

carry out the rules of the Committee or to facilitate the effective administration of the Committee, in accordance with the rules of the Committee and the Rules of the House of Representatives.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have several problems with the President's budget. First, the Draconian cuts and discretionary spending do not reduce the deficit. In fact, the deficit continues as far as the eye can see. This budget is not honest and omits many important priorities, thus negating the President's promise to cut the deficit in half by 2009. And further, this budget has the audacity to raise taxes on our veterans.

And as Shakespeare's Julius Caesar said to Brutus, "Et tu Brutus, yours is the meanest cut of all." This is the meanest cut of all in this budget: to cut our veterans, to raise taxes on our veterans. We need to be doing more for our veterans, not less. And certainly not raising taxes on our veterans as this budget does.

And this budget also hurts our farmers, cutting badly needed programs. The budget is not balanced. In fact, this budget creates a new record for a deficit \$427 billion for fiscal year 2006.

This administration's budget continues a record of deficits and raising debt over the last 4 years. For the third year in a row, the administration's budget creates a new record deficit, while offering no plan to restore the budget to balance. The \$5.6 trillion 10-year surplus inherited by this administration from the Clinton administration, which should have been used to strengthen Social Security, instead has been squandered and replaced by a deficit of \$4 trillion over the same time period from 2002 to 2011.

Our goal of the deficit reduction accomplished during the Clinton administration was to save for the retirement of the baby boomers. Instead, this administration has run up mountains of new debt, which just passes the bill for today's policy choices on to our children and our grandchildren.

Under the administration's policies, the annual burden of the Federal debt on the typical American family will more than double over the next 10 years, with each family's share of the Federal interest payments on the debt rising from just over \$2,000 per year to around \$5,000 per year. This is not the kind of legacy we should be leaving to our future, to our children and grandchildren. This debt transfer is essentially a birth tax.

Another thing, this budget is not honest. Several of the President's top priorities are omitted from this budget. What surprises me is these projects that he is omitting from his budget this week were signature points in his

State of the Union address last week. These omitted policies include debt service, and add \$2 trillion to the deficit.

Not included in the budget are transition costs of privatizing Social Security. By delaying the start of the President's new Social Security plan until 2009 and then passing it on over 3 years, this budget manages to avoid showing most of the costs, but they are to be substantial. The Social Security actuaries have estimated the cost could be about \$750 billion, and these are the President's people, over the 2009 to 2015 period alone, and between \$4 trillion and \$5 trillion over the first 20 years of full implementation.

Also not included in this budget are funds for appropriations and operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Just think: the additional \$81 billion being asked for this year for our soldiers for their safety, for their hardware, for their armor and the military, is not even in this budget. Is that responsible? According to a scenario developed by the Congressional Budget Office, costs for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan could run as much as \$400 billion more than what this budget includes.

The budget also includes no funding to repair the Alternative Minimum Tax, which protects middle-income taxpayers, which is another \$64 billion not accounted for in the budget.

The budget also imposes a \$250 annual enrollment fee for veterans without service-connected disabilities who also have incomes above VA means-tested levels. What this means is even before some of our veterans can even get into the hospital, they are being taxed \$250. The budget also increases pharmacy copayments for our veterans from \$7 to \$15. Both of these veterans taxes were proposed in the last two budgets, and we rejected both of them in Congress.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this Federal budget should be an honest blueprint for the spending priorities of this government. However, this budget is not honest. It is passing our obligations, responsibilities, and challenges to our children and grandchildren; and that is immoral. Let us stand up for the honesty and goodness of our Nation and reject this budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AN IMMORAL BUDGET PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the President has presented his budget to the Congress. We have begun a process which is the most moral process our government undertakes each year.

The budget of the United States is a moral statement. The President begins that budget process by making his own moral statement. The process goes forward with the Congress deliberating; and when we come out at the end of the year with the appropriations based on this budget, we are making a statement to the Nation and to the world of what our moral values are, stating what are our moral values.

This budget shows our moral values are really in serious trouble, because I think this is a budget of war against peace. You could call this a war-against-peace budget. It is not exaggerating to say it is kind of a barbarity-against-civilization budget. Because what we are doing is saving money. We are going to save money in all the areas which would carry forward our civilization and benefit peace and benefit a productive society; we are going to save that money in order to put it into the military. That is what this budget is all about.

