tax relief that has led to that. I do not get that.

Here is a chart showing that today there are more Americans working than ever before. Employment is at a record high in May of 2004, 138.8 million people. Here is what unemployment would be without the tax relief that we passed in the last 3 years. Again, 5.6 percent unemployment today. Without the tax relief, we believe it would be over 7 percent. Now, what does that translate into? Over 2 million jobs. Over 2 million jobs.

I just think it is crazy that at the point at which we are turning the corner, we are bringing back jobs, things are going so well, that again the rest of the world is looking up and saying now America is the engine of economic growth again, that the people back home who punch a time clock every day are seeing their wages going up, that we would want to jeopardize that.

Increasing spending is, again, a philosophical divide. We can talk about whether we should be increasing spending within the allocation we have for homeland defense, intelligence and so on as we did yesterday on the floor of the House, but let me show my colleagues what would happen with the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) amendment.

He said it is an increase in spending of about \$14.2 billion next year. Well, over a 10-year period, that is \$150 billion. Here is the spending increase that is in the legislation that is before us today or in the resolution before us. Again, we are not going to get the deficit under control unless we restrain that spending. Adding another \$150 billion over 10 years is not the solution, \$194 billion over 10 years. It is more than 150.

Now, let us talk about the tax increase. The tax increase, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said, is \$18.9 billion in fiscal year 2005, and it is, but we have to take that over

10 years, too. Let us look at the 10-year number there. We are talking about individual income tax increases by \$269 billion, over \$250 billion over the next 10 years.

I know, again, we have a philosophical difference on who should be paying. Let me just make the point that if those tax returns that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) talked about, that he wants to affect, over 75 percent of those tax returns have business income. Why is that? Because 90 percent of small businesses in this country are not C corporations. They are so-called pass-through entities. What does that mean? They pay taxes at the individual level.

So part of what my colleagues are doing, there is no free lunch around here. When they are saying they are going to go after the rich, who are they going after? They are going after a lot of businesses. These are the entrepreneurial businesses, the small businesses that are pass-through entities, so-called subchapter S companies, sole proprietors, LLC companies, partnerships that are creating the jobs out there.

Look, in our districts, it is not the large companies that are creating these net new jobs. It is these companies. It is the entrepreneurial companies that are taking a risk, that are pass-through entities. Ninety percent of small businesses pay taxes at the individual level. We are hitting them hard if we do this.

Again, let us not take this risk. Let us go back to what we know works. Let us restrain our spending. Let us grow this economy. Let us not go back to taxing and spending. That does not work. It is going to hurt our economy. It is going to hurt the very workers the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said he would like to help.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for giving us an opportunity to define who we are as a Congress. There are some who truly believe that we are going through a political period of polarization and disdain for each other and that this is corrupting the system. That may be so, but I think we might look at it in a more optimistic way is that we are making it abundantly clear to the American people, especially those who decide not to participate politically, that they will never, never be able to say this year that there is no difference between Republicans and Democrats, and I think that this is so important.

We do not need lectures on Economics 101. All we want to know is are you working, do you have health care and do you think you are getting a fair

shake from the government, and not as a Democrat, but also as an American, I would also add, and do you think our kids in the Armed Forces and our Reservists and the National Guard are getting a fair shake? Are we doing all that we can to protect them?

□ 1200

I do not really think people are going to be looking at our label, Democrats and Republicans; but they want to know what we stand for. If some of you believe that it is more important to excite the economy by finding the wealthiest people in America, that God has already blessed and given them large incomes, that by exciting them that you are helping the guy looking for a job, do not explain it to us. And do not get annoyed with us if we do not understand it.

Explain it to the people out there listening to us each and every day. Ask them whether or not the Republican majority has made their life any easier. Ask them why over half of the budget is appropriated for things that do not concern education and health care and improving the quality of life. Ask them whether or not they are prepared, given the opportunity, to pay for it.

I really, truly believe, from the bottom of my political heart, that most Americans are willing to say, if you can make this great country of ours better educated, if you can make them healthier, if you can make them more productive, then this is what I do not mind spending my dollars for.

If you believe that obligation is not a national obligation, but should be one that should be picked up by local and State governments and charitable organizations, even as the IRS steps up the investigations of not-for-profit organizations, then, for God's sake, between now and November do not change your minds. Stick to your guns. Provide the tax cuts for the rich, and let those people who are not as fortunate fend for themselves. If they cannot do it, let the mayors do it. If they cannot do it, let the government do it. And if they cannot do it, vote with your feet and forget about them.

We have to vote for the bottom line, as you say, and that is profits. So stick with your guns, and we will be here to publicize your position every chance we get. And that is why we appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). He is not saying tax and spend, he is saying invest and give Americans an opportunity to have the revenues to do it.

For those of us who have grandchildren, we wonder what we can say, if we live long enough and they ask us, well, granddad, what were you doing when they sold away our country? What were you doing when this debt increased to such an extent that you knew that they were leaving it for me to pay? Well, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has given us a chance to say what we would do is to vote against those injustices.

It is wrong. It borders on being corrupt. And the people understand what this body is all about. Thank you, thank you, thank you, Mr. OBEY.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART), a member of the Committee on the Budget to continue the debate on the Democrat increase-taxes-and-spending proposal.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was moved by this last speech. I really was. It was beautiful rhetoric and impressive rhetoric. But what I have learned here since I have been in D.C. is there are some Members of the Democratic Party who just will not let the facts confuse the issue.

Let us look at some of those facts. You see, there is a huge difference, I agree with the gentleman from New York who has just spoken, there is a huge difference between the two parties; and these are the facts. The big difference is that our friends in the minority party will find every opportunity to raise the taxes of every living American. No, no, let me correct myself. Not only every living American, but they will even try to raise taxes of Americans who have died, at every single opportunity, including a non-binding resolution that will do absolutely nothing, by the way, if it were to pass. But they just cannot help it. They have to try to raise taxes on every single hardworking American family and every single hardworking American business and every single small business, which are the ones that create the jobs in this country.

This resolution would raise taxes by almost \$19 billion, with a B. billion dollars in just 2005. It would increase spending by \$14.2 billion next year. And according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, this resolution, again which is nonbinding, would be equivalent to a tax increase of \$4.62 on those families and those small businesses in this country. And, again, that would cause possibly the loss of 130,000 jobs.

They keep saying, well, some of these people can afford that tax increase. But how about those 130,000 people who would lose their jobs if this were to happen? Can they afford more taxation? Can they afford this kind of resolution? The answer is no.

But, you see, they are consistent. Democrats are consistent. They are consistent because they offered three amendments to the Republican budget that would have raised taxes by over \$100 billion. They offered alternatives to major legislation just last year that would have added close to \$1 trillion to the deficit. And yet their rhetoric is beautiful. Actually, it is very nice. Mine cannot compare with that.

This is right off the page of Senator JOHN KERRY: raise taxes, increase spending, decrease the family budget in order to grow the Federal budget, in order to hire more bureaucracy, more bureaucrats up here.

American families and American small businesses do not need more tax

employees. American families do not need more bureaucrats taking more money out of their hard-earned pockets to send to D.C. It is their money, not the government's money.

What they need is for us to continue growing this economy. And the way to do it, and it has been proven, is cutting taxes, cutting taxes like we have done. That is why the economy is doing well. We do not need tax increases on every American. What we need is to, again, continue to have sound fiscal policy.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. Let me simply say, Mr. Speaker, that this is no less binding than is the budget resolution passed by the Republican majority.

Let me also say that we have heard a lot of concern about small business. I would like to see how many small businesses in each of our districts have profits of \$1 million per owner to qualify under this bill.

Thirdly, we are not raising taxes; we are asking people who make \$1 million a year or more to limit themselves to a \$24,000, on average, tax cut, which is still 25 times as much as the average person in this country making \$50,000 a year will get.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his exceptional leadership in this House on behalf of America's working families. He is a champion for middle-class families in our country, and once again that is reflected in the initiative that he has put forth today. Democrats are united behind the gentleman and his efforts.

As we all know, the budget should be a blueprint for meeting our obligations and moving forward as a country. But the Republican budget is a blueprint for disaster. Today, thanks to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), we have an opportunity to have a real impact on the budget. We have a chance to correct some of the imbalance in the Republicans' distorted priorities.

This vote matters. Congress will choose between giving tax cuts to people making over \$1 million a year or making critical investments in homeland security, education, our veterans, health care, and the environment.

Mr. Speaker, we all know, and it has been said over and over again on this floor, that our budget should be a statement of our national values. What is important to us as a country should be reflected in that budget. So I ask my colleagues, is it a statement of your values to give a tax cut, an additional tax cut to people making over \$1 million per year and leaving children behind because they are not receiving the proper education? Would you rather give a tax cut to people making over \$1 million a year or would you rather improve education by adding \$1.5 billion for disadvantaged schools, putting us on a path for full funding of the No Child Left Behind?

If the Republican budgets had prevailed over a 10-year period, nearly \$20 billion would have been spent on education, and they can see this. It is below the line for every year except fiscal year 2002, and it is just slightly above the line. Ask any economist, and certainly Bob Rubin would attest to this, educating the American people is the best investment that we can make, certainly from a humanitarian standpoint; but from a practical budgetary and fiscal standpoint nothing brings more money into the Treasury than educating the American people.

Early childhood, K through 12, higher education, post-grad, and life-time learning brings more money into the Federal Treasury than any tax cut or anything that you can name. And yet, and yet, the Republicans reject that, despite what it does for the growth of our country, what it does to bring money into the Treasury, and, instead, want to give tax cuts to people making over \$1 million a year.

Is it a statement of my colleagues' values to give a tax cut to people making over \$1 million a year instead of improving veterans health care and shortening waiting times at VA health care facilities? The Paralyzed Veterans of America call this bill vital. They call this bill vital because, instead of those tax cuts, it truly honors our veterans. We talk a lot about veterans on this floor and how we honor their service to our country, but we dishonor them if we say they do not get the proper priority they should have; that we do not value them in our budget.

Is it a statement of Republican values that in this time of uncertainty in terms of our homeland security to give a tax cut to people making over \$1 million a year instead of improving our homeland security; adding \$3 billion to give our first responders the equipment and training they need to increase security at our ports and at our airports? Most of the wealthy people I know who make over \$1 million a year say they do not need the tax cut, and they would rather have investments in America's children and in America's security. They know that it comes to them at a cost to our society.

This bill is also fiscally responsible. What the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has proposed would reduce the deficit by almost \$5 billion. That would be about 25 percent of this money that comes from these people making over \$1 million a year. He has investments in education, in veterans, in homeland security, in the environment, and a major investment in deficit reduction. What happened to the Republican deficit hawks? Have you become an endangered species?

Let us be clear. This bill does not raise taxes. The previous gentleman from Florida spoke about this raising taxes on every living being. If everybody he knows makes over \$1 million a year, maybe that is the circle he travels in; maybe that is his awareness of society. But it simply ain't so. And the

gentleman is right, the speaker previous to him said "there ain't no free lunch." There certainly is not. We should be paying as we go, and we will be addressing that in the substitute of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) later.

But let us be clear that this does not raise taxes. It does make major investments in our education, health care, homeland security, and environment. It does reduce the deficit by nearly \$5 billion, but it does not raise taxes. It halts a future tax cut, for those, again I keep repeating, making over, making over \$1 million a year, and stopping the fiscally irresponsible giveaway of \$19 billion next year to those who need it least.

And let us be equally clear, we would not spend one penny more than the Republicans would. We just spend it differently. They have passed an ill-conceived Medicare bill that will cost taxpayers \$534 billion and which gives \$149 billion in windfall profits to big drug companies. They have chosen to ignore a bipartisan approach to pay as you go.

Today, we see the stark difference between the two parties: Democrats are focused on the aspirations and the needs of all Americans; Republicans are solely focused on tax cuts for the wealthy few, many of whom, as I have said, realize that these tax cuts for them take a tremendous toll on society in general.

□ 1215

The gentleman from Wisconsin's bill is a fiscally sound bill that invests in the American people. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to read the last line of the bill. The minority leader may want to read page 5 of the resolution she just defended. It is not a tax increase? My goodness. What does "changes in tax laws sufficient to increase revenues by \$18 billion" mean? I heard one time if it walks like a duck, it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it might be a duck. This is a tax increase.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, to talk further about this Democrat tax increase resolution.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I know that this resolution is offered in good faith, but this is just a terrible idea for America. It offers something for nothing, like we often do here in Washington, D.C. We say, let's tax a few people behind the tree over there, the super wealthy, and then let's give everyone else in America something good. It almost sounds like a lot of things, too good to be true, and it is.

