Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, are we safer now than we were 4 years ago? We have spent billions and 1,000 of our best have died in Iraq. But spending blood and treasure without wisdom will not necessarily make us safer. And while we have as a unified Nation dealt with al Qaeda and Afghanistan, we have ignored the nuclear weapons programs of Iran and North Korea. Our policy toward those two greatest threats has been ''hear no evil, see no evil.''

□ 1030

The administration's idea on how to make us safe from those nuclear weapons as to North Korea is to beg and as to Iran is to beg the Europeans to beg on our behalf.

The Bush administration refuses to use economic sanctions on Iran and those who subsidize North Korea because they do not want to inconvenience corporate America. Our invasion of Iraq is as if in the wake of Pearl Harbor we invaded Fascist Spain while ignoring Imperial Japan and Nazi Germany.

VICE PRESIDENT CHENEY'S SCARE TACTICS

(Mr. MEEKS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to denounce Vice President CHENEY's disgusting and inappropriate remarks yesterday while campaigning. The Vice President's consistent attacks have reached an all-time low, even for him, and that is saying a lot for the most polarizing, divisive Vice President in the history of the United States.

We were not attacked because we were Democrats. We were not attacked because we were Republicans. We were attacked because we were Americans, and the question is where is this administration leading us? Mr. CHENEY criticizes Mr. KERRY while he was defending this country, and he took five deferments.

To exploit 9/11 and play on the public fears of terrorism is an affirmation by this administration that their record is too dismal to stand on its own. Americans should be fearful, fearful of the Bush-Cheney policies that have recruited more terrorists who want to destroy us, fearful that the hatred for America is at an all-time high, thanks to the policies of Bush-Cheney.

Time and time again this administration has made the wrong choices for America. JOHN KERRY and JOHN EDWARDS will take America in a new direction. He will make America stronger at home and more respected around the world.

VICE PRESIDENT CHENEY REACHED A NEW LOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Vice President CHENEY reached a new low. The Vice President has a history of saying outrageous things, but yesterday takes the cake.

I hope everyone realizes what the Vice President is up to. He is desperately trying to change the subject from the tragic milestone of 1,000 American fatalities in Iraq.

Today we mourn with the families who have lost their loved ones.

He can try to change the subject, Mr. Speaker, but he cannot change the fact that over and over and over again this administration has made the wrong choices in Iraq. Here we are, no weapons of mass destruction, 1,000 American fatalities, thousands and thousands of wounded and $200 billion later.

Imagine what we could have done with $200 billion. We could have invested that in jobs, in health care, in education and veterans programs, and in ensuring that our military is the best-equipped, best-trained and best-housed in the world. Those should be our priorities, Mr. Speaker, and it is sad that after 4 years in office, DICK CHENEY still does not get it.

OUTRAGE OVER INCREASE IN MEDICARE PART B PREMIUMS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to reiterate again my sense of outrage over this 17 percent increase in Medicare Part B premiums, which is basically $11 a month for America's seniors that is soon to go into effect.

President Bush said, well, this is because health care costs have gone up, but what he does not say is it is actually the result of Republican policies. The Republicans passed their so-called Medicare prescription drug bill, which we know is a sham, does not even go into effect until the year 2006, but what that bill did was to give a lot more money to insurers, and, as a result, the cost of Medicare premiums are going up.

The fact of the matter is that this 17 percent increase that is unaffordable for many seniors is a direct result of Republican policy and the Bush administration's policy, and it has to stop.

We need a change of administration. We need a President, JOHN KERRY, who is going to worry about senior citizens, address their needs, address the rising costs of health care, address the Medicare concerns, provide a true prescription drug benefit.

This premium increase is just an indication of what we would see over the next 2-years if the Republicans continue in power in this House. It has got to stop. Seniors should wake up and see the result of the Bush policies and what it means for their Medicare program.

LOSS OF SOLDIERS' LIVES

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to discuss the issue of having lost 1,000 of our soldiers. How heart-breaking this is when we look at the ages and the numbers of those young people, many of them barely 19 years old, whose dreams for their lives and hopes for their future are gone, and our hearts break for them and for their families.

One statistic that we have not heard much about, and frankly I think have not been given the truth about, are the number of those who have been wounded and maimed. Again, 18, 19, 20, 21 years old.

We are told that the casualty statistics of people wounded amounts to 7,000, but we found out last week in my office, because I was curious about that number, that the Pentagon has sent home over 15,800. These are young people coming back to the United States whose lives are changed forever, many of them amputees. Many of them lost their eyesight, many of them again changed and future gone, coming back to an America where the Veterans Administration has been so decimated by the Bush administration that they will have to wait 6 or 8 months even to see a doctor at the VA.

The resources, the health care that they need, that they counted on and that we made a contract with them is not there. What a sad commentary on this country, with its wealth and its riches and where people go on living their lives, that we would allow our young people and a large part of our future to be maimed and to be killed for a war with no end.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5006, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 754 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 754

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. 5006) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes. 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 Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be

considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except: sections 219(b), 221, and 506. Where points of order are waived against part of a section, points of order against a provision in another part of such section may be made only against such provision and not against the entire section. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. 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. TERRY). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. 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. Speaker, House Resolution 754 is an open rule which provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Wisconsin on H.R. 5006, the fiscal year 2005 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies appropriations bill.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and against provisions in the bill except as specified in this resolution.

After general debate, any Member wishing to offer an amendment may do so as long as it complies with the regular rules of the House.

The bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph, and the rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Finally, the rule permits the minority to offer a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a funding package that fulfills our promises to hard-working Americans and their families. Before I summarize the main components of this package, it is worth taking a big-picture view of the context in which we consider this incredibly important legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in this Chamber and all Americans listening to this debate today need no reminder that the world has changed dramatically since the terrorist attacks on our Nation. While we hang our flags a little higher and wear our stars and stripes a little more often these days, we do so in part as a response to the tragedy that took place on our soil on September 11.

The war against terror has brought us many new challenges; namely, how best to protect our homeland and keep it safe from future acts of terrorism. That is not an easy job. Yet each day that goes by without an act of terror in America's neighborhoods offers us reassurance that we are doing what is necessary to protect our Nation from harm, and each day monumental steps are being taken an ocean away in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere to nab terrorist cells and offer citizens of these nations new opportunities to live their lives free of fear and full of promise.

Mr. Speaker, as I see it, we cannot have a discussion about domestic priorities without taking a look at the bigger picture, without recognizing up front that we do, in fact, live in a different world today, and that we have sizable commitments to fulfill that we did not have a few years ago.

Like so many of my colleagues, I hear quite a bit from my constituents back home about the need to balance spending priorities. In fact, many of the candidate surveys I filled out this year for reelection specifically asked, ''If elected, how do you intend to balance domestic priorities with fighting the war on terror and protecting the homeland?'' In 100 words or less, I might add. Now, that is a tall order.