It is a very dishonest budget to begin with, because the largest items of expenditure for this coming year are not even put in the budget. We are going to be asked in a few weeks to vote on a budget which includes \$80 billion for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. That is not included in this budget. We ought to be honest about that.

We ought to be honest about the fact that Social Security proposals are being made which will require tremendous amounts of money to be drained from the budget also. So it is not an honest budget to begin with. It is not a moral budget, or it is a moral budget is that reflects bad morals.

The morality that we must undertake here is understanding what the Congressional Black Caucus always has understood, which is that this is the most important item on the agenda of the Congress; and we must deal with items like education, like health care, housing, et cetera. We have disparities which exist and impact upon the black community, and those disparities really impact on the total working-family community, and the majority of Americans are impacted.

□ 2000

So as we pursue the closing of the gap between those disparities, we are also pursuing that for the rest of America, as well as for the African American community.

The chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus will elaborate on that more in a few minutes. I just want to say that this omission that we are dealing with here tonight is the beginning of the process. We are going to have debates, negotiation, and legislation. I hope that those of us who debate and discuss and negotiate will show greater moral fiber than has been displayed so far, and that at the end of

this process in the fall, when we begin to vote on the appropriations bills, there will be a different moral manifesto of the Nation emerging, unlike the one in the statement made by this budget.

The way a nation spends its money, as I said before, provides the whole world with indisputable evidence of what its real moral values are. Our true beliefs are reflected in the way we allocate our resources; and here I will just give one example. They have cut \$4 billion worth of education programs. The President and the White House propose to cut \$4 billion worth of education programs. At the same time, we have a program called the Missile Defense Systems program, and it is adding, it is increasing that budget. It will now be \$8 billion. Twice as much as is being cut for education is going to be spent this coming year on the Missile Defense program, which does not work. And they say that they are cutting the education programs because they do not work.

This defense program has been around for some time. It used to be called Star Wars. All kinds of different labels have been placed upon it, but we read occasionally about them testing it and rockets going off in the sky and misfiring; and every time that happens it is \$75 million or \$100 million. The failed test costs us millions of dollars, yet we go on, we continue. It does not work, it costs millions of dollars, but we do not eliminate it.

Security, they say, is the number one issue, and I agree, security is the number one issue. The definition of security is what we have to discuss. Security is not throwing dollars at the military. Security is not throwing dollars at missile systems that do not work and missile systems which are almost irrelevant at this point. That is not security. Security means more than just guns, missiles, bombers.

I do want to applaud the President for increasing slightly the Millennium Fund, which is supposed to help nations across the world improve their own governments and deliver better education and health care to their own people. Education, in particular, is a concern of the Millennium Fund. The Millennium Fund got started as a result of an analysis. The Millennium Fund understood what happened with Osama bin Laden and the gathering of forces in Afghanistan. They came out of the madrassas, Pakistan primarily. Large numbers came out.

What is a madrassa? A madrassa is a name for a school, a religious school, and they were teaching there reading, writing, and the military, how to shoot, and how to hate. They recognized that there was an unlimited supply of such youth. They cannot get a decent meal at home; their parents are happy to have them go off to the madrassa and give them over to the madrassa for whatever they want them to do, including military training, which later leads to them being a part

of al Qaeda. The analysts understood this, so they began to be concerned about fighting terror by improving the conditions of the people abroad, starting with the funding for education.

Education at home, however, is going to be neglected. Education at home is as much a matter of national security as education anywhere in the world. Education is the least expensive way for us to guarantee our security. We can guarantee our security far cheaper with education being spread, beginning at home, than we can by throwing more money at the military and starving health care programs, housing programs, and education programs here at home in order to improve the military.

Among the programs that are being eliminated is a program that relates to foreign languages. If ever it was clear that foreign languages are important, it is right now when our own ability to fight the terrorists has been shown to be inadequate because we cannot translate the language, we cannot understand enough. There are not enough people around who can translate Arabic, let alone the more difficult languages of Urdu and Pashtu, and the languages that have seldom been before studied in our schools. We should be appropriating billions of dollars in order to train more young people in languages.

I can go on and on, and I intend later to come back and discuss in great detail some of these programs, especially in education, that are being eliminated and what their impact is on our society as a whole.