Let us start with the tax increase. They will tell you it is for the super wealthy, but eight out of the 10 people that they propose to tax more are just small businesspeople. Eighty-three percent of those in this category are small businesspeople who do not file as big

corporations but rather as individuals like you and me. And so we are not talking about taxing Bill Gates. We are talking about taxing Bill's dairy farm, Bill's print shop and Bill's grocery stores. Make no mistake, when we tax them more, we will send 130,000 Americans out of their jobs, out of work because we chose to tax these small businesses at a time we are just recovering our economy as a Nation.

And then it promises spending increases on good things, no question about it. But here is the catch. The tax increase is for 2 years. The spending goes on forever. At the end of 10 years, not only have we cost 130,000 people their jobs, we have added \$130 billion to the national debt. 130,000 jobs we lose, \$130 billion we add to this debt. This is a terrible idea.

I will finish with this. What we ought to be doing is cutting wasteful spending up here. In Washington, every program duplicates five others. We have got 340 economic development programs stretched across 13 different agencies. We waste your money just horribly. If we want to increase spending on certain areas, I am all for it as long as we cut out the horrible waste we have. The bottom line is Washington has all the money it needs, it just does not have all the money it wants, and it needs to learn the difference.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, we have sat here for 3 or 4 years and watched tax cuts erode away the surplus and then, after the surplus was gone, watched tax cuts add to the budget deficit. We have asked ourselves where are we headed? What is the point of all of this? And we have suspected, long suspected, that the next step was to take us to the stage we are in now where we will hear increasingly, we just don't have the funds to meet our obligations for veterans' health care, we don't have the funds to fund education at the level we promised when we passed the Leave No Child Behind bill, and the pitch will be that all of this has been forced upon us by some outside events and we can't help it, we simply have to conform the budget to fiscal reality.

Well, we do have a choice and this bill today shows us in one clear illustration what that choice is. We have a choice. It is not inevitable that we cut veterans' health care. It is not inevitable that we do not fully fund education or health care generally. We have a choice. We can move around, just a little bit, \$18.9 billion and do a world of good. Where does the money come from? From those making over \$1 million. How much do we take? \$18.9 billion and still leave them a tax cut. And where does it go? \$4.7 billion goes

to deficit reduction. \$14.2 billion goes to various selected needs.

Let me give my colleagues just a few examples. Veterans' health care. Our own Veterans' Committee tells us we have funded veterans' health care at \$1.3 billion below what is needed to meet our obligations. We have promises to keep and surely this is one we could keep, should keep, to our veterans. Selected pay increases for junior officers and senior NCOs. We did not fund it this year. We could fund it with this bill.

Education. We passed a bill called Leave No Child Behind. We set a high level because we were imposing mandates on school districts across this country. We promised them money. We are \$8.8 billion below the level that we set for ourselves in passing Leave No Child Behind.

Homeland security. There are a host of unmet needs here. We are skating on thin ice. One is port security, funded at all of \$124 million in this year's bill. That is twice what the administration requested. The Coast Guard tells us they need \$5.8 billion over the next 10 years. We are not on that track. We can at least provide more for needs like that, glaring needs in that particular area.

After 9/11, one of the questions quickly raised was what about the fire next time? What if this had been a radiological attack or a biological attack? A number of Members went down to CDC, the Centers for Disease Control, in Atlanta. They were really troubled when they saw those facilities and security at that facility in particular. So what do we do with CDC this year? The budget request from the President called for a \$410 million cut in CDC. This amount of money would allow us to plus it up.

Allied health care professions. We all know there are acute shortages of nurses coming up. The President's request this year cuts allied health care professions by 64 percent. Will this money be used better? Will it do more good for more people if we take some away from those whose AGI, adjusted gross income, is above \$1 million and put it to these pressing needs? You better believe it will. That is why we should vote for this bill.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, to continue the debate on this small business job-killing bill, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress, I have heard a number of bad ideas, but I cannot think of one worse than raising taxes on small businesses in America, the job-creating machine in America.

Let me just give you one example of why this is such a bad idea. Recently I was in Jacksonville, Texas touring a plant, Jacksonville Industries, a zinc and aluminum die cast business. Because of competitive pressures, they

were considering laying off two of the 22 workers that they had. But thanks to President Bush's economic growth program that we passed in this House, that tax relief for that small business enabled them to buy a new piece of machinery, I could not tell you what its name is, I could not tell you what it does, it is big, it makes a lot of noise, but most importantly, it makes them more efficient. And instead of having to lay off two people, they hired three new workers in just one plant in one small town in Texas, thanks to tax relief. That is five people who could have been on welfare, five people that could have been on unemployment. But instead it is five people with good, productive, tax-paying jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we have a choice today. We can choose to continue the historic economic growth we have seen over the past year or we can turn back the clock to recession and stagnant growth. We can choose to keep creating hundreds of thousands of new jobs or we can send Americans back to the unemployment line. We can choose to limit the growth of government or we can expand the Federal bureaucracy by another \$150 billion over the next decade.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to tax relief that Congress has passed, our economy is growing at the fastest rate in two decades. Thanks to tax relief, we have created 1.4 million new jobs since last August. Thanks to tax relief, the stock market is up, incomes are on the rise and the national rate of homeownership is at an all-time high.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to choose tax relief. I urge all of my colleagues to choose economic growth. I urge all of my colleagues to choose jobs for American families and soundly defeat the Obey amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we are forced to debate these very important topics within a nonbinding resolution, but the public ought to know that we are forced to debate these topics within a nonbinding resolution because of the corruption of the process by the Republican leadership in this House where we cannot debate these same items in the budget resolution.

Yesterday we saw that they would not face up to the debt limit extension, so they had to hide it in the defense bill to be added someday in the dark of night in some conference committee in the future. We have seen the corruption of legitimate debate and the exchange of ideas on the floor of the House. I do not know if the Republicans would really want the American public to know that over the last 10 years, the House Republicans have voted for \$20 billion less in education

spending than was finally appropriated by the Congress of the United States. I do not know if the Republicans really want in real debate the public to know that the House Republicans have decided that we will never have full funding of special education, special education that is very expensive for the school districts of this Nation, where school boards and superintendents and parents and children have come and lobbied this Congress and we have a bipartisan coalition to vote for full funding of special education.

But the Republicans will never get there. They have turned back the promises, they have turned back their votes of the past, they have decided they will add \$1 billion a year to special education, and that means we will never get to the promise we made to this country of full funding. The gentleman from Wisconsin adds another \$1.2 billion to that and in 6 years we would achieve the goal of full funding and take the pressure off those school districts to increase taxes at the lower level, but more importantly to be able to provide them the resources necessary for the education of those children with special needs.

I do not think the Republicans want to have a real debate about their position on the Pell grants that they have frozen over the last 3 years after the President of the United States promised that these young people would have access to a Pell grant to help them achieve their college education. But the Republicans do not really want to have a real up or down vote on increasing the Pell grants. Once again, they have promised to do that, they simply do not want to get caught voting against that promise, so they have us in a nonbinding resolution.

I do not think the Republicans want to get in a real vote on whether or not they are going to fully fund No Child Left Behind, where currently they are \$29 billion behind the curve that they have promised America's schoolchildren, their parents, their families that they would provide because we have provided the most significant reforms in the last 35 years in Federal education policy.

What does that mean? That means that if they do not adopt this resolution, and it is nonbinding, that means that 500,000 low-income children will not get the academic assistance that they need. That means that over 350,000 children will not have access to after-school care that they need where they get tutored and they get mentored and they get academic help. That means that thousands of teachers will not complete the process by which they become highly qualified teachers in the classrooms of our children. So another year goes by and thousands of more teachers enter the classroom without the professional development, without the credentials, without the certifications necessary to provide a first-class education to America's children.

The Republicans have so corrupted the process that they can continue to

make the promises to the public that they are for full funding of No Child Left Behind, they are for increasing the Pell grants to \$5,100, they are for full funding of special education, but they do not have to deliver on them because they hide their budget in a conference committee. It was due out here weeks, months ago, it has not been passed, so they deemed a budget, not a budget that they voted on, they just deemed a budget. What incredible dishonesty in the face of the needs of America's families and children to acquire a good education to participate to the full extent of their potential in the American society and in the American economy. What corruption. What dishonesty by the Republican leadership.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), a member of the Committee on the Budget, to continue the debate on this more-money-solves-all-problems proposal.

□ 1230

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. This amendment, and furthermore any move that would raise taxes on American workers and businesses, is going to reverse the positive effects of the progrowth economic initiatives that this House passed just last year. Those initiatives were the largest tax relief since Ronald Reagan. The U.S. economy is strong, it is growing stronger, and it is proving that the Republicans' clear, comprehensive progrowth agenda is working for America.

This Republican-led Congress understands that the best way to expand the economy and further great jobs is simply to leave more money in the hands of the people who earned it.

Now, if the Democrats do not believe this, all they have to do is look at the negative effects that States such as California, the Democrats there have spent with the tax-and-spend policies, it has had on that State.

California's tax and regulatory structure crippled that State. In 1 month alone, California lost 21,000 jobs, more than any other State, more than the rest of the country combined. When you compare that to other States, the once invincible California economy was suffering from competitiveness crisis.

Simply this, when taxes are raised, businesses leave, and jobs and wages are lost, negatively affecting the economy.

This week in my home State of New Jersey, the Democratic Governor, Jim McGreevey, passed what he is calling the millionaire's tax, a tax increase on New Jersey taxpayers. It is set to increase the marginal tax rate by 41 percent, the fifth highest now in the country. It is really a Robin Hood-like grab Democratic Governor Jim McGreevey has taken from these taxpayers, money that the Federal tax relief measures that we passed before restored to them, that were put in place by this Republican Congress to spur the economy along.

The Democratic Governor, Jim McGreevey justified his scheme of this millionaire's tax by saying, "I will only tax that which the rich have gotten back from the Bush tax cuts."

Well, now the gentleman from Wisconsin wants to eliminate that Bush tax cut altogether. So I ask, when is enough enough? The Democrats really are speaking from both sides of this argument, and they have shown their true colors: if given an inch, they will take a mile.

The small business owners of New Jersey, they are the ones who have spurred on the economy, and it was due to the tax cuts initiative of last year. And now under this initiative in our own State, they would lose the State tax cuts, and now by the initiatives on the other side of the aisle, they would lose the Federal tax cuts as well.

So I say to the Democrats in my home State of New Jersey in Trenton, and the Democrats in Washington as well, I say stop killing the Nation's economic recovery. No more taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Governor of New Jersey's, Mr. McGreevey, move to take away this tax savings will wreak havoc on the positive economic upswing that is occurring right now in my home State of New Jersey. As a matter of fact, the Center For Policy Research in New Jersey has shown that the tax cuts that we are talking about now will result in 28,000 jobs lost in the next 5 years, proving that this tax hike will only hurt the people of New Jersey.

Today, many of the new jobs that are created in New Jersey are by employers that were fleeing to the other States' higher tax levels. Businesses will flee now out of New Jersey, just as businesses fled out of California.

With this amendment on the other side of the aisle, we will now be raising taxes across the entire country, and the question will be, where are we telling businesses to flee to, then?

I would ask the sponsor of this amendment and Governor McGreevey, the Democrats in New Jersey as well, to take a look at the crippling effects that their policies have had in New Jersey and California and to say let us have some common sense to leave our economic recovery alone and let the people keep their own money. I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 23½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NUSSLE) has 21½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans in this House believe if you say something enough, long enough, somebody somewhere will believe it. I have

heard on this floor somebody refer to the famous Russell Long, who said, "Don't tax me. Don't tax thee. Tax the man behind the tree." They did so, of course, properly with derision, and the public who hears that must hear it with derision as well; but my friends, the Republicans have found out how to do that; and during the 8 years of the Reagan administration, they plunged this Nation deeper and deeper and deeper into debt, and during the 4 years of the Bush One administration, they plunged this country deeper, deeper, deeper into debt.

And then in 1993 those Republicans who were here came on the floor and said those Democrats are proposing a program that will plunge us deeper into debt, cause large unemployment and destroy our economy. You have heard me say it before on the floor. They were 180 degrees wrong, absolutely, incontrovertibly wrong. And they are wrong today.

The Republicans have said charge overseas. Spend more money overseas, \$25 billion in a bill just yesterday. Did we pay for it? We did not. Who was the man behind the tree who will pay for it? My three daughters and my three grandchildren. They are the man behind the tree. They will pay this bill, because you continue to spend. You spend more than was spent before. You create more debt than was created before. In fact, in the last 4 years of the Clinton administration, we never once raised the debt. Not once. Because we had a responsible economic policy. But you will raise it \$2.1 trillion in 4 years. That is a pretty stark difference, my friends.