But really, that is a very fair question and one that we in Congress, especially Members who sit on our Committee on Appropriations, must take very seriously.

So my purpose here today is to assure the American people that while we have incredible demands, expectations and commitments to fulfill as we continue to fight the war on terror and protect our homeland, we remain equally determined to fund critical initiatives here in the United States in a fiscally responsible manner.

Today I am privileged to be the first to give my colleagues the lay of the land as to how this Congress intends to fulfill its promises to Americans across the country in the areas of education, health and labor.

I am proud to report that the gentleman from Florida, the gentleman from Ohio and their colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations have produced a funding plan that reflects our priorities, meets our goals, and, most importantly, places the greatest amount of funding in the areas where we need it most.

Since the beginning of the 108th Congress, we have made tremendous progress in strengthening our Nation's education system. This House has moved forward measures to ensure our schools have the tools they need to meet President Bush's call for high standards and accountability, and while making remarkable progress, our work is not yet done.

The legislation before us today recognizes the important role education programs play in the lives of children with special needs by funding special education grants at the highest level in history, at over $11 billion. My friends watching in my home State of Ohio will be pleased to know that since fiscal year 2003, money directed to our State for special education programs has increased by 25 percent.

This legislation also recognizes the critical role that teachers play in the education of our Nation's students. We all remember those teachers who inspired us to learn and to succeed. We want to give every teacher tools to inspire their students. That is why this bill provides nearly $3 billion for grants to States to administer professional development programs for their teachers.

Of course, educating our Nation's children is a shared responsibility, at a Federal, State and a local level.

□ 1045

And I think my colleagues would agree with me that the Federal Government is fulfilling its role in dedicating funds to strengthen our Nation's education system.

When we talk about education, often our first thoughts are about the millions of American children who deserve to have good teachers, small classrooms, up-to-date textbooks, and a safe environment in which to learn. And while we can give our children the best of each of those things, if the child does not have his health, these things mean nothing. Same goes for adults who go to work every day to provide for their families. Without their health, productivity decreases, paychecks stop coming, and families struggle.

Good health is really the backbone to living a quality life. The Federal Government, through partnerships with State, local, and private entities, have made significant investments in medical research and health programs for years now. A few years ago, Congress fulfilled its commitment to doubling the budget of the National Institutes of Health, the medical research arm of the Federal Government. This truly was a remarkable goal and an even more remarkable achievement to meet such a goal. Since then, Congress has not rested on its laurels. We continue to provide significant increases in funding for NIH, as indicated by the $700 million increase in funds over last year's level. This brings NIH funding to a record high of $28.5 billion.

We all know that investments in research yield new treatments, but those treatments are only meaningful if they are accessible to those who need them. The legislation before us today recognizes the unique role that community health centers play in neighborhoods across America. These centers help ensure that the neediest in our communities have access to health care services.

President Bush and this Congress are committed to increasing Federal support for community health centers.

This bill expands the President's Community Health Center initiative to increase the role of community health centers in our neighborhoods by funding the program at $1.8 billion, an increase of $200 million over last year.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take a moment to highlight one other critical health-related program included in this package. That is the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education program. This program, funded at $303 million, helps our Nation's children's hospitals train future pediatricians. It is a wonderful program that has been increased significantly in funding based on annual evaluations since its very inception. I want to give a special thanks to both the chairman and the ranking member for supporting this critical program again this year.

Last but not least, this legislation makes clear Congress' support for job training programs and assistance for dislocated workers. The worker-training portion of the bill restores funding for core job training to over $1.5 billion and provides another $1.5 billion to assist displaced workers. Mr. Speaker, the best part of this package is that it recognizes that we have limited resources to spend, yet still meets America's needs with those resources. It demonstrates that funding America's priorities can be both generous and responsible.

Before closing, I would like to once again express my appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for their tremendous leadership as they have worked tirelessly this year to assure that Congress spends generously but wisely. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and approve the underlying bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio 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, appropriation bills are the truest expression of Congress' priorities. All year long we may claim to support after-school programs and child care assistance or provide expanded job-search assistance to the 1.2 million unemployed Americans. All year long we may have expressed opposition to the new Labor Department overtime rules. Today is the day we match the deeds to words.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, H.R. 5006, the fiscal year 2005 Appropriations Act for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, shortchanges a wide range of programs important to the people we serve.

Now, why are these programs being shortchanged? To meet our homeland security or our defense needs? To pay down our historic $422 billion deficit? No. Programs are being shortchanged to pay for tax cuts that the Congressional Budget Office found go disproportionately to the wealthiest Americans.

Schools are shortchanged under H.R. 5006. And those who supported the No Child Left Behind Act should have a problem with the fact that this measure shortchanges our schools to the tune of $9.5 billion.

The promises made when No Child Left Behind was signed into law over 2½ years ago may be a faint memory to those who supported the bill, but let me assure you that school superintendents, principals, teachers, and parents have not forgotten.

While I was pleased to see the bill raises funding levels for special education and title I funding by $1 billion each, this is a far cry from what has been promised.

The elimination of 22 education programs under H.R. 5006 warrants attention. Among them are the Dropout Prevention Program, Teaching American History grants, Foreign Language assistance, and the Arts in Education program, which encourages the integration of arts into classroom instruction.

There is a human toll to cutting these programs. A 60 percent cut to the Perkins loan program will result in 53,000 students losing college assistance. A freeze in the level of Federal support for after-school programs may force communities to close their centers. In my district, this year, the Rochester school board had to make the painful decision to cut their budget by over $7 million. The children in Rochester did not have the option this summer to take summer school, and now their after-school programs are in jeopardy.

Turning to the Health and Human Services section of the bill, I am troubled by cuts to public health and our critical health care safety net programs. The bill terminates the Healthy Communities Access program, which is a vital grant program supporting local efforts that take care of the health of the uninsured. It is wrong to eliminate this important program, especially given the fact that, according to the new census figures, the number of uninsured Americans has swelled to 45 million.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for the RECORD a report issued by the U.S. Census Bureau which provides further details regarding this issue:

Estimates derived from SIPP data answer such questions as: What percentage of households move up or down the income distribution over times? How many people remain in poverty over time? How long do people without health insurance tend to remain uninsured?

INCOME IN THE UNITED STATES

HIGHLIGHTS

Real median household money income remained unchanged between 2002 and 2003 at a level of $43,318, following two consecutive years of decline. Median income remained unchanged for all types of family and non-family households (such as married-couple household and single individuals) between 2002 and 2003.

Real median household income remained unchanged for non-Hispanic White, Black, and Asian households between 2002 and 2003. Households with Hispanic householders (who can be of any race) experienced a real decline in median income of 2.6 percent between 2002 and 2003.

The most commonly used measure of household income inequality, the Gini index, did not change between 2002 and 2003. The share of aggregate income received by the lowest quintile declined from 3.5 percent to 3.4 percent, as did the real income level delineating the 20th percentile of household income, from $18,326 to $17,984 (a 1.9 percent decline in real terms). The 80th percentile of household income increased 1.1 percent, from $85,941 to $86,867 in real terms.