We have a steady increase in the population of our prisons, a steady increase of African American males in our population of the prisons. There is a relationship between the tremendous number of cuts over the last 10 years in social programs and the steady increase of African American males in our prisons. They cost much more to maintain in our prisons, of course, than the cost is to provide a decent education, either in elementary and secondary education, or in college.

But I will pause here and call upon the President of the Congressional Black Caucus to enunciate the Caucus's emphasis and position as we go into this process of deliberating on this budget to make this budget a more moral document, reflecting a more civilized approach to guarantee the security of the American people and people all over the world.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

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

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) for reserving the 1 hour of time this evening for the Congressional Black Caucus to make preliminary comments on the President's proposed budget.

When the Congressional Black Caucus met with President Bush on Janu-

ary 26, we presented a CBC agenda that would close disparities and create opportunity. We outlined six areas in which significant barriers exist that prevent African Americans from enjoying the same quality of life as white Americans. We requested the President's support and asked him to demonstrate it both verbally and substantively. Unfortunately, the budget that the President sent to Congress yesterday falls far short of the substantive goals that we hoped the President would have set forth to eliminate disparities.

The first area we presented to the President was in the area of closing the achievement and opportunity gaps in education. In his budget, the President proposes eliminating the Perkins loan program, which provides low-interest loans to low- and middle-income college students. This proposal would have disastrous effects on African American college students, many of whom rely heavily on Federal financial aid programs to offset the cost of obtaining higher education. As it is, African Americans attend college at a lower rate than white Americans. If the President succeeds in his plan to eliminate the Perkins loan program, a college education would simply be unaffordable and unattainable for many African American college students.

African American college enrollment rates are 10 percent lower than white college enrollment rates. College graduation rates are even worse for African American students. Only 46 percent of African American freshmen ever graduate from college, compared to 67 percent of white freshmen. According to the Education Trust, the typical American college or university has a graduation rate gap between white and African American students of over 10 percentage points. A quarter of institutions have a gap of 20 percentage points or more.

In a recent study by the Luna Foundation For Education, the Foundation found that the single most important financial variable influencing whether or not a student will attend college is the amount of need-based financial aid being provided. In spite of these disparities, the President seeks to not only eliminate the Perkins loan program, but he is proposing to eliminate the Gear Up and the TRIO programs as well.

The sole purpose of the Gear Up program, which our Congressional Black Caucus colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) introduced, and the TRIO program, both of those programs are designed to prepare low-income and disadvantaged students for college. In other words, the President, through his budget, wants to eliminate the very programs that would help close the achievement and opportunity gaps in education. In fact, one out of every three programs that the President proposes to cut or eliminate in his budget is in the Department of Education. So the President has not been

responsive at all to the CBC agenda in that area.

The second area we outlined to the President was in the area of health care, providing quality health care for every American. The President's proposed budget slashes at least \$45 billion from the Medicaid program, which provides health coverage to 50 million low-income children, working families, seniors, and others who would otherwise be uninsured. The President's proposed cuts to Medicaid would have devastating effects on the working poor and would have particularly devastating effects on African Americans.

According to Families USA, African Americans are generally less likely to receive employer-based health care because African Americans are more likely than whites to work in positions where health care benefits are not offered, work for companies, typically small companies, that cannot afford to pay for employee health insurance, and to be unable to afford health insurance premiums when coverage is offered.

The third area we asked the President to respond to was in the area of economic security, building wealth, and business employment. The African American unemployment rate is consistently more than double the average national average. In inner cities, that number is even larger. Yet, the President proposes cutting the budget for the Department of Labor by 4.4 percent, including Workforce Investment Act State grants. Further, while the African American homeownership rate is over 20 percentage points behind that of white Americans, the President proposes cutting funding for the Department of Housing and Urban Development by almost \$3.7 billion.

We asked the President to address disparities in foreign policy, eradicating poverty, hunger, and armed conflicts around the world, especially in Africa and the Caribbean, which is a major component of the CBC's agenda. Unfortunately, the President's budget offered no solutions on how to strengthen the economic stability and self-sufficiency of countries in the African Diaspora.