What the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) says is we need to invest in America. If we are going to invest overseas, if we need to help the people in Iraq, that is fine, but do not leave behind America's children. Do not leave behind America's veterans. Do not leave behind America's infrastructure while we help those overseas.

That is what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is saying. And the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is saying, yes, we have a problem. Terrorism needs to be confronted, needs to be defeated, and America needs to be kept safe. So what does the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) say?

Let us follow what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the Republican chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the Democratic ranking member, said we ought to do 2 years ago: invest further funds in the safety of our people here in America. Invest in homeland security.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard it and the public has heard it. Eighty-three percent of the small businesses are going to be affected by that. That is baloney, baloney. That is the politest word I can think to use at this present period of time. The IRS says there are 3.8 percent of small businesses who

claim more than \$1 million in taxable income. That is almost as much of a mistake as you made on your Medicare bill and almost as much of a mistake as this administration made in terms of telling us how much their Medicare bill was going to cost. They only missed by 25 percent.

And we heard about waste, fraud, and abuse, as if somebody else is in charge of Washington. For 40 months, 40 months, the Republicans have had the Presidency, the Senate, and the House; and there is still waste in Washington.

What is wrong with your administration? We have a larger infrastructure than we had when you took office. You talk about smaller government. It was smaller under President Clinton.

Mr. Speaker, vote for the Obey amendment. Vote for honesty and investment in America and Americans.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, to continue our debate on this Democrat increased-taxes bill, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS).

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

I have heard a lot of baloney, and there appears to be a good bit in the House. I have great respect for the minority whip, but there is beef in the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) job-cutting proposal.

This is about jobs. This is about taxes. This is about spending. And I have only been here a short time, but this has got to be one of the worst ideas I have ever seen come from our colleagues across the aisle. It is bad for the Nation. It is bad for working America. We are going to cut the heart out of a recovering economy. We are going to destroy the momentum that we are enjoying all because the Democrats want to tax, and they want to spend. They want to tax, and they want to spend. And they want to do it at America's expense. At America's expense.

Just last week, just last week, they were complaining about our not doing enough to create jobs. We created 1.1 million jobs just this year. They want to take away that momentum.

It really is about the people who create jobs, the small businesses, the farmers in the 12th District of Georgia. It is about people who create jobs; 200,000 hardworking taxpayers, of which 80-plus percent are small businesses, will see their taxes go up. And that is the engine that creates the jobs for America. These are precisely the small businesses and farms that we need to protect and to encourage by providing them the deserved tax relief that they currently enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, we need to finish this business pretty quickly because there is no telling whose jobs or whose money the Democrats are going to go after next.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker has not listened to the

debate. We are going to ask people making over \$1 million a year to make a small sacrifice during this time of war. That is who is going to pay for investment into America's future.

In Congress, our values are expressed more by our budget priorities than by our speeches. And the Obey resolution reflects American values far better than this year's Republican budget, and this is why: the Republican budget continues the same old status quo, a failed philosophy that has led to unprecedented deficits. That philosophy was expressed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), majority leader, on March 12, 2003: "Nothing is more important in the face of war than cutting taxes." A direct quote.

That bizarre philosophy flies in the face of the basic American value of shared sacrifice during time of war. Can anyone imagine Franklin Roosevelt having stood here on December 8 of 1941 saying to the American people it is time to cut taxes, nothing is more important than that after Pearl Harbor? In World War II, fortunately, President Roosevelt did something different. He inspired all Americans to make sacrifices to support the war and our servicemen and -women, and it was the right thing to do.

Unfortunately, as we now face the war on terrorism, the Republican budget reflects the gentleman from Texas's (Mr. DELAY) flawed philosophy that tax cuts should trump sacrifice and services for veterans and military families during time of war. What is the result of this ideologically driven budget? First, the consequence is that this year's deficit is the largest deficit in American history. With massive unpaid-for tax cuts, we are borrowing billions of dollars to pay for the Iraqi war, and that means that young soldiers from my district at Fort Hood fighting in that war today will have to come home and help pay for it after the war is over. Billionaires living safely here at home, getting multimillion-dollar-a-year tax cuts while young soldiers have to fight for the war in Iraq and then pay for it. Where is the fairness in that?

To add insult to injury, the Republican budget pays for its tax cuts to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans by reducing veterans health care and freezing military housing improvement programs. If the American people find out about this dirty little secret in the Republican budget, they will be outraged, as they should be. And as a representative of nearly 40,000 soldiers who fought in Iraq over the last 18 months, I am certainly outraged.

These are the facts: fact number one, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), Republican chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, has said it would take \$2.5 billion of increased VA health care spending just to keep from having to reduce veterans health care services because of health care inflation.

□ 1245

Fact number two: The Republican budget underfunds present services for VA health care by \$1.3 billion. That means real cuts to millions of real veterans.

Fact number three: several weeks ago, on the same day the House Republican leadership voted to give Members of Congress a tax cut, they pushed through a Defense authorization bill that will freeze the most important military housing improvement program in American history. Over 24,000 military families will not receive the new housing they deserve. No new housing for thousands of military families, while we get thousands in tax cuts, we Members of Congress. Where is the fairness in that? Where is the American value in that?

There is a better choice, a clear choice, a choice that reflects the true values of the American people. The Obey resolution will prevent cuts in veterans health care and will prevent cuts in military housing. It is the right thing to do for America.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, to continue our debate on this tax-increase, job-killing bill, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

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

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to put in my comments on this very good debate here, and it is a debate that is good, because it shows clashing two philosophies: one of higher taxes for more spending, versus lower taxes for more private sector growth, more jobs through the private sector.

The proposal in front of us today is for a \$270 billion tax increase over a 10-year period of time. So taxes would go up in a fashion like that, \$270 billion; and the justification that we are hearing is so that we can spend more money.

But I want to say this as a fiscal conservative: if you look at what we have been doing since 1994, we have in fact been spending a lot of money, and, ironically, in the very areas where we are being accused of not spending enough.

But this is a Committee on the Budget chart, and it shows since 1994 how much our spending has in fact increased. We are being accused of not spending enough on education; but here is one education program alone, title I. Since 1999, it has gone up this much, nearly, I am going to guess, about \$6 billion. The exact math is available, but I just want to show the chart to illustrate.

Pell grant funding, an important scholarship program, has increased in a similar fashion of about maybe \$5 billion. The gentleman from Iowa can correct me if my quick, on-the-spot-math is wrong.

No Child Left Behind. The irony about No Child Left Behind, an important Bush initiative on education, is

we hear a lot of critics say, you are not funding it. Yet look at No Child Left Behind. Growth in education under President Bush has increased 40 percent.

Special education, something that has a lot of bipartisan support, since 1999 we have gone from about \$4 billion in spending to nearly \$12 billion in spending. So where is the cut in education? There is not one to show.

Veterans programs. Often the liberals hide behind veterans programs and say, you are not spending enough. But here, again, since 1985 to 2004, budget authority has gone from \$27 billion to \$60 billion. The gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SMITH) have worked hard to champion that and done it on a good bipartisan basis. Spending per veteran during that period of time has gone from \$950 to \$2,400. Veterans spending has in fact increased.

Another criticism we are getting is spending to combat terrorism has not increased. Here we are, from 2001, spending about \$20 billion, to \$87 billion today. So where are these cuts that we are suffering from? There are not any cuts.

Now, as I said, I am a fiscal conservative. I wish these charts did go in a different direction in many cases. I wish that I could honestly be accused of cutting a lot of government programs. Unfortunately, we failed in that. But the will of the House, the will of the Senate takes a long time for the process to go through. I am just saying that the spending cuts are not there.

But who do we propose to get the income from? We keep hearing about these big, bad, horrible people called millionaires in American society today. Let us examine who these millionaires are.

These millionaires, for the most part, are small business owners; people who are farmers, people who own bicycle shops, people who are contractors. They have \$1 million in revenue, and therefore they are taxed in the 35 percent bracket. How many? Is that just a few? Hardly. It is 73 percent of them.

What about in the group that earns from \$200,000 to \$499,000? 68 percent. What about in the big bad group that grosses from \$500,000 to \$1 million? 76 percent. And \$1 million in revenue and above, 82 percent of them are small business owners.

So what are we talking about doing? What we are talking about doing is beating up on the small employers out there, the folks who are turning this economy around.

Here we are looking at the job charts, what is happening in the economy. Right now we have nearly 140 million Americans working, the highest level in history. Yet we want to reverse that trend by killing the goose that is laying the golden egg, and that is the small business owner.

If you are for jobs, the correct vote on this is "no." If you want to kill economic prosperity, if you want to kill

the small business employer, if you want to kill jobs, vote "yes," because that is exactly what will happen.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, despite the fiction we have just heard, you have to make \$1 million a year profit in order to be covered by this. To suggest small businessmen are hurt by that is laughable.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the majority started this country on a ride a few years ago, and the signposts along the way are fairly clear. We have a record-high deficit, hundreds of billions of dollars; we have a record trade deficit; we have a 50-year high on mortgage foreclosures; we have 3 years in a row of historic highs in personal bankruptcies. And yet, they suggest that we should operate on the same forecast that they were operating on when they started out on this trip, when they said we had 10 years of surpluses coming our way, trillions of dollars; and we can afford to give the wealthiest among us a tax break.

So they did that, and they do not see the other signposts: \$200 billion for a war in Iraq. They do not look at the other signposts along the road that show that we have lost millions of jobs.

Now we have replaced 1 million-or-so of those jobs that we lost, and they want to say that we have created new jobs. They are a long way off from creating a new job that is a net new job, but they do not want to talk about that. They do not want to look at these signposts. They want to keep going down this road.

What the Obey resolution suggests is we should take a different course. We should say to millionaire taxpayers that rather than take \$124,000 in tax cuts, take \$24,000. Let us pay our way for this war. Let us pay our way in terms of investing in the needed resources of our country.

Albert Einstein said a long time ago that we have to have a different level of thinking to solve problems than the level of the thinking that we used when we created these problems.

This program that the Republican majority has taken us toward as a country is leading us to fiscal bankruptcy. This majority has to understand that we have to take into account that we live in a different forecast now, with dark clouds on the horizon. We are at war. We should pay the costs now, and we should do it by saying a little less tax cut for those who are doing very, very well. That is what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) does. I ask that this resolution be supported.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, to continue the debate on the Democrat tax-

increase proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat a couple things said in the past. If a small business makes \$1 million, what does that mean? That means they are making money and hiring people. Two-thirds of our jobs in America come from small businesses. Two-thirds of all those who file in the top bracket are small businesses. In this new rate structure being proposed, this new tax increase, 75 percent of those people are small business people.

Why would we want to tax the recovery of this economy at this time? What we accomplished in the last tax bill was finally lowering the tax rate on small businesses down to a level large corporations pay.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that before the July tax cuts, we were charging small business owners higher tax rates than we charged the largest corporations in America, like Exxon or IBM or General Motors. What this bill will do is do that again. It will increase taxes on small businesses and make small businesses pay higher tax rates than the largest corporations in America. Why would we want to reintroduce that injustice back into the Tax Code?

We want to keep low tax rates on small businesses. That is who are creating jobs right now. Two-thirds of our jobs today come from small businesses. This big tax increase on small businesses is not the way to go. We want small businesses making money. This is a tax on their income that they reinvest in their businesses.

More importantly, this proposal adds \$130 billion to our deficit over the next 10 years. It is fiscally irresponsible, taxing small business and spending more money. Adding to the deficits is what has given us this hole we are trying to dig out of in the first place.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, again, despite all of the misinformation that we have just heard, the IRS has told us that fewer than six-tenths of 1 percent of all returns with small business income have incomes of more than \$1 million. To suggest that this is even laying a glove on small business is a colossal red herring fiction.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) to respond.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, two-thirds of all those who file their taxes in the top bracket are people who report small business income, subchapter S corporations, limited liability corporations. Seventy-five percent of all those in this new tax bracket covered in this bill are those who report small business income.

Small businesses do not pay taxes as corporations; they pay taxes as people.

So we are not talking about tax increases on millionaires who are hanging out on yachts. We are talking about tax increases on people who are running businesses. They have 25 employees, they have 50 employees, they have 100 employees, they have two employees, they have five employees.

The point is, these small businesses, the engine of economic growth, the job creator of this economy, pay their taxes on the individual rate; and these are the people whose taxes are being increased under this proposal.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentleman refers to one-third of the top bracket. This does not touch everybody in the top bracket. The top bracket is \$319,000 or more. We do not touch anybody with an income of less than one million bucks, less than one million bucks. That is not \$300,000. Do not try to bamboozle people.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, we do not want to "bamboozle," so I would yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my friend and I, we get along very well personally when the mikes are not on; but I just have to say, that is not what this proposal says. This proposal says "reduction in tax cuts for taxpayers with incomes above \$1 million," period, end of story. The committee figures out how to do the rest of it.