The real median earnings of men who worked full-time, year-round remained unchanged between 2002 and 2003 at $40,668. The real median earnings of the comparable group of women declined by 0.6 percent to $30,724. Reflecting the fall in the earnings of women, the female-to-male earnings ratio declined from 0.77 to 0.76 between 2002 and 2003. The last time the female-to-male earnings ratio experienced an annual decline was between 1998 and 1999.

Compared with 1967, the first year for which household income statistics are available, real median household income is up 30 percent. Over this period, median income tended to rise and fall along with the business cycle. median income peaked in 1999, was unchanged in 2000, declined over the next 2 years (by a cumulative 3.3 percent), and was unchanged in 2003.

RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN

Real median household income remained unchanged for most race groups between 2002 and 2003. For example, the median incomes of non-Hispanic White households, Black households, and Asian households remained unchanged. Hispanic households experienced a decline in median income of 2.6 percent.

Black households had the lowest median income. Their 2003 median money income was about $30,000, which was 62 percent of the median for non-Hispanic White households (about $48,000).

Median money income for Hispanic households was about $33,000 in 2003, which was 69 percent of the median for non-Hispanic White households.

Asian households had the highest median income among the race groups. Their 2003 median money income was about $55,000. 117 percent of the median for non-Hispanic White households.

AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE POPULATION

Because of the relatively small population of this racial group, the sampling variability of their income data is larger than for the other racial groups and may cause single-year estimates to fluctuate more widely. To reduce the chances of misinterpreting changes in income or comparisons of income with other groups, the Census Bureau uses 2-year-average medians for measuring changes in the income of American Indians and Alaska Natives over time, and 3-year-average medians when comparing the income of this group with other racial groups.

The 3-year-average (2001–2003) median income for American Indian and Alaska Native households was higher than the median for Black households; not different from the median for Hispanic households; and lower than the medians for non-Hispanic White households and Asian households.

Comparison of 2-year moving averages (2001–2002 and 2002–2003) shows that the median income for American Indian and Alaska

Native households who chose that race alone or in combination with another increased by 4.0 percent over that period for single-race American Indian and Alaska Native households, median income remained statistically unchanged.

NATIVITY

Native households had a real median income in 2003 ($44,347) that was not different from that in 2002. Foreign-born households experienced a real decline of 3.5 percent to $37,499. Households maintained by a foreign-born house-holder who was not a citizen of the United States experienced their third consecutive annual decline in real median household income, down 5.6 percent from 2002 to $32,806. The real median income of households maintained by a foreign-born householder who was a naturalized citizen remained unchanged at $46,049.

Median income was $44,347 for native households, 18 percent higher than the median for all foreign-born households ($37,499), and 35 percent higher than for noncitizen foreign-born households ($32,806).

REGION

Real median money income of house-holds did not change between 2002 and 2003 in three of the four regions, while income in the South declined 1.5 percent to $39,823. the South had the lowest income of any region. In 2003, the median income of households in the Northeast was $46,742; in the Midwest, it was $44,73; and in the West, it was $46,820.

RESIDENCE

Real median income remained unchanged between 2002 and 2003 for households inside metropolitan areas overall and outside metropolitan areas, while the real median income of households in central cities of metropolitan areas declined by 1.4 percent of $37,174. This is the third consecutive year that households in central cities of metropolitan area experienced a decline.

INCOME INEQUALITY

The Gini index indicated no change in household income inequality between 2002 and 2003. The 2003 Gini index (0.464) was higher than in 1995 although the individual annual changes in that period were not statistically significant.

Between 2002 and 2003, the real income of the household at the 20th income percentile (that is, the income percentile (that is, the income delineating the lowest 20 percent of households) declined 1.9 percent from $18,326 to $17,984, and the income of the household at the 80th income percentile increased 1.1 percent from $85,941 to $86,867 (the income levels denoting the 40th and 60th percentiles did not change). In addition, the share of aggregate income received by the lowest household income quintile declined from 3.5 percent to 3.4 percent. The shares of all other quintiles were unchanged—in 2003, the second quintile received 8.7 percent, the third quintile 14.8 percent, the fourth quintile 23.4 percent, and the fifth quintile 49.8 percent.

WORK EXPERIENCE AND EARNINGS

Of the 80.6 million men aged 15 and over who worked in 2003, 73.0 percent worked full-time, year-round, unchanged from 2002. Of the 71.4 million women in the same age group who worked in 2003, 58.7 percent worked full-time, year-round, also unchanged from 2002.

The real median earnings of men who worked full-time, year-round in 2003 ($40,668) did not change from 2002, while those of their female counter-parts declined by 0.6 percent, to $30,724. The decline in women's real earnings between 2002 and 2003 was the first since 1995. Reflecting the decline in the real earnings of women, the female-to-male earnings ratio for full-time, year-round workers fell from 0.77 to 0.76 between 2002 and 2003. The last time the female-to-mail earnings ratio experienced an annual decline was between 1998 and 1999.

HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE IN THE UNITED STATES

HIGHLIGHTS

The number of people with health insurance coverage increased by 1.0 million in 2003, to 243.3 million (84.4 percent of the population).

An estimated 15.6 percent of the population or 45.0 million people, were without health insurance coverage in 2003, up from 15.2 percent and 43.6 million people in 2002.

The percentage and number of people covered by employment-based health insurance fell between 2002 and 2003, from 61.3 percent and 175.3 million to 60.4 percent and 174.0 million.

The percentage and number of people covered by government health insurance programs increased between 2002 and 2003, from 25.7 percent and 73.6 million to 26.6 percent and 76.8 million, driven by increases in the percentage and number of people covered by Medicaid (from 11.6 percent and 33.2 million to 12.4 percent and 35.6 million) and Medicare (from 13.4 percent and 38.4 million to 13.7 percent and 39.5 million).

The proportion of children who were without health insurance did not change, remaining at 11.4 percent of all children, or 8.4 million, in 2003. With an uninsured rate at 19.2 percent, children in poverty were more likely to be uninsured than all children.

The uninsured rate and number of uninsured increased from 2002 to 2003 for non-Hispanic Whites (from 10.7 percent and 20.8 million to 11.1 percent and 21.6 million), but not for Blacks or Asians. Although the number of uninsured increased for Hispanics (from 12.8 million to 13.2 million), their uninsured rate was unchanged at 32.7 percent.

The historical record is marked by a 12-year period from 1987 to 1998 when the uninsured rate (12.9 percent in 1987) either increased or was unchanged from on year to the next. After peaking at 16.3 percent in 1998, the rate fell for two years in a row to 14.2 percent in 2000, before the latest period of annual increases to 15.6 percent in 2003.

TYPE OF COVERAGE

Most people (60.4 percent) were covered by a health insurance plan related to employment for some or all of 2003, but the proportion declined from the previous year. This decline essentially explains the fall in total private health insurance coverage, from 69.6 percent in 2002 to 68.6 percent in 2003.