The Caucus supports reducing the heavy burden that debt has on many countries and reengaging with the United Nations, regional organizations, and countries throughout the world to help promote civil society, global health, fair trade, and peace. While we applaud the President for his proposal to fund the global initiative to fight HIV/AIDS, we implore him to also provide financial assistance to end the fighting in African countries that are engaged in civil war and in genocide.

We asked the President to help address retirement security for African Americans and the disparities that exist there. During the last several weeks, President Bush has traveled the country, selling his Social Security reform proposal to the American people. Because African Americans rely heavily on the survivor disability and re-

tirement benefits provided by Social Security, the CBC is extremely interested in the details of this proposal. Contrary to the President's claims, African Americans receive a higher rate of return than whites, due to their heavier reliance on the full range of benefits offered by Social Security.

The CBC has made it clear to the President that we are against any proposal that would result in future benefit cuts or divert payroll taxes from the Social Security Trust Fund. African Americans are 8 percent of all retired beneficiaries, 13 percent of survivor beneficiaries, and 18 percent of all disability recipients. Social Security is the only source of retirement income for 40 percent of older Americans, and if those benefits were reduced, the poverty rate for older African Americans would double almost overnight.

Social Security is one of the most effective programs in the history of the United States and is essential to the livelihood of African Americans.

We asked the President to ensure justice for every American. The CBC supports criminal and juvenile justice reform that focuses greater emphasis on prevention and rehabilitation, reduces recidivism by successfully reintegrating former inmates into society, and ends arbitrary mandatory minimum sentences.

□ 2015

We also strongly support preserving affirmative action until all the effects of past and present discrimination have been eliminated.

While the President's budget does include \$75 million for a prisoner reentry initiative, much more rehabilitation needs to be done for prisoners while they are in prison.

In addition, we are disappointed to report that the President's fiscal year budget proposes to cut funding for the Justice Department's civil rights division even while we all know that more enforcement is necessary. And despite that fact our election system does not work properly, the President's budget proposes to eliminate grants to States for election reform.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the budget that the President sent to Congress yesterday reflects priorities and values that are not in line with those held by the majority of American families or by the Congressional Black Caucus.

Today the President told reporters that his budget sets priorities. He went on to say, "Our priorities are winning the war on terror, protecting our homeland, and growing our economy." I would say to the President that while we fight the war on terror, America's families also want to fight the war on poverty. While we protect our homeland, we must also ensure that American families are able to buy affordable homes. While we must grow our economy, we must also provide retirement security for American families in times of economic downturn. These, Mr. President, are America's priorities.

I hope the President will work with the Congressional Black Caucus to turn these priorities into realities.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a summary of some of the draconian cuts that the President has proposed in his budget.

BUSH ADMINISTRATION FY 2006 HOUSING BUDGET—CONTINUING THE ASSAULT ON THE MOST VULNERABLE

The Bush Administration's FY 2006 Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) budget makes deep cuts to a wide range of housing programs that serve low-income families, the elderly, and disabled persons. Overall, the HUD budget is cut by 11.5 percent. Critical housing and community development programs (CDBG, Brownfields cleanup, and Empowerment Zones) are eliminated and are consolidated into a new program in the Commerce Department, with an overall funding cut of 35 percent. The biggest funding cuts are targeted at those programs that serve our most vulnerable citizens, as follows:

THE POOR

CDBG: Transfers CDBG flexible block grants to the Commerce Department, with a 35 percent cut. This proposal would result in \$1.16 billion less in funding for low-income housing than last year.

Public Housing. Eliminates HOPE VI public housing revitalization program, and rescinds the \$143 million funded in FY05. Also cuts ongoing funding for public housing by \$270 million. The overall request is 30 percent lower in real terms than when the Bush Administration took office.

HOME Block Grants. Cuts HOME block grants by \$66 million (a 4 percent cut).

Section 8 vouchers. Purports to fully fund voucher renewals. But, the budget promises that legislation will be introduced later to renew the Administration block grant proposal—to gut the targeting of funds to the poorest families and the maintenance of affordable voucher rent levels.

AIDS Housing (HOPWA). Cuts HOPWA funding by \$14 million (a 5 percent cut).

Lead Paint Abatement. Cuts funding for lead paint abatement by \$48 million (a 29 percent cut).

THE DISABLED

Cuts 50 percent from the Section 811 disabled housing program (from \$238 m. to \$119 m). Also eliminates the Federal role in funding construction of new housing for the disabled.