The point is, if businesses are becoming successful, that means they are going to start hiring people again. We do not want to raise their taxes.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, the point of this all is, this is a tax increase. They are admitting it. There were so many Members who came to the floor and said, oh, no, no, no, we are not really increasing taxes. But what the colloquy between the two gentleman from Wisconsin proves is, once and for all, this is a tax increase.

So if one wants to come to the floor today in the middle of an economic recovery and vote to increase taxes on small business, knock yourself out.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Line 22 and line 23 of page 6: The only taxpayers that are affected are "taxpayers with adjusted gross income above \$1 million." Period.

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

□ 1300

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to address priorities that have been severely underfunded by the House leadership's budget. I will mention only

two or three of those, depending upon the time, but ones which effect millions of people.

The Obey resolution provides \$500 million for the National Park Service, which has been forced to absorb huge unbudgeted items over the last 3 years, including natural disaster damage, competitive sourcing contracts, and antiterrorism requirements. The Park Service has been forced to cut personnel, reduce services, defer maintenance, and ignore resource protection. One million visitors every day to our national parks this summer are going to be the victims of that neglect.

Second, for education, this resolution adds \$1.5 billion in additional Title I funds toward keeping this Congress's promise to Leave No Child Behind. No Child Left Behind challenged America's public schools to achieve higher standards and promised Federal dollars to help. But Congress has failed to provide schools full funding. The budget resolution for 2005 falls far below the \$20.5 billion for Title I grants authorized by No Child Left Behind. The \$1.5 billion added by the Obey resolution does not meet the whole promise, but without it, we will surely leave more and more children behind.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be good for history's sake to look at the last time that we dramatically increased taxes. We did that; when President Clinton came into office, we had the largest tax increase in history, and what was the effect of that on spending? During those years of the Clinton administration, we increased spending by 33 percent. During those periods, we increased the debt limit three times. So we have dramatically demonstrated that if we have more money, we are going to have more spending.

I would suggest that there has to be some limit, and the overall bill gives us some intestinal fortitude, gives us some guts to resist the temptation to promise more and spend more has to be incorporated.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can have the kind of votes and support to give us that discipline in this kind of budget reorganization.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Obey resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I feel like this is Alice in Wonderland. In 3 years, at the end of the Clinton administration, we had the largest surpluses in American history, and now, after 3 years under Republican rule, both the presidency and the House and the Senate, we have the largest deficits in American history.

The Republicans used to call themselves fiscal conservatives. They cannot say that anymore. What has happened to the heart and soul of the Republican Party? We are having an orgy

of tax cuts and we are leaving a legacy of debt to our children and grandchildren. It is unconscionable.

Every day people come into my office and need more money for desperately needed programs. Veterans are pleading; they need more money for health care. The Republicans say no. People who have kids in schools want more money for No Child Left Behind in education. Republicans say no. In health care, we want a prescription drug bill, seniors tell me, that will really help seniors; not the phony one passed by the House. Republicans say no.

So what Democrats are trying to say is that in programs that we desperately need, homeland security, first responders for police and firemen, putting homeland security dollars for trains and things where people know we need it, Republicans say no. And what is the Republicans' proposal? To give great tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires.

The Obey proposal would simply say, if your adjusted income is \$1 million or more, you ought to give back a little bit of those tax breaks to help us with priorities in this country. The borrow-and-spend Republicans say no.

The Obey proposal ought to be voted on. It ought to set priorities for our country. Let us help our veterans. Let us help our kids. Let us help our seniors. Support the Obey proposal.

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

Respectfully, because I know the Speaker is from New York, let me yield myself 30 seconds and say I think a lot of that money we borrowed was sent up to New York. So when the gentleman is talking about what happened and Alice in Wonderland, let me just remind the gentleman that we sent a lot of that to New York. We had a terrorist attack. I know the gentleman knows that, and he voted for it then, and he did not say a word about it then. He said send the money. We need it. Do whatever it takes. Now he comes to the floor and he says, gee, I guess we borrowed too much money.

Well, maybe we did, but the gentleman should have complained about it then.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Iowa, for yielding me this time.

I just think we ought to remember how we got in the situation we are in today, because we have seen charts and heard rhetoric that said the reason Federal revenues are down is because of Republican economic policy, but they have overlooked some of the hard and cold facts; and facts are stubborn things, some hard and cold facts that have happened over the last few years.

For example, in 1999 we had a huge tech bust. The NASDAQ dropped more than half. It was not based on Republican policy. Then we had the recession that happened while President Clinton was still in office. It began in Novem-

ber of 2000, before President Bush was sworn in. And then on September 11, 2001, terrorists attacked our homeland and drove our economy down the tubes. The result was a 14 percent reduction in federal revenue. That reduction was not based on Republican policy at all; it was based on those series of events, the most tragic being the attack by terrorists on September 11.

Well, what did the Republicans do to respond to that? We lowered taxes across the board for everyone, including the top 1 percent, the same percentage as everybody else, and the result was that today we have more Americans working than ever before in the history of our Nation. And the income of our workers is up higher than it has ever been in the history of our Nation. Homeownership is up, higher than ever before in the history of our Nation, as well as minority ownership of homes.

We have had tremendous success because of Republican policy. But now we are trying to regress and tax those people who are creating the jobs. Mr. Speaker, 83 percent of the people in the top 1 percent of income earners in America are small business owners. They are farmers, they are people who own little machine shops, they are the people down at the local drugstore, or retailers.

If we start taxing them in addition, up to near 40 percent of their income, less money will be available to create jobs.

So there are two different philosophies we are hearing today. We have the dark and stormy liberalism that says raise taxes, and we have the bright and sunny conservatism that says lower taxes and let Americans become successful, because the result is more Americans working, greater jobs, stronger economy.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for putting this very important motion forward.

The Republicans cannot win this argument in the world of reality, so they have created a world of illusion that they are speaking to today.

One of their illusions is that this is a tax increase bill. If you make less than \$1 million a year of taxable income, this bill has absolutely nothing to do with you. The second illusion is that this bill will have a devastating and crushing effect on those who do file more than \$1 million a year of adjusted gross income.

Well, first of all, we have heard the statistic over and over and over again about small businesses. Fewer than 4 percent of the small businesses in this

country file more than \$1 million a year of adjusted gross income. And for those that do, under this proposal, their taxes would be \$24,000 a year lower than they were 3 years ago. This makes their tax cut smaller than it was; their taxes would still be \$24,000 a year lower than they were 3 years ago.

And the third illusion is that we are disrupting this masterful economic strategy that is bringing this boon to our country.

Well, this masterful economic strategy has lost 1.9 million more jobs than it has created. The rate for people making more than \$1 million a year that is in this bill is the strategy that resulted in 23 million more jobs being created than were lost. So much for the world of illusion.

In the world of reality, the Republicans cannot explain this vote, if they vote no, because when they go to the VFW hall and they are asked by the members of the VFW why they are not doing something about reducing the waiting lines at the VA health clinics, they will not be able to explain why they did not vote for more money for VA health care. When they sit down with the members of the Board of Education in their towns and the board members say, why do you not fully fund special education, and they all sign letters that say they support that and they introduce bills that say they support that, they will not be able to explain why they did not vote for a \$1 billion-plus increase in special education that would lower property taxes and go right to the local schools.

When they visit with the environmental community in their hometowns, and they hear, why can you not do more to clean up the Superfund sites that are in our area, and why can you not do more to bring environmental progress to our area, they will not be able to explain why they voted against a bill that significantly increases investments in environmental protection.

This bill is filled with all of the promises that everyone here makes: more veterans' health care, more money for education. When they visit the fire company and police department in their hometown and they are asked why those guys and women still do not have biochem suits and training to deal with the terrorist attack, they will not be able to explain why they voted against this bill, which adds money for those firefighters and first responders.

So because they will not be able to explain this vote at the fire station or the Board of Education or the VFW hall or the local Sierra Club, they have created a world of illusion: It is a tax increase. No, it is not. It will crush small businesses. No, it will not. It will interfere with the masterful management of the U.S. economy by this administration, which has lost nearly 2 million more jobs than it has created.

Mr. Speaker, if the argument against this bill is that it disrupts the Bush

economic policy, I say that is the finest argument I could hear to vote yes on this bill. If there ever was a policy that needed disruption, this is the one.

Vote yes for the things that you say that you support when you are back home.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

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

My favorite Member of Congress is the gentleman who just spoke, Robert Andrews of New Jersey. I consider him the most articulate Member of Congress; but I think as articulate as he was on this issue, he is missing the whole point.

This is a bill that spends more money and increases taxes. And we believe with all our hearts and souls that when we added 58 percent more on veterans' spending in the last 4 years, that is a spending increase for a very good cause and has enabled us to improve veterans' services every year, we are continuing to include more and more for our veterans. Only in Washington when you spend so much more money do people call it a cut.

On No Child Left Behind, we have increased spending by 40 percent in the last 4 years. It is not funded at the highest level the authorizers have allowed but we are spending far more than we have ever spent.

We are at war. We are at war not just in Iraq, but against terrorism around the world. And I think a 9 percent increase in Defense and Homeland Security is a huge increase in spending. The huge increases in spending that we have in our entitlements shows a tremendous amount of concern that our government has for the people of our country.

But when President Bush inherited a recession and then inherited September 11, and then inherited a breakdown in the structure of the business community with Enron and WorldCom, it is remarkable how well our economy has grown, with new jobs being created and new revenue coming into our coffers, and an incredible increase in productivity.

□ 1315

We believe in large measure growth in our economy is the result of economic policy centered around tax cuts.

And so for me I am happy to have this debate, happy to go into the election this fall and emphasize we are against tax increases and ever increasing spending.

When we had the budget meeting and the budget votes, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle said we voted against veterans, we voted against this, we voted against that. They failed to say in each one of those amendments was a tax increase. We voted against the amendments because there were tax increases at a time when we think it is unwise. So we have a dif-

ference of opinion that we will obviously fight out this fall.

So I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for providing this opportunity to distinguish the differences between the two parties. We do not want a tax increase. We do not want a lot more government spending.

Let me end by saying this: 5 percent of the American people pay 55 percent of the taxes. 50 percent of the American people pay 96 percent of the taxes. When we passed our tax cuts, we gave the tax cuts to the people who pay taxes. That is the reality of what we did.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, this bill is very clear. With the war on terror going on, what this bill says is that every American has their skin in the game. I have seen my Marine units going. And on the war on terror, not all of America is fighting. So when it comes down to investing in the war on terror, when it comes to making sure that we have access to higher education, health care so our veterans are taken care of, every American has their skin in the game to make sure the 21st century is the American century.

And I have seen many, many a wealthy American. I would stop and ask our colleagues to appeal to their patriotism, not just their selfishness. There are patriotic wealthy Americans who are ready to make sure America is safe and secure in the 21st century.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is pure and simple about shared sacrifice, as the gentleman from Illinois has just indicated. What we are asking is that those lucky people in this country who make more than \$1 million a year, that includes the one-half of 1 percent of small businessmen who make profits of over \$1 million a year, we are asking them to accept a scaled-back tax cut so that they only get, on average, \$24,000 in tax cuts. That is 24 times as large as someone will get if they make \$50,000 a year.

And, instead, we are saying please, for the sake of the country, take a little bit smaller tax cut so that we have some room in the budget to strengthen protection on our borders, to strengthen protection in our ports, to strengthen protection at our airports, to provide stronger opportunities for education, to provide more civilized health care for our veterans, to provide better housing for our military personnel, to provide a little better shot at protecting the environment, to help local communities so that they do not have to lay off hundreds of thousands of kids from health care programs like SCHIP and Badger Care in my own State. This is an effort to see to it that we can enrich the many and enrich the few at the same time.

Trickle-down economics is what we have heard from our friends on the

other side of the aisle today. They say if you just give enough to the people at the top, eventually some will trickle down to people at the bottom.

My old friend Harvey Dueholm in the legislature used to describe it this way. He said trickle-down economics is the theory that if you just feed the horses enough oats, eventually some of it will filter down to the sparrows. Think about it. And vote "yes." It is the fair, it is the right, it is the just thing to do.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, that is the difference between Republicans and Democrats. It all comes down to who is doing the feeding of the oats. The government does not feed oats. That is not where the economic advantage of this country comes from. We do not pass out money to people here and say here is government money, we printed it, you get to have it. They get it from working. They get it from farming. They get it from taking risk. They get it from unlocking their door in the morning and letting in the public to their flower shop, to their shoe store, to their bank, to whatever it might be, unlocking that door and letting the energy and the economic engine of this country work.