The percentage of people covered by health insurance provided by the government increased between 2002 and 2003. Medicaid coverage rose by 0.7 percentage points to 12.4 percent in 2003. Medicare coverage also rose in 2003, by 0.2 percentage points to 13.7 percent. Among the entire population, 26.6 percent had government insurance, including Medicare, Medicaid, and military health care (3.5 percent).

RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN

In 2003, the uninsured rate for Blacks was unchanged at about 19.5 percent, and the rate for Asians unchanged at about 18.7 percent. The uninsured rate rose for non-Hispanic Whites—from 10.7 percent to 11.1 percent. Among Hispanics, the uninsured rate was unchanged at 32.7 percent, whereas the number of Hispanics without coverage increased from 12.8 million to 13.2 million in 2003.

The 3-year averages of the uninsured rates by race and Hispanic origin (2001–2003) show that people who reported American Indian and Alaska Native had an uninsured rate that was lower than the uninsured rate for Hispanics (32.8 percent) but higher than those of the other race groups. Comparison of 2-year moving averages (2001–2002 and 2002–2003) shows that the uninsured rate for American Indians and Alaska Natives did not change.

NATIVITY

The uninsured rate increased in 2003, from 12.8 percent to 13.0 percent for the native population, and from 33.4 percent to 34.5 percent for the foreign-born population. Among the foreign born, the uninsured rate for noncitizens also increased, from 43.3 percent to 45.3 percent, while the uninsured rate for naturalized citizens was unchanged at 17.1 percent. The proportion of the foreign-born population without health insurance (34.5 percent) was about two and a half times that of the native population (13.0 percent) in 2003. Among the foreign born, noncitizens were more likely than naturalized citizens to lack coverage—45.3 percent compared with 17.1 percent.

ECONOMIC STATUS

The likelihood of being covered by health insurance rises with income. Among people in households with annual incomes of less than $25,000 in 2003, 75.8 percent had health insurance; the level increased with income up to 91.8 percent for those with incomes of $75,000 or more. Compared with 2002, the coverage rate was unchanged for those with household incomes more than $75,000, whereas rates fell for those in each lower category of household income.

Of those 18 to 64 years old in 2003, full-time workers were more likely to be covered by health insurance (82.5 percent) than part-time workers (76.2 percent) or nonworkers (74.0 percent). The uninsured rate for those working full-time increased from 16.8 percent in 2002 to 17.5 percent in 2003. The comparable rates for those working part-time or not working did not change.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE

The percentage and number of children (people under 18 years old) without health insurance did not change between 2002 and 2003, at 11.4 percent and 8.4 million, respectively. The likelihood of health insurance coverage varied among children by poverty status, age, race, and Hispanic origin. Children in poverty were more likely to be uninsured than the population of all children in 2003—19.2 percent compared with 11.4 percent.

Children 12 to 17 years old were more likely to be uninsured than those under 12—12.7 percent compared with 10.6 percent. While 21.0 percent of Hispanic children did not have any health insurance in 2003, the comparable rates among children for whom a single race was reported were 7.4 percent for non-Hispanic White children, 14.5 percent for Black children, and 12.4 percent for Asian children.

REGION

The South was the only region to show an increase in the percentage of people without health insurance in 2003, up from 17.5 percent in 2002 to 18.0 percent. The uninsured rates for other regions did not change in 2003—12.9 percent for the Northeast, 12.0 percent for the Midwest, and 17.6 percent for the West.

RESIDENCE

The uninsured rates increased between 2002 and 2003 inside metropolitan areas overall (from 15.3 percent to 15.6 percent) and for people living in the suburbs (from 13.1 percent to 13.5 percent), while the uninsured rates for people in central cities of metropolitan areas (19.5 percent) and outside metropolitan areas (15.5 percent) did not change in 2003.

Mr. Speaker, it is also wrong to freeze funding for Title X Family Planning services or for prenatal care for mothers and medical treatment for uninsured children, which this bill does.

Most importantly, this bill does nothing to address the recently announced, just last week, over the holiday, the 17 percent hike to Medicare premiums, which is the largest premium increase in the 40-year history of Medicare. For seniors living on fixed incomes, there is no room in their budgets to pay another $11.60 for doctors' visits per month.

At a time when seniors in Medicare are preoccupied with questions of the prescription drug law, the news of a premium increase only compounds their concern and frustration with the Medicare program. Medicare is not being reformed; it is being eviscerated.

Another troubling aspect of the bill is the inclusion of a provision offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) that could have a devastating effect on women's ability to receive the full range of reproductive health services, including abortion care and even simple information about their medical options. Talk about unconstitutional.

Under the Weldon amendment, health care companies are granted the right to exempt themselves from any Federal, State, or local law that assures women have access to abortion services and information. This is another gag rule. This sweeping ''refusal'' policy, otherwise known as a ''backdoor gag rule on doctors,'' is not restricted to just the actual abortion services, but also would allow companies not to pay for abortions, or even referrals for patients to see another doctor.

Once again, we are asking professionals not to be able to give to their patients the information they deserve and they need. It not only undermines the rights of women but also bestows power on insurance companies to choose whether or not to comply with the law. This is a precedent that should worry all of us and one that we have seen before that has been struck down. I know that this provision will be struck in conference and, if not, certainly in the courts.

It also says that should that information be given, the community can lose all of its Federal money. I do not know exactly how extensive that is. Does that mean all Medicare, Medicaid, nutrition money, highway money, school money, everything else that comes in from the Federal Government to the community will be cut off because a woman has been told her rights? Surely nobody in this House would want that.

Now, let me address some unfinished business from last year's appropriation debate: unemployment and overtime. This is really a tragedy, Mr. Speaker, for the millions of unemployed who are losing their homes, their cars, and are unable to keep their children in college. Millions of unemployed Americans today lost their jobs because of trade policies or outsourcing or the stalled economy, and they have not found replacement jobs. They have had to survive without the unemployment assistance for a year, something this country has never done before.

The news that 144,000 jobs were created in August was no solace, since our economy is still 1.2 million jobs short of where it was in 2000. At this rate, the current administration will be the first in our history to see fewer non-farm jobs created at the end of 4 years.

A 10 percent cut to farm offices is certainly not helpful. And funding Job Corps at a paltry $1.5 billion and providing only $25 million for community college training initiatives are also troubling decisions.

In addition to training, today's unemployed, over a fifth of whom are the long-term unemployed, need Congress to extend the unemployment insurance. I have constituents, as do all of my colleagues, who have exhausted all their regular and extended unemployment and still have not been able to secure a job. Unemployment insurance, which expired last November, must be extended and more needs to be done for America's dislocated workers.

Finally, I want to turn to a subject of keen interest to working Americans, access to overtime compensation. This week, for the 122nd year, Americans came together to commemorate Labor Day, a day when we celebrate the contributions that workers have made to the strength and the prosperity of our country. Alas, this year there is no cause for celebration for America's workers.