MINORITIES

Fair Housing: Cuts the Fair Housing budget by 16 percent.

Minority Higher Education Institutions. Cuts Section 107 grants by 16 percent. Section 107 grants fund Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic Serving Institutions, Community Development Work Study, and other related programs.

La Raza. Eliminates funding for the National Council of La Raza for affordable housing activities and technical assistance (funded at \$4.8 million in FY 2005).

RURAL HOUSING

Rural Housing Service. Cuts funding by 73 percent for Section 515, the core RHS affordable housing program. Also eliminates the Section 515 program's authority to fund new construction.

HUD Rural Housing an Economic Development Program. Eliminates this \$24 million program, consolidating it with 17 other programs in the Commerce Dept.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING

Cuts funding for Native American housing block grants by \$110 million, a 16 percent cut.

Eliminates funding for the National American Indian Housing Council (\$2.4 m. in FY 05).

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement by the CBC chairman on the Bush budget and the Congressional Black Caucus' core agenda.

**CBC CHAIR CALLS BUSH BUDGET PROPOSAL
EXTREMELY DISAPPOINTING**

Bush Budget Blueprint Offers No Solutions to End Disparities that Exist in Our Society

Today, Congressman Mel Watt (D-NC), Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC), issued the following statement in response to President George Bush's fiscal year 2006 budget proposal:

"On first review of President Bush's budget proposal, I find it extremely disappointing. Mr. Bush's proposal recommends severe cuts in education, food and nutrition programs, and literacy initiatives for youth and young adults.

"The proposed budget neglects suggestions offered by the Congressional Black Caucus for ending disparities that exist between African Americans and White Americans in every aspect of life. The CBC gave the President three distinct opportunities to respond favorably to our Agenda: (1) during a meeting with the President on January 26th when the CBC delivered our Agenda which outlined these disparities and offered ways to eliminate the gap; (2) during the State of the Union address; and (3) in his budget proposal. Unfortunately, the President missed all three opportunities. This budget appears to offer no real solutions for change and falls short of what the CBC hoped would be included in the document.

"In summary, Members of the CBC are extremely disappointed with the President's budget proposal and will work with our colleagues on the Hill for a budget that reflects the values and concerns of all Americans: education, health care, economic opportunity, justice for all, retirement security and foreign policy."

The CBC advocates Closing the Achievement and Opportunity Gaps in Education as the most critical path to achieving our objectives in all areas of our Agenda. To do so, the CBC supports devoting more attention and, where necessary, more resources to:

1. Early childhood nutrition, Head Start and movement toward universal pre-school;
2. For children in school, student nutrition, identifying and providing education and assistance appropriate to the needs of each individual student to fulfill the promise of No Child Left Behind, dropout prevention, after-school programs, school modernization and infrastructure and equipment enhancement;
3. Pell Grants, scholarships, loan assistance and other specialized programs to enable and provide incentives to more African-American students to obtain college, graduate or professional degrees or otherwise receive training and retraining to meet changing job needs; and
4. Preserving and improving Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

The following are some of the dramatic disparities that the CBC believes would be reduced by the above priorities: In 2003, 39 percent of African American 4th grade students could read at or above a basic reading level compared to 74 percent of White 4th grade students and 39 percent of African American 8th grade students performed at or above a basic math level compared to 79 percent of White 8th grade students; High

school completion rates—83.7 percent African-Americans, 91.8 percent Whites; Bachelor Degree recipients—16.4 percent African-Americans, 31.7 percent Whites; Digital Divide—41.3 percent of African Americans are capable of accessing the Internet, 61.5 percent of Whites.

The CBC advocates Assuring Quality Health Care for Every American. To do so, the CBC believes that health care must emphasize universal access, affordability and prevention and should provide meaningful coverage for prescription medications to every American. Among the dramatic disparities the CBC believes would be reduced by doing so include:

In December 2004, the American Journal of Public Health reported that 886,000 more African Americans died between 1991 and 2000 than would have died had equal health care been available; while African-Americans comprised 12 percent of the U.S. population in 2000, they represented 19.6 percent of the uninsured and this disparity has grown since then; Black men experience twice the average death rate from prostate cancer; in 2002, the African-American AIDS diagnosis rate was 11 times the White diagnosis rate (23 times more for women and 9 times more for men); African Americans are two times more likely to have diabetes than Whites and four times more likely to see their diabetes progress to end-stage renal disease and four times more likely to have a stroke.