That is what we want to continue: working. We do not want this to kill jobs. Just at the moment when we are increasing jobs, look what we have done. Yes, there was a downturn. In the aftermath of 9/11 and in the aftermath of the dot-com bubble busting and the aftermath of the Clinton recession, there is no question, look right here; that is what that is, that little downturn. But look how it is going back up.

And it is going up because the engine of America is working. It is not going up because of the chart on spending. When we increase spending in Washington, that does not drive the economy. That does not do anything except it spends money in Washington. What drives the economy are people in Wisconsin and Iowa taking a risk, building a business, employing people so that when they balance their checkbook around their kitchen table and they meet their obligations and pay for their kids' college and pay for health care and turn on the lights and pay for groceries, they can do it. It is not because, with all due respect to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), we send them a check. Because that does not do anything.

The check they want to make is a paycheck, not a government check. Every single person in America wants a paycheck. And that is what we have done. We have created paychecks. Look what the spending side of this does. They are saying we are not spending enough in Washington. Look at all of this increase. Look at all of the debt that they are complaining about. And on top of all of that, they say, no, the problem is we are still not spending enough money in Washington. And the thing they misconnect is that that

money in Washington came from somebody, a taxpayer.

Money does not start in Washington. Money starts in Iowa, in Wisconsin, across the country, in people's pockets, in small businesses. That is where it starts. And they want to take more of it, they want to kill those jobs, so that they can hand out more money, so that they in Washington can have the power. We do not want that to happen. We want the power to be around the kitchen tables of Iowa and Wisconsin. That is why we have opposed their big tax increases.

As far as the spending, the taxes, that is obvious those increases are ridiculous. But the increases in spending, one can always say we want to hand out more money in order to demonstrate our compassion. And we have told them about the increases in education, the increases in veterans, the increases in health care, the increases for the environment, for all sorts of programs, and to make sure our country was protected. But on top of that, they say, you know what, I think we can even be more compassionate. We are going to hand out money and tell people we care.

Well, quite honestly, I think it is time for us to start looking around for the waste. I believe that, instead of this debate on the floor today, what we should have done is had an appropriation bill come up. That is what we should have done. We should have started going through all the accounts and look for ways where the Federal Government is not spending that money as wisely as the people back home in Iowa and Wisconsin.

We do not want to kill jobs; we do not need to increase spending. We do not need a resolution like the Democrat proposal on the floor today to tax and spend and tax and spend and tax and spend and tax and spend more and more in Washington. This needs to be done around the kitchen tables of Iowa, not the committee tables in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members vote against this ill conceived proposal.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank DAVID OBEY for offering this budget amendment, even if I fundamentally disagree with it. I have great respect for Mr. OBEY, and I think he makes a valuable contribution to this House. And the Obey amendment is important, because it clarifies the distinctions between the two parties.

As then candidate Ronald Reagan said to then President Jimmy Carter, "There they go again." The Obey amendment is a return to the traditional Democratic philosophy of tax and spend. If the Democrats were to create their own "Contract with America", the first two promises would be tax more and spend more. This budget amendment raises taxes by \$18 billion in the first year, more than \$250 billion in ten years. These tax increases are aimed at the job creators, the entrepreneurs, the small business owners. This amendment raises taxes on these job creators by about five percent. Increasing costs on a business by five percent is the difference between success and failure.

If you increase costs on a small business by five percent, the small business owner has two choices. They can pass the cost increase onto consumers by raising prices. Or they can cut costs elsewhere. Because of stiff price competition from our competitors, the usual result is cutting costs elsewhere. That means a small business owner won't hire that extra worker.

The Heritage Foundation says that a tax cut of this size will kill 130,000 jobs in the next year. Increasing taxes now, just as the economy is ready to take off, is a cruel joke to play on Americans who need a job.

Remember several years ago, when Democrats decided to increase taxes on luxury items like yachts. The Democrats thought they were being clever. But those middle class boat builders who lost their jobs because of that tax increase didn't think it was so funny. We ended up repealing the so-called luxury tax a year later.

The second part of the Obey plan is also familiar: Increase government spending. Clearly, today's Democrats reject President Clinton's promise that the era of big government is over. We need to control spending in the Federal government. We don't need another spending spree. But by spending over \$200 billion over ten years on a variety of politically attractive programs, the Obey amendment is just that: Another spending spree.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this budget amendment. Let's support smaller and smarter government. Let's support more job creation in this country. And let's reject this tax and spend scheme once and for all.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY, and I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for recognizing the great need in the veterans' health care system.

I also want to state my opposition to some of the other measures we are considering today that would cap discretionary spending and reinstate pay-as-you-go measures through fiscal year 2009. These rules would have significant impacts on VA health care and many other domestic discretionary and mandatory programs.

This February, Veterans Affairs Chairman CHRIS SMITH and I recommended that the budget committee add \$2.5 billion to the President's request for VA discretionary programs. We agreed, on a bipartisan basis, that this was the bare minimum necessary to continue to operate current services in fiscal year 2005.

Mr. OBEY's amendment adds the other half of the recommended funding that the House neglected to provide in passing its budget resolution. This will ensure that veterans can rely upon the system created to serve their special needs rather than being subjected to increased copayments, new enrollment fees and the waiting lists for care that could reappear and worsen in the absence of adequate funding.

As dangerous as the budget proposed by the Administration for fiscal year 2005 is, the budget planned for future years is even more perilous for our veterans' programs. Ranking Member SPRATT and I have produced a report to be released tomorrow that will identify some of the scenarios that could come from the planning guidance issued by the Office of Management and Budget.

The planning guidance leaked to the press recently indicates that VA should find \$910 million to cut from its fiscal year 2006 budget request for VA discretionary programs. This guidance was offered in the absence of discretionary caps and pay-as-you-go enforcement for mandatory funding. We could expect even worse if there were an overall ceiling applied to discretionary spending. In the Spending Control bill, only the tax cuts that benefit our wealthiest Americans are protected.

We could do things far differently and far more fairly. If we must impose discipline upon ourselves, we should subject tax cuts to the same enforcement we would impose upon our veterans' benefits. As it now stands, tax cuts are driving vital funding and policy decisions for all of our veterans' programs. Tax cuts have taken so much out of the pie that all of our appropriated programs are fighting to keep what they've got rather than growing to fulfill new or evolving needs. There is no question that we must provide adequate resources to our fighting men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan for as long as we choose to continue these engagements. Prioritizing tax cuts in a time of war is flat out irresponsible.

If we trust ourselves to impose self-discipline on decisions regarding tax cuts, why shouldn't we trust ourselves to have the same restraint in regard to high-priority programs? Why subject Congress to the double standard H.R. 3973 would impose?

I hope Congress will wake up and realize that we do have limited resources and our funding choices must reflect our priorities. Those who value tax cuts from the wealthiest Americans more than social programs for veterans, for the environment, for our less fortunate Americans, for children and education, and for our seniors will make that clear by supporting Mr. NUSSLE's bill.

Mr. OBEY's resolution on Democratic priorities is a much better reflection of my values than the standing House-passed budget resolution. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Fiscal Year 2005 budget authored by Ranking Member OBEY. I also want to thank the House Leadership as well as Chairmen NUSSLE and YOUNG for allowing an up-or-down vote on an alternative budget. Until today, the budget process had operated under severe restraints—doing a disservice to this chamber and an injustice to the millions of Americans whose lives are improved by Federal government programs.

My colleagues, federally-funded programs are critical. We provide the children of working parents with safe places to go after school. We recruit young professionals into nursing—a profession with a looming shortage that will affect all Americans who seek health services. We help law enforcement officers and public safety officials obtain needed equipment and training. We prevent our most vulnerable from having to choose between food and heat. We make owning a home—the pinnacle of the American dream—a reality. We help put kids through college.

These activities benefit every fabric, every member of our society. Yet, many of these services will be cut short if we continue down the current path.

It is important my colleagues remember that on the heels of this year's limited budget will come an even skimpier spending proposal in fiscal year 2006. America was put on notice in

May, when the Administration circulated a memorandum indicating that the future spending cuts outlined in this year's budget will be implemented. What does that mean?—huge reductions in spending on health, education, and homeland security.

Whether you vote for the Obey budget today or not, the sad reality is the forecast for our future is troubling. That is, unless we change course.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the Obey budget. Too many of the initiatives and programs that benefit our constituents and our communities are at stake.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 685 is an alternative to the Republican leadership's failed economic policies. Unbalanced priorities, escalating spending, and three rounds of tax cuts have led to the highest budget deficits in history while short-changing our children, seniors, and our troops and veterans. Before "borrowing" from the Social Security trust fund, this year's deficit is expected to total \$638 billion.

This resolution is a small but significant step to reverse the unfortunate trend of the last three years. By limiting tax reductions for those earning over \$1 million annually, we can help fund promises this Congress made to the American public, to make our country safer, improve our schools, and provide real healthcare benefits to those who need it the most.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the choices we make define us, our priorities, and our values. The Obey resolution before the House today gives members of Congress the clearest choice possible. Our vote on this measure today will speak volumes about our priorities and values and what we stand for as representatives in the People's House.

Four years ago, the President came before Congress and proposed a sweeping tax cut. Citing a large projected surplus in the budget over ten years, the President said that he was here to claim a refund on behalf of the American people. I voted against the President's proposal for two key reasons: The lion's share of tax relief in the President's plan goes to the very richest households in America, instead of the middle-income families I represent. Indeed, millionaires receive annual tax cuts averaging over \$120,000, while middle-income families receive annual tax cuts averaging somewhere between \$317 and \$1,186 a year.

The other reason I voted against the President's tax plan is because it relied on improbable blue-sky economic forecasts that left no margin for error. As we have seen, the economy has not performed as well as the Administration predicted. The tax plan has left this nation with insufficient resources to fund the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan as well as the improvements needed in this country's homeland security in the aftermath of 9–11. This has led the Majority Party in Congress to short-change fundamental commitments we have made in the areas of education, veterans health care, medical research, public health, homeland security, and protecting our environment.

The resolution before the House presents us with a clear choice. We can stay on the path we are on and continue to underfund the most basic needs of our children, veterans and communities, or we can make a small adjustment in the tax code and ask the very richest among us—those with incomes exceeding

\$1 million a year—to accept a smaller tax cut next year than they currently receive. The taxpayers affected by this resolution would still receive tax cuts that average thousands of dollars—even tens of thousands of dollars—more than most other American families receive.

This small adjustment in revenue would generate \$18.9 billion. This resolution would redirect a quarter of this, \$4.7 billion, to deficit reduction. The balance would go to fulfill basic needs that this Congress and the Bush Administration have underfunded. It would invest \$3 billion to bolster homeland security and ensure that first responders have the equipment and training they need. The resolution would also provide \$1.3 billion to keep our promise to fund veterans' health care. It also provides \$5.7 billion for key education programs and help our community schools meet the requirements Congress imposed on them in the No Child Left Behind Act. In addition, it provides additional funds for Pell Grants to help families afford college. It would also invest in critically needed medical research at the National Institutes of Health and help control infectious diseases and expand immunizations.