Today, they are simply struggling to support their families on wages that have not kept pace with inflation. They strain to cover exploding health care premiums, and they try to avoid joining the ranks of the 1.4 million workers who lost coverage last year alone. And they worry that their jobs are the next to be shipped off to Mexico or China. Now, with the enactment of the Labor Department's new overtime rules, they have a whole new source of stress. Today, they worry they are among the 6 million workers who stand to lose access to overtime pay under the new rules.

My colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), will offer an amendment to block enforcement of the final overtime rule with one exception. It would allow an increase to the salary threshold for low-wage workers from $8,060 to $23,600. Last year, this body approved, by a vote of 221 to 203, a similar measure that would have stopped the Department of Labor from rolling back the 40-hour workweek. As we all know, at the insistence of this administration, that provision was stripped out from the final fiscal year 2004 omnibus appropriations bill, even though it had passed both Houses.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of people who are losing their overtime work, which include firefighters, police sergeants, nurses, licensed practical nurses, nursery school teachers, oil and gas pipeline workers, steel workers, teachers, and on and on.

THE REPUBLICAN-LED SENATE VOTED 99:0 TO PROTECT OVERTIME RIGHTS FOR WORKERS IN 55 JOB CATEGORIES BECAUSE THEY HAD NO CONFIDENCE IN THE ADMINISTRATION'S CLAIMS

Any work paid on an hourly basis
Blue collar workers
Any work provided overtime under a collective bargaining agreement
Team Leaders
Computer programmers
Registered Nurses
Licensed practical nurses
Nurse midwives
Nursery school teachers
Oil and gas pipeline workers
Oil and gas platform workers
Refinery workers
Steel workers
Shipyard and ship scrapping workers
Teachers
Technicians
Journalists
Chefs
Cooks
Police Officers
Firefighters
Fire sergeants
Police sergeants
Emergency medical technicians
Paramedics
Waste disposal workers
Day care workers
Maintenance employees
Production line employees
Construction employees
Carpenters
Mechanics
Plumbers
Iron Workers
Craftsmen
Operating engineers
Laborers
Painters
Cements masons
Stone and brick masons
Sheet metal workers
Utility workers
Longshoremen
Stationary engineers
Welders
Boilermakers
Funeral directors
Athletic trainers
Outside sales employees
Inside sales employees
Grocery store managers
Financial services industry workers
Route drivers
Assistant retails managers

Mr. Speaker, we do not do enough in this bill, and we really must.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule. There is a campaign of disinformation that is being waged against the overtime pay reforms put in place by the Department of Labor late last month, and I would like to speak to that.

The administration has guaranteed overtime protection for 6.7 million working Americans, and it is a reform that was needed and it was overdue. We have not seen millions of workers lose their overtime pay. In fact, we have watched as 1.3 million additional Americans have gained their right to claim overtime pay.

The previous system was outdated, it was unfair, and the Bush administration deserves credit for reforming the system, even though they knew the political interests aligned against the President would try to frame it as a negative.

The old status quo was a 54-year-old regulation. That is what the critics are claiming was fair. Under that regulation, someone earning as little as $8,060 would be classified as a white collar employee and prevented, prevented, from receiving overtime pay. No more, Mr. Speaker. This new policy is worker-friendly, it is fair, and I support the rule.

□ 1100

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago we heard one of the speakers on the majority side of the aisle talk about this bill in terms of being a bill which meets our promises. I am not quite sure what bill she was referring to, but it certainly could not have been this one because this bill is a monument to broken promises and is an embarrassment to the institution, in my view, if this institution pretends that it cares about making the long-term investments in our economy and in our kids that are necessary.

If you take a look at what this bill does not produce, this bill falls $9.5 billion below the promises in the No Child Left Behind Act of just 3 years ago for Title I alone, which is the major program by which we attack poor education systems for disadvantaged children. For Title I alone, this bill is $7 billion short of the promises laid out in the No Child Left Behind Act.

Special education: Both political parties posed for political holy pictures in terms of how much we are going to try to do for handicapped children, and yet this bill provides $2.5 billion less than the Republicans promised in their own budget of just 1 year ago.

Then if we look at Pell grants, I was so flabbergasted, I practically fell onto the floor when I saw the President of the United States speak to the Republican convention and talk about his determination to increase Pell grants, when, in fact, the majority has frozen Pell grants for 2 years in a row, and this bill is part of that freezing process. So Pell grants have been frozen while tuition has gone up at the average 4-year university by almost 17 percent in that same time period.

In the Department of Labor, we have almost a million and a half fewer private sector jobs than we had 4 years ago, and yet this legislation cuts help for people making a job search through State agencies by 10 percent.

The Community Access Program, which attempts to provide access to decent health care for poor people, is eliminated. The After School Center Program, which is an effort to see to it that kids do not go home to an empty nest after they finish the school day and can still receive some meaningful instruction, that program is frozen. NIH, National Institutes of Health, which do the basic research on all disease: smallest increase in 19 years. Now these cuts are not necessitated, as was indicated on the majority side, because we are at war; these cuts are necessitated because the majority has decided that their top priority is to provide people who make a million dollars a year with a $127,000 tax cut next year. That is why these squeezes are made necessary.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the House to vote against the previous question on the rule so that we can offer an amendment that would shave those tax cuts for millionaires from $127,000 to a mere $89,000. I do not know how they will be able to get along with a mere $89,000 tax cut, the poor devils, but they are just going to have to do it. We are going to try to shave that tax cut for the most well-off people in this society so we can continue to meet our obligation to the least well-off people in our society.

What is at stake, in my view, is whether or not this Congress is willing to slowly shred the safety net for the middle class, or whether we are going to continue to build that safety net. I want to be able to offer an amendment which will restore $5.5 billion more to education, which will invest $200 million more in workforce training, invest an additional $1.6 billion to provide more assistance to the 45 million people without health care, and make a series of other adjustments that will make this a far more progressive and humane bill. The only way we can do that is if we defeat the motion on the previous question on the rule. I would urge the House to do just that when the opportunity comes in just a few moments.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the dean of the delegation from the great State of Ohio and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I want to highlight some of the positive things about this bill.

This bill distributes over $142.5 billion, and it does things for people. It is aimed at helping people, and I think we can be proud as a Congress for what we are doing here. It funds over 500 discretionary programs, and every one of those programs is important to people in this Nation. But, importantly, also, it stays within the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation and the constraints that were established in the budget resolution. It would be easy to go over because these programs are something that are very sensitive, but I think we have tried very hard, and we had a bipartisan effort in the subcommittee, to meet the needs and aspirations without exceeding the budget.

We did this with a lot of hearings, 23 days of hearings. We heard from 33 different agencies, and we had over 100 public witnesses. One of the things that we have done in our subcommittee is give the public an opportunity to be heard on how these programs affect them and what is important to them.