The CBC advocates FOCUSING ON EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC SECURITY, BUILDING WEALTH AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT. The CBC supports:

1. Eradicating employment discrimination and insuring the employment of a diverse workforce by employers in the private sector and in government (including staffs of Committees and Members of Congress);
2. Protecting the rights and working conditions of all employees;
3. A living wage for all employees;
4. The advancement of African Americans into management, executive and director positions;
5. Equal access to capital for individuals and businesses and the elimination of redlining and predatory lending practices;
6. Expanding affordable rental and ownership of housing; and
7. Aggressive minority business goals and participation in government and private contracting.

Among the dramatic disparities the CBC believes would be reduced by pursuing these policies are the following: Unemployment rates for African Americans are consistently almost double the rates for White Americans; the median weekly earnings of full-time African-American workers is consistently over \$130 less than White workers who are similarly educated and situated; the poverty rate for African Americans is almost double the national poverty rate (24 percent vs. 12.5 percent) and more than triple (33 percent vs. 9.8 percent) for children under the age of 18; home ownership for African Americans is 48 percent compared to 72 percent for White Americans and African Americans are more than two times more likely to be denied a mortgage and more than two times more likely to receive sub-prime loans; and minority-owned businesses receive only 57 cents of each dollar they would be expected to receive based on the percentage of "ready, willing and able" businesses that are minority owned.

The CBC advocates INSURING JUSTICE FOR ALL. To do so, the CBC supports:

1. Guaranteeing equal access to the vote, making sure that every vote is counted, extension of the expiring provisions of the Voting Rights Act and reinstatement of voting rights after criminal defendants have served their sentences;

2. Ending racial and ethnic profiling;
3. Criminal and Juvenile Justice Reform, including greater emphasis on prevention and rehabilitation and ending arbitrary mandatory minimum sentences;
4. Appointment of fair and impartial Judges; and
5. Preserving Affirmative Action until all the effects of past and present discrimination have been eliminated.

Among the dramatic disparities the CBC believes would be reduced by pursuing the above policies are the following: Practices of the kind documented in Florida in 2000 and in Ohio in 2004, the latter in a 100+ page Investigative Report issued by members of the House Judiciary Committee in January 2005; and African-American men are 44 percent of all male inmates in State and Federal prisons and jails (an estimated 12 percent of black males) and African-American females are five times more likely than White females to be incarcerated.

The CBC advocates RETIREMENT SECURITY FOR ALL AMERICANS. The CBC supports the following to each this objective:

1. Preserving Social Security as a safety net for older Americans and guaranteeing that Social Security benefits continue to be paid; and
2. Making it possible for people of all income levels to accumulate assets and save for retirement as means of supplementing their Social Security benefits.

Among the realities the CBC believes the above policies would help address are the following: Social Security benefits are the only source of retirement income for 40 percent of older African Americans and without these benefits the poverty rate for African-American seniors would more than double; and 28 percent of African Americans receive income from assets upon retirement compared to 62 percent of White Americans and 32 percent of African-American retirees receive income from private pension plans compared to 45 percent of White-American retirees.

The CBC advocates INCREASING EQUITY IN FOREIGN POLICY. To do so, the CBC supports:

1. Reaching the Millennium Goals for developing countries;
2. Eradicating poverty, hunger and armed conflicts in countries around the world, especially in Africa and the Caribbean;
3. Reducing the heavy burden that debt has on many countries; and
4. Reengaging with the United Nations, regional organizations and countries throughout the world to help promote civil society, global health, fair trade and peace and to help combat terrorism and increase security at home.

Among the realities the CBC believes the above policies would help address are the following: Nearly 1.3 billion people around the world live in poverty and do not have safe drinking water; More than one-third of the world's children are malnourished; Within the last 10 years, approximately two million children have been killed in armed conflicts, many after being forced to be child soldiers; Many poor countries spend 30 percent-40 percent of their annual budgets (often more than they spend on health and education combined); and Horrific conditions can lead individuals to become more disaffected and susceptible to recruitment by terrorist organizations.