Mr. Speaker, the answer to every problem is not to throw money at it. But we must acknowledge that some problems won't be addressed without spending money. As I said, this Congress faces a defining choice today. Do we stay the course we set four years ago, or do we act to address the most pressing needs confronting this country? For me, this is not a difficult choice. Vote for the Obey resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 22, 2004, the resolution is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX this 15-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 685 will be followed by 5-minute votes, as ordered, on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 692; adopting House Resolution 692; and suspending the rules and adopting House Resolution 676.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 230, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

YEAS—184

Abercrombie	Berry	Capuano
Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Cardin
Allen	Bishop (NY)	Cardoza
Andrews	Blumenauer	Case
Baca	Boswell	Chandler
Baird	Boucher	Clay
Baldwin	Boyd	Clyburn
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Conyers
Bell	Brown, Corrine	Cooper
Berkley	Capps	Costello

Cramer	Kildee	Pomeroy	McCotter	Platts	Simpson	Boehner	Hall	Pearce
Crowley	Kilpatrick	Price (NC)	McCrery	Pombo	Smith (MI)	Bonilla	Harris	Pence
Cummings	Kind	Rahall	McHugh	Porter	Smith (NJ)	Bonner	Hart	Peterson (PA)
Davis (AL)	Kleczka	Rangel	McInnis	Portman	Souder	Bono	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Rodriguez	McKeon	Pryce (OH)	Stearns	Boozman	Hayes	Pickering
Davis (FL)	LaHood	Ross	Mica	Putnam	Stenholm	Bradley (NH)	Hayworth	Pitts
Davis (IL)	Lampson	Rothman	Miller (FL)	Radanovich	Sullivan	Brady (TX)	Hefley	Platts
DeFazio	Langevin	Roybal-Allard	Miller (MI)	Ramstad	Sweeney	Brown (SC)	Hensarling	Pombo
DeGette	Lantos	Ruppersberger	Miller, Gary	Regula	Tancredo	Brown-Waite,	Herger	Porter
Delahunt	Larsen (WA)	Rush	Moore	Rehberg	Tanner	Ginny	Hobson	Portman
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)	Moran (KS)	Renzi	Taylor (MS)	Burgess	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)
Dicks	Lee	Sabo	Murphy	Reynolds	Taylor (NC)	Burns	Hostettler	Putnam
Dingell	Levin	Sánchez, Linda	Musgrave	Rogers (AL)	Terry	Burr	Houghton	Radanovich
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	T.	Myrick	Rogers (KY)	Thomas	Burton (IN)	Hulshof	Ramstad
Dooley (CA)	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta	Nethercutt	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry	Buyer	Hunter	Regula
Edwards	Lofgren	Sanders	Neugebauer	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt	Calvert	Hyde	Rehberg
Emanuel	Lowe	Schakowsky	Ney	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiberi	Camp	Isakson	Renzi
Engel	Lucas (KY)	Schiff	Northup	Royce	Toomey	Cannon	Issa	Reynolds
Eshoo	Lynch	Scott (VA)	Norwood	Ryan (WI)	Turner (OH)	Cantor	Istook	Rogers (AL)
Etheridge	Majette	Serrano	Nunes	Ryun (KS)	Upton	Capito	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Evans	Maloney	Nussle	Osborne	Sandlin	Vitter	Carter	Johnson (CT)	Rogers (MI)
Farr	Markey	Saxton	Ose	Saxton	Walden (OR)	Castle	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Fattah	Matsui	Schrock	Otter	Schrock	Walsh	Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Filner	McCarthy (MO)	Scott (GA)	Oxley	Scott (GA)	Wamp	Chocola	Jones (NC)	Royce
Ford	McCarthy (NY)	Sensenbrenner	Paul	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (FL)	Coble	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Frank (MA)	McCollum	Sessions	Pearce	Sessions	Weldon (PA)	Collins	Kelly	Ryan (KS)
Frost	McGovern	Shadegg	Pence	Shadegg	Welder	Cox	Kennedy (MN)	Saxton
Gonzalez	McIntyre	Shaw	Peterson (MN)	Shaw	Whitfield	Crane	King (IA)	Schrock
Gordon	McNulty	Shays	Peterson (PA)	Shays	Wicker	Crenshaw	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Green (TX)	Meehan	Sherwood	Petri	Sherwood	Wilson (SC)	Cubin	Kingston	Sessions
Grijalva	Meek (FL)	Shimkus	Pickering	Shimkus	Wolf	Culberson	Kirk	Shadegg
Gutierrez	Menendez	Shuster	Thompson (CA)	Shuster	Young (AK)	Cunningham	Kline	Shaw
Harman	Michaud	Simmons	Thompson (MS)	Simmons	Young (FL)	Davis, Jo Ann	Knollenberg	Shays
Herseth	Millender-		Tierney			Davis, Tom	Kolbe	Sherwood
Hinches	McDonald		Towns			Deal (GA)	LaHood	Shimkus
Hinojosa	Miller (NC)		Turner (TX)			DeLay	Latham	Shuster
Hoeffel	Miller, George		Udall (CO)			Diaz-Balart, L.	LaTourette	Simmons
Holden	Mollohan		Udall (NM)			Diaz-Balart, M.	Leach	Simpson
Holt	Moran (VA)		Van Hollen			Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Smith (MI)
Honda	Murtha		Nadler			Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Hooley (OR)	Napolitano		Velázquez			Duncan	LoBiondo	Souder
Hoyer	Neal (MA)		Visclosky			Dunn	Lucas (OK)	Stearns
Insee	Oberstar		Waters			Ehlers	Manzullo	Sullivan
Israel	Obey		Watson			Emerson	McCotter	Sweeney
Jackson (IL)	Oliver		Watt			English	McCrery	Tancredo
Jackson-Lee	Ortiz		Waxman			Everett	McHugh	Taylor (NC)
(TX)	Ortiz		Weiner			Feeney	McInnis	Terry
Jefferson	Owens		Wexler			Ferguson	McKeon	Thomas
John	Pallone		Wilson (NM)			Flake	Mica	Thornberry
Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell		Woolsey			Foley	Miller (FL)	Tiahrt
Kanjorski	Pastor		Wu			Forbes	Miller (MI)	Toomey
Kaptur	Payne		Wynn			Fossella	Miller, Gary	Turner (OH)
Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi					Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)	Upton

NAYS—230

Aderholt	Cox	Harris
Akin	Crane	Hart
Alexander	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)
Bachus	Cubin	Hayes
Baker	Culberson	Hayworth
Ballenger	Cunningham	Hefley
Barrett (SC)	Davis (TN)	Hensarling
Bartlett (MD)	Davis, Jo Ann	Herger
Bass	Davis, Tom	Hill
Beauprez	Deal (GA)	Hobson
Biggert	DeLay	Hoeckstra
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hostettler
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Houghton
Blackburn	Doolittle	Hulshof
Blunt	Dreier	Hunter
Boehlert	Duncan	Hyde
Boehner	Dunn	Isakson
Bonilla	Ehlers	Issa
Bonner	Emerson	Istook
Bono	English	Jenkins
Boozman	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Bradley (NH)	Feeney	Johnson (IL)
Brady (TX)	Ferguson	Johnson, Sam
Brown (SC)	Flake	Jones (NC)
Brown-Waite,	Foley	Keller
Ginny	Forbes	Kelly
Burgess	Fossella	Kennedy (MN)
Burns	Franks (AZ)	King (IA)
Burr	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Burton (IN)	Gallely	Kingston
Buyer	Garrett (NJ)	Kirk
Calvert	Gerlach	Kline
Camp	Gibbons	Knollenberg
Cannon	Gilchrest	Kolbe
Cantor	Gillmor	Latham
Capito	Gingrey	LaTourette
Carson (OK)	Goode	Leach
Carter	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Castle	Goss	Lewis (KY)
Chabot	Graves	LoBiondo
Chocola	Green (WI)	Lucas (OK)
Coble	Greenwood	Manzullo
Cole	Gutknecht	Marshall
Collins	Hall	Matheson

NOT VOTING—19

Barton (TX)	Doyle	Meeks (NY)
Bereuter	Gephardt	Quinn
Berman	Granger	Reyes
Brown (OH)	Hastings (FL)	Smith (TX)
Carson (IN)	Jones (OH)	Tauzin
DeMint	Linder	
Deutsch	McDermott	

□ 1352

Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. HART, and Messrs. CRANE, NEY, KENNEDY of Minnesota, KING of Iowa, BACHUS, BRADY of Texas and HALL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. HINCHEY, CLYBURN and BISHOP of Georgia changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was not agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:
Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 301 I inadvertently voted “yea” I meant to vote “nay.”

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4663, SPENDING CONTROL ACT OF 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The pending business is the question of ordering the previous question on House Resolution 692 on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 197, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

YEAS—217

Aderholt	Barrett (SC)	Bilirakis
Akin	Bartlett (MD)	Bishop (UT)
Bachus	Bass	Blackburn
Baker	Beauprez	Blunt
Ballenger	Biggert	Boehlert

Bonilla	Bonner	Bono	Boozman	Bradley (NH)	Brady (TX)	Brown (SC)	Brown-Waite,	Burr	Burton (IN)	Buyer	Calvert	Camp	Cannon	Cantor	Capito	Carter	Castle	Chabot	Chocola	Coble	Collins	Cox	Crane	Crenshaw	Cubin	Culberson	Cunningham	Davis, Jo Ann	Davis, Tom	Deal (GA)	DeLay	Diaz-Balart, L.	Diaz-Balart, M.	Doolittle	Dreier	Duncan	Dunn	Ehlers	Emerson	English	Everett	Feeney	Ferguson	Flake	Foley	Forbes	Fossella	Franks (AZ)	Frelinghuysen	Gallely	Garrett (NJ)	Gerlach	Gibbons	Gilchrest	Gillmor	Gingrey	Goode	Goodlatte	Goss	Graves	Green (WI)	Greenwood	Gutknecht
Hastings (WA)	Hayes	Hayworth	Hefley	Hensarling	Herger	Hobson	Hoekstra	Hostettler	Houghton	Hulshof	Hunter	Hyde	Isakson	Issa	Istook	Jenkins	Johnson (CT)	Johnson (IL)	Johnson, Sam	Jones (NC)	Keller	Kelly	Kennedy (MN)	King (IA)	King (NY)	Kingston	Kirk	Kline	Knollenberg	Kolbe	Latham	LaTourette	Leach	Lewis (CA)	Lewis (KY)	LoBiondo	Lucas (OK)	Manzullo	McCotter	McCrery	McHugh	McInnis	McKeon	Mica	Miller (FL)	Miller (MI)	Miller, Gary	Moran (KS)	Murphy	Musgrave	Myrick	Nethercutt	Neugebauer	Ney	Northup	Norwood	Nunes	Nussle	Osborne	Ose	Otter	Oxley	Paul
Peterson (PA)	Petri	Pickering	Pitts	Platts	Pombo	Porter	Pryce (OH)	Putnam	Radanovich	Ramstad	Regula	Rehberg	Renzi	Reynolds	Rogers (AL)	Rogers (KY)	Rogers (MI)	Rohrabacher	Ros-Lehtinen	Royce	Ryan (WI)	Ryan (KS)	Saxton	Schrock	Sensenbrenner	Sessions	Shadegg	Shaw	Shays	Sherwood	Shimkus	Shuster	Simmons	Smith (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Souder	Stearns	Sullivan	Sweeney	Tancredo	Taylor (NC)	Terry	Thomas	Thornberry	Tiahrt	Toomey	Turner (OH)	Upton	Vitter	Walden (OR)	Walsh	Wamp	Weldon (FL)	Weldon (PA)	Weller	Whitfield	Wicker	Wilson (NM)	Wilson (SC)	Wolf	Young (AK)	Young (FL)	

NAYS—197

Abercrombie	Conyers	Ford
Ackerman	Cooper	Frank (MA)
Alexander	Costello	Frost
Allen	Cramer	Gonzalez
Andrews	Crowley	Gordon
Baca	Cummings	Green (TX)
Baird	Davis (AL)	Grijalva
Baldwin	Davis (CA)	Gutierrez
Becerra	Davis (FL)	Harman
Bell	Davis (IL)	Herseth
Berkley	Davis (TN)	Hill
Berry	DeFazio	Hinches
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Hinojosa
Bishop (NY)	Delahunt	Hoeffel
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Holden
Boswell	Dicks	Holt
Boucher	Dingell	Honda
Boyd	Doggett	Hooley (OR)
Brady (PA)	Dooley (CA)	Hoyer
Brown, Corrine	Doyle	Insee
Capps	Edwards	Israel
Capuano	Emanuel	Jackson (IL)
Cardin	Engel	Jackson-Lee
Cardoza	Eshoo	(TX)
Carson (OK)	Etheridge	Jefferson
Case	Evans	John
Chandler	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Clay	Fattah	Kanjorski
Clyburn	Filner	Kaptur