The bill only goes up a little over 2 percent above last year's level, and obviously we had to make some very tough priority choices in order to stay within the constraints of the budget resolution which gave us a little bit over 2 percent.

A policy decision we made was to focus on education, and we put $342 million more into education programs than was requested in the President's budget. The bill reflects the priorities of Members of the House. For example, the original budget proposed to cut vocational education State grants by $200 million. We not only restored the $200 million, but added $20 million above last year because we recognized that vocational education is extremely important as people need to have training and retraining. We think of vocational education as only at the high school level, but we have a lot of adult education programs that give individuals an opportunity to get skills for new job opportunities that come their way.

We increase the funding for student aid in higher education in certain areas not requested by the administration, and we restored other programs that were proposed for termination. I think overall the bill reflects the priorities of the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle in the field of education. Obviously, it would be nice to have a lot more, but we have to work within the constraints of the budget.

An area of great interest to our Members is special education, IDEA, and we added a billion dollars to this program above last year that brings the total to over $11 billion. In Title I, we added a billion dollars over last year for a total of $13.3 billion. In addition to aid to education, this bill expands funding for training and adjustment services for workers that are dislocated due to plant closures and mass layoffs. It reflects the fact that we have somewhat of a changing mix of the employment opportunities in our society.

This bill also provides $50 million for the President's new Community College/Community-Based Job Training Initiative. These types of institutions, because they are sort of a hands-on opportunity, have provided a lot of great help to people. I know in my own district we have a vocational or trade school that is post-high school 2 years. It offers skills in about 45 different curricula offerings, and enrollments just leaped to a very high level, and the important thing is that they have an excellent record in placing their graduates, their 2-year graduates, in jobs. So we want to support that type of thing in this bill.

Another area that is of interest to people are the community health centers, because it keeps people out of

emergency rooms that really need that access. It provides medical help to the people that are without means. I think expansion of the community health center service is very important. We support the proposal of the President in his budget.

Through NIH, we support medical research. This is an agency that gives hope to people, hope that there will be a cure. I think the measure of the success is testimony by Dr. Zerhouni that every 5 years life expectancy goes up a year in the United States. That is a tremendous record. We try to continue the support. We have more than doubled NIH in the last 5 years, and we added $700 million to this year's bill.

Also we recognize that preparedness is very important in today's world of terrorism and uncertainty, so we have given the Federal, State and local public health officials the ability to respond to terrorism, to meet whatever emergencies arise in the public health system. One of the things that has been our goal is to make the whole public health system seamless, starting with the Centers for Disease Control and with the State public health and the local public health, so the ability to communicate when there is an emergency is done almost instantly. Secretary Thompson has given great leadership, I think, in focusing an information center in HHS that allows a quick response whenever there is a critical problem. Because of the importance of all this, we added $188 million above the 2004 level.

We added $398 million to the Centers for Disease Control. Because we have a freer flow of people around the world: SARS, the West Nile virus, hepatitis, influenza, and other emerging global disease threats. And the watchdog, the protection for all of us, is done effectively by the Centers for Disease Control. They are on the cutting edge. Recognizing that, we put an increase in $29 million over 2004 to deal with some of these threats to all of us.

I could say a lot more about the bill and will in the general debate, but I think overall the bill, given the constraints that we had in terms of the allocation, we have done a fair job. I think fair in the sense that it reflects not a partisan outlook, but reflects the feeling of the members of the subcommittee and the full committee and the Members of this House, many of whom testified on various things. We tried to make a balanced bill that would give the best possible service to the American people in terms of their education, in terms of their health, job retraining, and basically I suppose one could describe this bill as the epitome of hope. It gives hope that there will be cures found by NIH, hope that people will get new skills so they can be reemployed, and hope that their children will have better education opportunities than they have, and we have tried to respond to that desire on the part of the American people.

I urge Members to support this rule and to support the bill when we get to it. I think it is a fair and balanced approach to the challenges that confronted our subcommittee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

□ 1115

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I thank the chairman and ranking member of this committee for the work that they have done, as well as the full committee, because I know that they have worked, as we would say, against all odds. But I think when we come to the floor of the House, it is appropriate to tell the truth and to really acknowledge why this bill does not deserve in its present form the support of those of us who believe in comprehensive health care and recognizing the valiant work of Americans who work every day to make the engine of this country run.

First of all, this bill suffers because this administration and this Congress have made a decision that those who make a million dollars, those who make millions of dollars a year, are far more important with giving them, the 1 percent richest of America, the biggest tax cut that they will ever have. In fact, part of the reason why we are suffering in this legislation is because there is this idea that we should make these tax cuts permanent, permanent in the light of soaring costs in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, young men and women losing their lives and not having the resources that they need in health care and jobs when they come home, those who do come home, and then those families whose young ones have lost their lives not having the resources in order to survive.

This is a bill that suffers a lot. First of all, it immediately squeezes the middle class. How does it do that? By eliminating for the first time in history the rights to overtime. Overtime has been somewhat of a sacred understanding that when you go the extra mile, you are paid in many instances. This bill does not affirm that because, of course, it affirms the Labor Department's regulations. I hope that we all will support the Obey-Miller amendment in order to restore the rights of overtime.

This bill does not affirm what we call access to health care by minorities. Hispanic males and African American females were in the highest obesity at-risk groups when data was evaluated by race and gender. African American men are at least 50 percent more likely to develop lung cancer than white men. African American men are twice as likely to be diagnosed for prostate cancer as white men. We have a problem in the lack of access to health care and disparity in health care. None of the resources in this bill focus particularly on that concern. In fact, the Centers for Disease Control loses money.

Job-training programs lose money. But more importantly, the whole idea of promoting good health care for the uninsured loses its momentum in this legislation. For example, the NIH gets its smallest increase over the years. The NIH is involved in research that helps improve health conditions. And, of course, we have a problem with respect to community health centers in promoting more of those in our community. Access to health care is a key to good health care, particularly for those who are uninsured.

I will offer two amendments that deal with the inequities in health care in particular, adding dollars to lupus research and also adding dollars for research in hepatitis C, which impacts minorities and veterans to a high degree.

I would say that this legislation is lacking in a lot of ways. It is lacking in its caring attitude. It is lacking in the recognition that there are great needs among populations that have been underserved. It is lacking in the fullest amount of funding to allow the utilization, to close the gap between health care. And, of course, it is lacking in the understanding of the 44 million that are uninsured. I would hope that we would come to grips with the fact that health care is very much a part of the American dream. It is a part of equality and justice. Until we have justice in health care, until we have justice in labor rights, our country is not meeting its promise.

I hope that my colleagues will vote enthusiastically for the Obey-Miller amendment to restore overtime rights, and I hope they will support my amendments on adding additional funds for lupus research and as well as adding additional funds to find the cure and do research in hepatitis C.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), a champion and leader in the area of education.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the underlying legislation and the rule which is before us because it includes many things which I support, community health centers, the Ryan White AIDS program, and programs and activities at the CDC and the NIH, but mostly because the bill reflects our priority for the schools and students across the country. In the past 9 years, this Congress has provided record increases to our Nation's education programs, more than doubling discretionary spending to the U.S. Department of Education. As we all know, in recent years these increases have been coupled with widespread reforms that will ensure that every child in the classroom is learning.

In January of 2001, the No Child Left Behind Act was signed into law, and we are now beginning to see the benefits of these bold policies. In the past couple of months, many States have reported

the number of schools in need of improvement is actually decreasing. In fact, in my home State of Delaware, 128 of our 173 schools have met adequate yearly progress, up from 75 in the last school year. This is remarkable news, and educators across the country are to be commended for their dedication to meeting the rigors of No Child Left Behind.

No Child Left Behind provides the road map for reform, and our past appropriations acts have given the funding to help make it possible. Title I alone has increased over $3 billion in the past 3 years and programs encompassed by the No Child Left Behind Act have nearly doubled over the same time period. Today's bill builds upon our impressive record by providing increases to IDEA, State assessments, teacher quality, Impact Aid and the Institution of Education Sciences, to name only a few.

As time progresses, the facts grow clearer that No Child Left Behind is the right thing for our students and that the Federal Government is providing the resources needed. There is no evidence to show that the law is an unfunded mandate, and we should all stand proud on our record of supporting all education programs.

I would be remiss if I did not take time here today to discuss embryonic stem cell research as well. As many of my colleagues know, I have been leading the House effort with my colleague from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) to expand the current Federal policy in order to realize the true hope that science holds for millions of patients who suffer nationwide. We have organized letters, met with the Nation's premier scientists, visited the Harvard Stem Cell Institute and Children's Hospital in Boston where leading research is taking place, and have introduced bipartisan legislation that would expand the policy while remaining consistent with the President's ethical concerns.

Times have changed and science has moved forward from the President's thoughtful decision, and there are now over 150 new stem cell lines nationwide that have been derived with improved technology and are genetically diverse. We must reevaluate this policy. Unfortunately, now is not the time to do so. This issue must be decided on science, not politics. We must have a thorough debate in the House and in the U.S. Senate on the state of the research and how to move the policy forward while ensuring that research is conducted ethically.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to press forward with this issue in the coming months. It is too important to ignore.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I want to call a vote for the previous question and urge a ''no'' vote.

If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will make in order an amendment that was submitted to the Rules Committee yesterday by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ranking Member OBEY) but, sadly, was rejected. The amendment would increase funding for a number of vital programs and services that are insufficiently funded in the bill.

The programs and services provided in H.R. 5006 touch the lives of almost every American. The bill funds activities ranging from education for preschoolers from low-income families, to college tuition assistance, and to home-delivered meals for the elderly. It also provides for job training, worker protection, and funding for medical research. But as critical as these programs are to our citizens, the leadership has drastically underfunded them. The Obey substitute will help restore funding to a number of the most important of these programs.

I want to point out that this amendment is fully paid for. It offsets the increased costs of the programs by slightly scaling back the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts for those with incomes above $1 million. Under this amendment, their average tax cut would go from $127,000 to $89,000, still a very substantial tax cut. I think most people making that kind of money are willing to accept this modest cut, especially since it will help improve the quality of life for so many less-privileged Americans and help America.

Mr. Speaker, all Members of this House need to be very concerned about the lack of adequate funding for the critical programs and services in this bill, whether it is health care, education, medical research, services for the elderly, low-income energy assistance. The list is long. The Obey amendment would help correct the funding deficiencies in the bill and would do so, as I said, with no additional cost to the deficit.

I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we can vote on the Obey amendment. A ''no'' vote will not stop the House from taking up the Labor-HHS bill. It will not affect the open-amending process provided for in the rule. But a ''yes'' vote will prevent the House from considering this important amendment.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Today we have a unique opportunity to tell the American people what their government is doing with their money. While this Congress remains fully committed to fighting the war on terror and protecting our homeland, we remain just as focused on meeting the needs of Americans here at home. That is what we are doing today.

This carefully crafted package reflects the Federal Government's commitment to ensuring that children with special needs and the teachers who inspire them to learn have the tools they need in school to succeed. This package also reflects the government's commitment to ensuring that critical agencies like the National Institutes of Health can conduct medical research to better treat illnesses and making certain that those treatments get into the hands of the Americans who need them. This package also reflects the government's commitment to seeing that men and women looking for new jobs receive the helping hand and training that they need to bring home a paycheck.

Mr. Speaker, the authors of this appropriations package, my good friend from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and his committee, were asked to do a very tough job this year, to balance spending priorities. Once again, they have met this challenge by producing a carefully crafted product that provides considerable increases for vital programs and services while preserving our commitment to spending taxpayers' dollars wisely.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H.RES. 754—RULE ON H.R. 5006 FISCAL YEAR 2005 LABOR/HHS/EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

''Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 3 shall be in order without intervention of any point of order and before any other amendment if offered by Representative OBEY of Wisconsin or a designee. The amendment is not subject to amendment except for pro forma amendments or to a demand for a division of the question in the committee of the whole or in the House.

Sec. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

In title I, under the heading ''Employment and Training Administration, Training and Employment Services'', after ''$2,649,728,000'' insert ''(increased by $125,858,000)'', after $1,642,442,000'' insert ''(increased by $125,858,000)'', and after ''$1,178,192,000'' insert ''(increased by $38,000,000)''.

In title I, under the heading ''State Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service Operations'', after each appearance of ''$141,934,000'' insert ''(decreased by $137,000)'', and after ''$3,440,914,000'' insert ''(increased by $87,995,000)''.

In title I, under the heading ''Departmental Management, Salaries and Expenses'', after ''$264,653,000'' insert ''(increased by $74,317,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''Health Resources and Services Administration, Health Resources and Services'', after ''$6,305,333,000'' insert ''(increased by $403,000,000)'', after ''$32,500,000'' insert ''(increased by $7,500,000)'', and after ''$278,283,000'' insert ''(increased by $17,000,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Disease