Kennedy (RI)	Miller, George	Schiff	Bono	Hart	Peterson (PA)	Crowley	Kilpatrick	Price (NC)
Kildee	Mollohan	Scott (GA)	Boozman	Hastings (WA)	Petri	Cummings	Kind	Rahall
Kilpatrick	Moore	Scott (VA)	Bradley (NH)	Hayes	Pickering	Davis (AL)	Kleczka	Rangel
Kind	Moran (VA)	Serrano	Brady (TX)	Hayworth	Pitts	Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Reyes
Kleczka	Murtha	Sherman	Brown (SC)	Hefley	Platts	Davis (FL)	Lampson	Rodriguez
Kucinich	Nadler	Skelton	Brown-Waite,	Hensarling	Pombo	Davis (IL)	Langevin	Ross
Lampson	Napolitano	Slaughter	Ginny	Herger	Porter	Davis (TN)	Lantos	Rothman
Langevin	Neal (MA)	Smith (WA)	Burgess	Hobson	Portman	DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Lantos	Oberstar	Snyder	Burns	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)	DeGette	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Larsen (WA)	Obey	Solis	Burr	Hostettler	Delahunt	Lee	Lee	Rush
Larson (CT)	Olver	Spratt	Burton (IN)	Houghton	DeLauro	Levin	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Lee	Ortiz	Stark	Buyer	Hulshof	Dicks	Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Levin	Owens	Stenholm	Calvert	Hunter	Dingell	Dingell	Lipinski	Sánchez, Linda
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Strickland	Camp	Hyde	Doggett	Doggett	Lofgren	T.
Lipinski	Pascarell	Stupak	Cannon	Isakson	Dooley (CA)	Dooley (CA)	Lowey	Sánchez, Loretta
Lofgren	Pastor	Tanner	Cantor	Issa	Doyle	Doyle	Lucas (KY)	Sanders
Lowey	Payne	Tauscher	Capito	Istook	Edwards	Edwards	Lynch	Sandlin
Lucas (KY)	Pelosi	Taylor (MS)	Carter	Jenkins	Emanuel	Emanuel	Majette	Schakowsky
Lynch	Peterson (MN)	Thompson (CA)	Castle	Johnson (CT)	Eshoo	Eshoo	Markey	Schiff
Majette	Pomeroy	Thompson (MS)	Chabot	Johnson (IL)	Etheridge	Etheridge	Scott (GA)	Scott (VA)
Maloney	Price (NC)	Tierney	Chocola	Johnson, Sam	Evans	Evans	Matheson	Serrano
Markey	Rahall	Towns	Coble	Jones (NC)	Farr	Farr	Matsui	Sherman
Marshall	Rangel	Turner (TX)	Cole	Keller	Fattah	Fattah	McCarthy (MO)	Skelton
Matheson	Reyes	Udall (CO)	Collins	Kelly	Filner	Filner	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter
Matsui	Rodriguez	Udall (NM)	Cox	Kennedy (MN)	Ford	Ford	McCollum	Smith (WA)
McCarthy (MO)	Ross	Van Hollen	Crane	King (IA)	Frank (MA)	Frank (MA)	McGovern	Snyder
McCarthy (NY)	Rothman	Velázquez	Crenshaw	King (NY)	Frost	Frost	McIntyre	Solis
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky	Cubin	Kingston	Gonzalez	Gonzalez	McNulty	Spratt
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Waters	Cuningham	Kline	Gordon	Gordon	Meehan	Stark
McIntyre	Rush	Watson	Davis, Jo Ann	Knollenberg	Green (TX)	Green (TX)	Meek (FL)	Stenholm
McNulty	Ryan (OH)	Watt	Davis, Tom	Kolbe	Menendez	Menendez	Michaud	Strickland
Meehan	Sabo	Waxman	Deal (GA)	LaHood	Michaud	Michaud	Millender-	Stupak
Meek (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	Weiner	DeLay	Latham	Harman	Harman	Millender-	Tanner
Menendez	T.	Wexler	Diaz-Balart, L.	LaTourrette	Herseth	Herseth	McDonald	Tauscher
Michaud	Sánchez, Loretta	Woolsey	Diaz-Balart, M.	Leach	Hill	Hill	Miller (NC)	Taylor (MS)
Millender-	T.	Wu	Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Hinches	Hinches	Miller (NC)	Thompson (CA)
McDonald	Sánchez, Loretta	Wynn	Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Hinojosa	Hinojosa	Miller, George	Thompson (CA)
Miller (NC)	Schakowsky		Duncan	LoBiondo	Hoefel	Hoefel	Mollohan	Thompson (MS)

NOT VOTING—19

Barton (TX)	Deutsch	Meeks (NY)
Bereuter	Gephardt	Quinn
Berman	Granger	Smith (TX)
Brown (OH)	Hastings (FL)	Tauzin
Carson (IN)	Jones (OH)	Tiberi
Cole	Linder	
DeMint	McDermott	

□ 1400

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote. A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 197, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

AYES—217

Aderholt	Bartlett (MD)	Blackburn
Akin	Bass	Blunt
Bachus	Beauprez	Boehler
Baker	Biggert	Boehner
Ballenger	Bilirakis	Bonilla
Barrett (SC)	Bishop (UT)	Bonner

Dunn	Ehlers	McCotter
Dunham	Emerson	McCreary
Duncan	English	McHugh
Dunn	Everett	McInnis
Dunham	Feeney	McKeon
Duncan	Ferguson	Mica
Dunn	Flake	Miller (FL)
Dunham	Foley	Miller (MI)
Duncan	Forbes	Miller, Gary
Dunn	Fossella	Moran (KS)
Dunham	Franks (AZ)	Murphy
Duncan	Frelinghuysen	Musgrave
Dunn	Gallegly	Myrick
Dunham	Garrett (NJ)	Nethercutt
Duncan	Gerlach	Neugebauer
Dunn	Gibbons	Ney
Dunham	Gilchrest	Northup
Duncan	Gillmor	Norwood
Dunn	Gingrey	Nunes
Dunham	Goode	Nussle
Duncan	Goodlatte	Osborne
Dunn	Goss	Ose
Dunham	Graves	Otter
Duncan	Green (WI)	Oxley
Dunn	Greenwood	Paul
Dunham	Hall	Pearce
Duncan	Harris	Pence

NOES—197

Abercrombie	Berry	Cardin
Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Cardoza
Alexander	Bishop (NY)	Carson (OK)
Allen	Blumenauer	Case
Andrews	Boswell	Chandler
Baca	Boucher	Clay
Baird	Boyd	Clyburn
Baldwin	Brady (PA)	Conyers
Becerra	Brown, Corrine	Cooper
Bell	Capps	Costello
Berkley	Capuano	Cramer

Holden	Moore	Moran (VA)
Holt	Murtha	Nadler
Honda	Napolitano	Neal (MA)
Hoyer	Neal (MA)	Oberstar
Inslee	Obey	Israel
Israel	Olver	Jackson (IL)
Jackson (IL)	Ortiz	Jackson-Lee
Jackson-Lee	Owens	(TX)
Jefferson	Pallone	John
John	Pascarell	Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor	Kanjorski
Kanjorski	Payne	Kaptur
Kaptur	Pelosi	Kennedy (RI)
Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (MN)	Kildee
Kildee	Pomeroy	

NOT VOTING—19

Barton (TX)	Gephardt	McDermott
Bereuter	Granger	Meeks (NY)
Berman	Gutknecht	Quinn
Brown (OH)	Hastings (FL)	Smith (TX)
Carson (IN)	Jones (OH)	Tauzin
DeMint	Kirk	
Deutsch	Linder	

□ 1407

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table. Stated for: Mr. Speaker, today, I missed roll-call vote number 303: H. Res. 692, to provide consideration of H.R. 4663. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on this vote.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. BARTON of Texas (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of

attending the funeral of a district staff member.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today after

2:00 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of his son's wedding.

Mr. LINDER (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today until 6:00 p.m. on account of a commitment in the district.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4635: An act to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2017. An act to designate the United States courthouse and post office building located at 93 Atocha Street in Ponce, Puerto Rico, as the "Luis A. Ferré United States Courthouse and Post Office Building."

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on June 23, 2004 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 3378. To assist in the conservation of marine turtles and the nesting habitats of marine turtles in foreign countries.

H.R. 3504. To amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to redesignate the American Indian Education Foundation as the National Fund for Excellence in American Indian Education.

H.R. 4322. To provide for the transfer of the Nebraska Avenue Naval Complex in the District of Columbia to facilitate the establishment of the headquarters for the Department of Homeland Security, to provide for the acquisition by the Department of the Navy of suitable replacement facilities.

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on June 24, 2004 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 4589. To reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program through September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4635. To provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Friday, June 25, 2004, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8772. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Contracting for Architect-Engineer Services [DFARS Case 2003-D105] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8773. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Fish, Shellfish, and Seafood Products [DFARS Case 2002-D034] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8774. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Follow-On Production Contracts for Products Developed Pursuant to Prototype Projects [DFARS Case 2002-D023] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8775. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Production Surveillance and Reporting [DFARS Case 2002-D015] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8776. A letter from the Acting General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-D-7557] received June 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8777. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-B-7446] received June 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8778. A letter from the Acting General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations — received June 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8779. A letter from the Acting General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7833] received June 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8780. A letter from the Acting General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received June 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8781. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (RIN: 1820-ZA34) received June 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8782. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Institute on Disability and Rehabil-

itation Research (RIN: 1820-ZA37) received June 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8783. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (RIN: 1820-ZA26) received May 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8784. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safe Schools/Healthy Students (RIN: 1865-ZA02) received June 3, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8785. A letter from the Director, OSHA Standards and Guidance, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mechanical Power Transmission Apparatus; Mechanical Power Presses; Telecommunications; Hydrogen — received June 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8786. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Health Care Continuation Coverage (RIN: 1210-AA60) received May 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8787. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received June 2, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8788. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Sta., FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Requirements for Liquid Medicated Animal Feed and Free-Choice Medicated Animal Feed [Docket No. 1993P-0174] received June 14, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8789. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Sta., FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Device Reports; Reports of Corrections and Removals; Establishment Registration and Device Listing; Premarket Approval Supplements; Quality System Regulation; Importation of Electronic Products; Technical Amendment; Correction — received May 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8790. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Review of Part 15 and other Parts of the Commission's Rules [ET Docket No. 01-278; RM-9375; RM-10051] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8791. A letter from the Legal Advisor, Office of the Bureau Chief, WTB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 97 of the Rules Governing the Amateur Radio Services [Dkt No.04-140, RM-10313, RM-10352, RM-10353, RM-10354, RM-10355, RM-10412, RM-10413, RM-10492, RM-10521, RM-10582, RM-10620, RM-10621] Amendment of Section 97.111 of the Amateur Radio Service Rules to Limit Transmissions of Information

Bulletins; Conforming Amendments to Part 97 of the Commission's Rules to Implement the World's Radio Conference 1997 Final Acts; Amendment of Part 97 to Provide Color-coded License Documents; Amendment of Part 97 to Allow Instant Temporary Licensing; Amendment of the Amateur Service Rules to Limit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8792. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Chase City, Virginia, and Creedmoor, Ahoskie, Gatesville, and Nashville, North Carolina) [MB Docket No. 03-232; RM-10819] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8793. A letter from the Legal Advisor, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b) FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Glasgow and Bowling Green, Kentucky) [MB Docket No. 04-42; RM-10850] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8794. A letter from the Legal Advisor to Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations. (Anniston, Alabama) [MB Docket No. 03-229; RM-10795] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8795. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Arlington, The Dalles, Moro, Fossil, Astoria, Gladstone, Portland, Tillamook, Coos Bay, Springfield-Eugene, Manzanita and Hermiston, Oregon, and Covington, Trout Lake, Shoreline, Bellingham, Forks, Hoquiam, Aberdeen, Walla Walla, Kent, College Place, Long Beach and Ilwaco, Washington) [MB Docket No. 02-136; RM-10458; RM-10663, RM-10667, RM-10668] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8796. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of the Commission's Rules Regarding Dedicated Short-Range Communication Services in the 5.850-5.925 GHz Band (5.9 GHz Band) [WT Docket No. 01-90] Amendment of Parts 2 and 90 of the Commission's Rules to Allocate the 5.850-5.925 GHz Band to the Mobile Service for Dedicated Short Range Communications of Intelligent Transportation Services [ET Docket No. 98-95; RM-9096] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8797. A letter from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Arthur and Hazelton, North Dakota) [MB Docket No. 03-208; RM-10793] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8798. A letter from the Legal Advisor to Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations. (Roswell, New

Mexico) [MB Docket No. 04-16; RM-10840] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8799. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of the Commission's Space Station Licensing Rules and Policies [IB Docket No. 02-34] Mitigation of Orbital Debris [IB Docket No. 02-54] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8800. A letter from the Legal Advisor, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of the Commission's Space Station Licensing Rules and Regulations [IB Docket No. 02-34] 2000 Biennial Regulatory Review — Streamlining and Other Revisions of Part 25 of the Commission's Rules Governing the Licensing of, and Spectrum Usage by, Satellite Network Earth Stations and Space Stations [IB Docket No. 00-248] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8801. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Voluntary Fire Protection Requirements for Light Water Reactors; Adoption of NFPA 805 as a Risk-Informed, Performance-Based Alternative (RIN: 3150-AG48) received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8802. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Methods of Withdrawing Funds From the Thrift Savings Plan; Court Orders and Legal Processes Affecting Thrift Savings Plan Accounts; Loan Program; Thrift Savings Plan—received June 2, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8803. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Change in Federal Wage System Survey Job (RIN: 3206-AJ79) received May 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8804. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Pay Administration (General) (RIN: 3206-AK47) received May 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8805. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Physicians' Comparability Allowances (RIN: 3206-AJ96) received May 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8806. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees Health Benefits Program: Modification of Two-Option Limitation for Health Benefits Plans and Continuation of Coverage for Annuitants Whose Plan Terminates an Option (RIN: 3206-AK48) received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8807. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendments to Parts 1, 2, 27, and 90 of the Commission's Rules to License Services in the 216-220 MHz, 1390-1395 MHz, 1427-1429 MHz, 1429-1432 MHz, 1432-1435 MHz, 1670-1675 MHz, and 2385-2390 MHz Government Transfer Bands [WT Docket No. 02-8; RM-9267, RM-9692, RM-9797, RM-9854, RM-9882] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8808. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Action #1 — Adjustments of the Commercial Fishery from the U.S. — Canada Border to Cape Falcon, Oregon [Docket No. 040429134-4135-01; I.D. 051704B] received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8809. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; "Other Flatfish" in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 031124287-4060-02; I.D. 060104A] received June 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8810. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Yellowfish Sole in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 031124287-4060-02; I.D. 060304C] received June 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8811. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Closure of the Quarter II Fishery for Loligo Squid [Docket No.031104274-4011-02; I.D. 060804G] received June 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8812. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Groundfish Observer Program [Docket 980702167-4150-03; I.D. 031901A] (RIN: 0648-AK26) received June 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8813. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast (NE) Multispecies Fishery; Amendment 13 Regulatory Amendment [Docket No. 040112010-4167-03; I.D.122203A] (RIN: 0648-AN17) received June 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8814. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife; Sea Turtle Conservation Requirements [Docket No. 040412113-4152-01; I.D. 040104C] (RIN: 0648-AS02) received June 16, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8815. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary and Acting Director, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to Representation of Others Before The United States Patent and Trademark Office [Docket No. 2002-C-005] (RIN: 0651-AB55) received June 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8816. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary and Acting Director, U.S. Patent and

Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Power of Attorney and Assignment Practice [Docket No.: 2003-P-019] (RIN: 0651-AB63) received May 26, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8817. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Designating Classes of Employees as Members of the Special Exposure Cohort under the Energy Employees Occupations Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000; Final Rule (RIN: 0920-AA07) received May 28, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8818. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Representations and Certifications—Other Than Commercial Items (RIN: 2700-AC97) received April 1, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

8819. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Compensation for labor or personal services (Rev. Proc. 2004-37) received June 14, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8820. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Compensation for Injuries or Sickness (Also Amounts received Under Accident and Health Plans) (Rev. Rul. 2004-55) received June 14, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8821. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Weighted Average Interest Rates Update [Notice 2004-42] received June 14, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3916. A bill to improve circulation of the \$1 coin, create a new bullion coin, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. [Filed on June 25 (legislative day, June 24), 2004]

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 694. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4614) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-569). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 4677. A bill to name the lake known as Falls Lake in North Carolina after United States Senator Jesse Helms; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DAVIS of Florida:

H.R. 4678. A bill to bar certain additional restrictions on travel and remittances to

Cuba; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. WATT, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. LEE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BACA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama):

H.R. 4679. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide assistance for privately owned low- and moderate-income housing with expiring Federal subsidies to prevent displacement of low- and moderate-income tenants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H.R. 4680. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to ensure that Indian tribes and any organizations owned, controlled, or operated by Indian tribes are not considered employers for purposes of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. McNULTY):

H.R. 4681. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish and maintain an Internet website that is designed to allow consumers to compare the usual and customary prices for covered outpatient drugs sold by retail pharmacies that participate in the Medicaid Program for each postal Zip Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. BASS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. HOYER, and Ms. SOLIS):

H.R. 4682. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 4683. A bill to enhance the preservation and interpretation of the Gullah/Geechee cultural heritage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 4684. A bill to extend the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota):

H.R. 4685. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a pilot program under which up to 15 States may issue electronic Federal migratory bird hunting stamps; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 4686. A bill to revitalize the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. OSBORNE):

H.R. 4687. A bill to amend part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require Medicare Advantage (MA) organizations to pay for critical access hospital services and rural health clinic services at a rate that is at least 101 percent of the payment rate otherwise applicable under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILCHREST (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H.R. 4688. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 4689. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiaries with access to geriatric assessments and chronic care management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 4690. A bill to transfer certain lands along the Cle Elum River in the State of Washington to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, to support a land exchange involving a portion of such lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. BEAUPREZ, and Mr. TANCREDO):

H.R. 4691. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in a feasibility study relating to long-term water needs for the area served by the Fryingpan-Arkansas Project, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. BAIRD):

H.R. 4692. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to permit qualifying States to use a portion of their allotments under the State children's health insurance program for any fiscal year for certain Medicaid expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 4693. A bill to require persons who seek to retain seed harvested from the planting of patented seeds to register with the Secretary of Agriculture and pay fees set by the Secretary for retaining such seed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 4694. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide for mental health

screening and treatment services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for integration of mental health services and mental health treatment outreach teams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 4695. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to extend the redesignation period for certain Historically Underutilized Business Zones (HUBZones) in States with persistently high unemployment; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MCHUGH:

H.R. 4696. A bill to promote the use of anaerobic digesters by agricultural producers and rural small businesses to produce renewable energy and improve environmental quality; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCHUGH:

H.R. 4697. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a permanent extension of the credit for producing electricity from wind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCHUGH:

H.R. 4698. A bill to establish a grant program to support cluster-based economic development efforts; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCHUGH:

H.R. 4699. A bill to establish a grant program to support broadband-based economic development efforts; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCINNIS:

H.R. 4700. A bill to provide special authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain Forest Service administrative sites in the White River National Forest in Colorado, to reserve the proceeds from such conveyances to help resolve the facilities needs of that national forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr.

FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4701. A bill to provide for entitlement to dependents' and survivors' benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act based on permanent partnership as well as marriage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 4702. A bill to require farmers to be offered supplemental crop insurance based on an area yield and loss plan of insurance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSBORNE (for himself, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. FORD):

H.R. 4703. A bill to establish a Federal Youth Development Council to improve the administration and coordination of Federal programs serving youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. OSE (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, and Mr. DOOLEY of California):

H.R. 4704. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits for climate neutral combustion technologies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMEROY:

H.R. 4705. A bill to provide crop and livestock disaster assistance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CASE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 4706. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide for stewardship of fishery resources for the American public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. HOUGHTON):

H.R. 4707. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives to encourage diversity of ownership of telecommunications businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 4708. A bill to allow workers certified to receive trade adjustment assistance under the Trade Act of 1974 who are rehired by the same employer to continue to receive such assistance if they are subsequently unable to work because of a lock-out in the course of a labor dispute; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 4709. A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to bring sexual assault crimes under military law into parallel with sexual assault crimes under Federal law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4710. A bill to clarify the congressional intent concerning, and to codify, certain requirements of the Communications Act of 1934 that ensure that broadcasters afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

H.R. 4711. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate reductions of basic pay for eligibility for basic educational assistance for veterans under the Montgomery GI Bill; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 4712. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 with respect to enforcement provisions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. HONDA):

H. Con. Res. 465. Concurrent resolution commending the efforts of women in the Republic of Colombia to promote peace; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Con. Res. 466. Concurrent resolution urging the Government of India to conduct a thorough and transparent investigation of the scope of abusive child labor in circuses throughout India and to pursue immediate and effective remedies to end such abuse, and to provide immediate and continuous police protection to secure the personal safety of Kailash Satyarthi, his family, and his colleagues in the South Asian Coalition Against Child Servitude; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WYNN, Ms. LEE, Ms. MAJETTE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WATT, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. WATSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FORD, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H. Con. Res. 467. Concurrent resolution declaring genocide in Darfur, Sudan; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. MATSUI):

H. Res. 695. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives to the family and friends of Mattie Stepanek on his passing, and honoring the life of Mattie Stepanek for his braveness, generosity of spirit, and efforts to raise awareness of muscular dystrophy; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. FROST:

H. Res. 696. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3767) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to deliver a meaningful benefit and lower prescription drug prices under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. MANZULLO):

H. Res. 697. A resolution urging the Government of the People's Republic of China to take certain actions regarding exports of coke; to the Committee on International Relations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. MILLER of Florida introduced A bill (H.R. 4713) for the relief of Christine L. Barrott; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 99: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 173: Mr. McCOTTER.
 H.R. 284: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
 H.R. 303: Ms. HERSETH.
 H.R. 344: Mr. OTTER.
 H.R. 594: Ms. HERSETH.
 H.R. 715: Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 792: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 953: Ms. HERSETH.
 H.R. 962: Mr. WU.
 H.R. 1080: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 1355: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1466: Mr. HOEFFEL.
 H.R. 1501: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 1563: Mr. RENZI.
 H.R. 1684: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. SKELTON.
 H.R. 1746: Mr. POMEROY.
 H.R. 1824: Mr. CRANE.
 H.R. 2079: Mr. KLECZKA.
 H.R. 2176: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 2239: Mr. KANJORSKI.
 H.R. 2262: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 2318: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 2387: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2536: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 2598: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 2959: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. PORTER.
 H.R. 3009: Ms. HARRIS and Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 3148: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. MAJETTE, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 3180: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 3192: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. REYES.
 H.R. 3194: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 3313: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. OTTER.
 H.R. 3327: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 3424: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 3425: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 3558: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. GIBBONS.
 H.R. 3574: Ms. DUNN.
 H.R. 3579: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. LAN-TOS.
 H.R. 3619: Ms. HERSETH.
 H.R. 3642: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
 H.R. 3672: Ms. HERSETH.
 H.R. 3676: Ms. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 3684: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 3728: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 3767: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 3804: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 3810: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. PASTOR.
 H.R. 3831: Mr. CASE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FARR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. WATERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SABO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 3858: Mr. BEAUPREZ, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. McCOTTER, and Mr. BOEHNER.
 H.R. 3988: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 4026: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 4046: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FROST, Mr. WEINER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 4067: Mr. LANGEVIN and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 4093: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4097: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 4100: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FALDOMAVAEGA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. LEE, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FORD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 4110: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 4119: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 4124: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 4131: Mr. OSE and Mr. FOSSELLA.
 H.R. 4150: Mr. SIMMONS.
 H.R. 4169: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
 H.R. 4187: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 4206: Mr. FROST, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 4207: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 4242: Mr. REYES.
 H.R. 4261: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 4263: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WEINER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. SOLIS.
 H.R. 4269: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 4284: Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PAUL and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
 H.R. 4303: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. McCOTTER.
 H.R. 4306: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 4343: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 4354: Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 4415: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 4420: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
 H.R. 4430: Mr. BONILLA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
 H.R. 4433: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 4440: Mr. CARTER and Mr. JENKINS.
 H.R. 4449: Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 4472: Mr. FROST, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. JOHN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 4502: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCINNIS, and Mr. SAXTON.
 H.R. 4511: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 4521: Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 4530: Mr. ENGLISH.
 H.R. 4533: Mr. NUNES.
 H.R. 4561: Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 4576: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. RENZI.
 H.R. 4584: Mr. RENZI.
 H.R. 4600: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H.R. 4608: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 4610: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. LOPGREN, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. BECERRA.
 H.R. 4622: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 4634: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 4636: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. CARDOZA.
 H.R. 4655: Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4671: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. McNULTY.
 H. Con. Res. 330: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H. Con. Res. 375: Mr. MATSUI, Ms. LEE, and Mr. DEUTSCH.
 H. Con. Res. 418: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. McCOTTER.
 H. Con. Res. 431: Mr. MARSHALL.
 H. Con. Res. 442: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. KLECZKA.
 H. Con. Res. 459: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H. Con. Res. 462: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LEACH, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. McCOTTER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WU, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. KING of New York.
 H. Res. 60: Mr. SHAW.
 H. Res. 466: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
 H. Res. 485: Mr. COLE and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H. Res. 566: Mr. GREENWOOD.
 H. Res. 570: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H. Res. 667: Mr. EVANS and Mrs. MYRICK.
 H. Res. 687: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. SABO.
 H. Res. 688: Mr. WELLER and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4614

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT No. 3. At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
 SEC. . . None of the funds made available in this Act that are provided to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service or a State department of natural resources for the purpose of carrying out habitat restoration measures for endangered species pursuant to the Corps of Engineers Missouri River Master Water Control Manual may be used for any other purpose.

H.R. 4614

OFFERED BY: MS. NORTON

AMENDMENT No. 4. Page 3, line 17, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$20,000,000) (reduced by \$20,000,000)".

H.R. 4614

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT No. 5. Page 19, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$30,000,000)".

Page 23, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$30,000,000)".