Control, Research, and Training'', after ''$4,228,778,000'' insert ''(increased by $100,000,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Cancer Institute'', after''$4,870,025,000'' insert ''(increased by $63,486,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Heart, and Blood Institute'', after ''$2,963,953,000'' insert ''(increased by $38,639,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research'', after ''$394,080,000'' insert ''(increased by $5,137,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases'', after ''$1,726,196,000'' insert ''(increased by $22,503,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke'', after ''$1,545,623,00 '' insert ''(increased by $20,149,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases'', after ''$4,440,007,000'' insert ''(increased by $54,622,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Institute of General Medical Sciences'', after ''$1,959,810,000'' insert ''(increased by $25,548,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Institute of Child Health and Humane Development'', after ''$1,280,915,000'' insert ''(increased by $16,698,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Eye Institute'', after ''$671,578,000'' insert ''(increased by $8,755,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences'', after ''$650,027,000'' insert ''(increased by $8,474,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Institute on Aging'', after ''$1,055,666,000'' insert ''(increased by $13,762,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases'', after ''$515,378,000'' insert ''(increased by $6,719,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Institute of Deafness and Other Communication Disorders'', after ''$393,507,000'' insert ''(increased by $5,130,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Institute of Nursing Research'', after ''$139,198,000'' insert ''(increased by $1,815,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism'', after ''$441,911,000'' insert ''(increased by $5,761,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Institute on Drug Abuse'', after ''$1,012,760,000'' insert ''(increased by $13,203,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Institute of Mental Health'', after ''$1,420,609,000'' insert ''(increased by $18,519,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Human Genome Research Institute'', after ''$492,670,000'' insert ''(increased by $6,423,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering'', after ''$297,647,000'' insert ''(increased by $3,880,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Center for Research Resources'', after ''$1,094,141,000'' insert ''(increased by $136,907,000, of which $122,644,000 shall be for extramural facilities construction grants)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine'', after ''$121,116,000'' insert ''(increased by $1,579,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Center on Minority Health Disparities'', after ''$196,780,000'' insert ''(increased by $2,565,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''John E. Fogarty International Center'', after ''$67,182,000'' insert ''(increased by $876,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''National Library of Medicine'', after ''$316,947,000'' insert ''(increased by $4,132,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''Office of the Director'', after ''$359,645,000'' insert ''(increased by $14,719,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services'', after ''$3,270,360,000'' insert ''(increased by $40,000,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''Low-Income Home Energy Assistance'', after ''$200,000,000'', after ''$1,900,000,000'' insert ''(increased by $200,000,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''Refugee and Entrant Assistance'', after ''$491,336,000'' insert ''(increased by $32,000,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''Payments to States for the Child Care and Development Block Grant'', after ''$2,099,729,000'' insert ''(increased by $100,000,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''Children and Families Services Programs'', after ''$8,985,663,000'' insert ''(increased by $110,000,000)'', after ''$6,898,580,000'' insert ''(increased by $80,000,000)'' and after ''$710,088,000'' insert ''(increased by $30,000,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''Administration on Aging, Aging Services Programs'', after ''$1,403,479,000'' insert ''(increased by $70,000,000)''.

In title II, in the first paragraph under the heading ''Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'', after ''$1,842,247,000'' insert ''(increased by $16,000,000)'', and after ''$1,187,760,000'' insert ''(increased by $16,000,000)''.

In title II, in the third paragraph under the heading ''Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'', after ''$60,000,000'' insert ''(increased by $40,000,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''Education for the Disadvantaged'', after ''$15,535,735,000'' insert ''(increased by $1,727,686,000)'', after ''$7,849,390,000'' insert ''(increased by $1,727,686,000)'' after ''$7,037,592,000'' insert ''(increased by $233,636,000)'', after each appearance of ''$2,469,843,000'' insert ''(increased by $633,182,000)'', and after ''$80,000,000'' insert ''(increased by $227,686,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''School Improvement Programs'', after ''$5,641,401,000'', and after ''$4,031,016,000'' insert ''(increased by $425,000,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''Special Education'', after ''$12,176,101,000'' insert ''(increased by $1,200,000,000)'', and after ''$6,560,447,000'' insert ''(increased by $1,200,000,000)''.

In title II, under the heading ''Student Financial Assistance'', after ''$14,755,794,000'' insert ''(increased by $2,200,000,000)'', and after ''$4,050'' insert ''(increased by $450)''.

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

Sec. . In the case of taxpayers with adjusted gross income in excess of $1,000,000, for the tax year beginning in 2005 the amount of tax reduction resulting from enactment of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 and the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 shall be reduced by 30 percent.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, 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 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of the adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 190, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

YEAS—209

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
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
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NAYS—190

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baca
Baird
Baldwin

Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Clyburn
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—34

Andrews
Ballenger
Bilirakis
Boehlert
Brady (TX)
Cannon
Chandler
Clay
Conyers
Culberson
Engel
Flake
Grijalva
Hobson
John
Jones (OH)
Kleczka
Kolbe
Lampson
Lewis (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McInnis
Mollohan
Nethercutt
Norwood
Owens
Payne
Putnam
Ryan (OH)
Schrock
Simmons
Tauzin
Udall (CO)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1152

Mr. DOOLEY of California and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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 resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5006, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 754 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5006.

□ 1152

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5006) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer today the fiscal year 2005 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and related agencies. By taking into consideration the priorities of the President and the Members, all the Members of this House, we have produced a bill that meets the needs of all Americans. This bill affects the lives, in one way or another, of every American.

We are appreciative of the efforts of the leaders of the House and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), to provide a workable allocation for this bill. I am pleased to say that this bill was unanimously approved on a bipartisan basis in both the subcommittee and the full committee. I would also like to acknowledge the hard work, dedication, and expertise of my subcommittee staff, as well as the minority staff, in putting together this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is about hope. It gives hope to every child seeking a good education, it gives hope to everyone searching for a good or better job than they have, and it gives hope to the ill seeking a cure.

This bill provides $142.5 billion—that is $500 for every person in the United States of America—a 2.2 percent increase over fiscal year 2004, for over 500 different discretionary programs. It is responsible, it is fair, and it is balanced.

Let me first talk about education. I would like to discuss what this bill provides for education. Education is essential to the preservation of democracy, and an investment in education is an investment in human capital and an investment in the future of this great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, Federal education spending has more than doubled since fiscal year 1996, from $23 billion to nearly $60 billion today. We have focused spending in this bill in the key areas that most directly improve our children's education.

First and foremost, I believe that no child will be left behind if he or she has a quality and dedicated teacher. Almost every teacher in our Nation's classrooms today is there for one reason: They love children and want to help them reach their full potential, and that should be their goal.

We applaud their hard work and dedication, and we support them in this bill by providing funding to encourage people to enter the field of teaching and to strengthen and maximize the skills of those already in the classroom.

I would urge young people that are thinking about a career to give consideration to being in a classroom, where they can touch the lives of children. Often when I speak to large groups out in the district, I say, how many of you had a teacher that has made a difference in your life? Almost every hand in the room goes up.

This bill also supports teachers and students by increasing funding for Title I by $1 billion. Title I provides the additional resources to low-income schools to help principals, teachers and students close education achievement gaps. At the school level, Title I helps provide additional staff, ongoing training and the latest research, computer equipment, books or new curricula offerings that, coupled with strong accountability efforts, helps disadvantaged children meet the same high standards as their more advantaged peers.

In addition to the funding increases in Title I, this bill also increases funding for scientifically based reading programs so that all children can read well by the end of the third grade. In 3 short years, funding for reading programs has tripled to over $1.3 billion, tripled, and importantly so. Reading is the key. This investment will assist parents, teachers and school districts in meeting the reading challenges of our children.

Mr. Chairman, many of my colleagues speak with me about the financial demands of special education on