OTHER PRIORITY AREAS: There are many areas in addition to the above in which disparities continue to exist and on which the CBC Action Agenda will also focus. Some of these areas include building stronger African-American families, improving the welfare of children, increasing African-American political representation, reducing inequities and improving opportunities for African Americans to advance in the military,

documenting and preserving African-American history by assuring that financing and construction of the African-American Museum moves forward and eliminating waste, fraud, abuse and disparities in every area of government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), a former member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think we need to put the budget into perspective to see where we are with the budget as we discuss the priorities.

This chart just shows where we are starting with the first Bush administration ending with a \$290 billion deficit. The 8 years of the Clinton administration, each year better than the previous year, up to a \$236 billion surplus, with surpluses increasing as far as the eye could see.

The first year of the Bush administration we used up all of the surplus and ended up just with the Social Security and Medicare surplus, and each year worse than the year before. This year we expect a \$427 billion deficit. Last year we ended up with a \$412 billion deficit. When President Clinton left office, we had expected a surplus of \$400 billion, a swing of over \$800 billion.

That is significant, Mr. Speaker, because if you look at what we get from the individual income tax, everybody's individual income tax, it is less than \$800 billion. That was the swing just in 1 year.

Mr. OWENS. Would the gentleman mind explaining the fact that every penny of the deficit costs us additional money because we pay interest on what we borrow and that is another expenditure that is added to the budget?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. When President Clinton left office it looked as though we could pay off the national debt by 2008 or 2009, which meant we would be paying out zero interest on the national debt. We would be able to replace all the money in the trust funds by about 2012, 2014, somewhere in there so there would be zero interest on the national debt paid to the trust funds.

Right now, about 2009, interest national debt is projected, instead around zero, about \$300 billion a year. At \$30,000 apiece that is enough to hire 10 million Americans, more than the total number unemployed today.

Where are we going? This chart shows, this red line is President Bush's projection of cutting the deficit in half in 5 years. First of all, we just showed that we started off with a surplus. We ought to be replacing the surplus, not just cleaning up half the mess. So the discussion about whether or not you can cut the deficit in half in 5 years really is out of place.

This chart up here shows in 2002, after 2001 President Bush projected surpluses in the hundreds of billions of dollars, and now he is talking about cutting the deficit in half. This chart down here shows a more realistic projection because it includes actually the

war in Iraq and Social Security privatization, interest on all of that debt, extending the tax cuts and all of these policies would put us down on this line below.

Mr. OWENS. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his observation there, because I have thumbed through the budget documents, the introductions, and the administration is applauding itself for reducing the budget in half in 5 to 10 years.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. The budget deficit.

Mr. OWENS. The deficit in half. Great applause is being showered upon them when we should not have a deficit to begin with.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. We should have a surplus. And you will notice if we adopt these policies we will not even come close.

I mentioned Social Security. It is hard to take the Social Security plan seriously because this green line shows that we will be able to pay full benefits until 2042. If we adopt the President's plan to solve the problem, because after 2042 we will have a deficit, the President's plan goes bankrupt 11 years earlier. So if that is the solution to the problem, it is just very difficult to take that very seriously. Furthermore, there was not that much of a problem. In fact, the Social Security shortfall was about \$3.7 trillion. If we do not make the tax cuts permanent for the top 1 percent, that is enough to just about cover the entire shortfall. Making the tax cuts permanent, \$11.6 trillion, is much more than the Social Security shortfalls.

So when you talk about your priorities, there is a priority, tax cuts for the top 1 percent first. Worry about Social Security second. I think we should worry about Social Security first and then tax cuts second.

If you look at the other kinds of priorities, look at the criminal justice priorities. I serve on the Committee on the Judiciary, and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) mentioned some of the disparities in the criminal justice system.

There is a good part of the budget. There is more money in residential drug treatment and drug courts, but unfortunately it appears to be at the expense of other good programs in the substance abuse area. There is more money for offender reentry, \$5.6 million for a total of \$15 million; but we have hundreds of thousands of prisoners coming out of prison, so that is woefully inadequate. But, unfortunately, they are severe cuts, not only in education but in prevention programs, like Safe and Drug Free Schools, Weed and Seed and other prevention programs, the COPS program which will actually reduce crime.

There is more money for prisons, building two new prisons. Unfortunately, that only exacerbates the disparities there are now. For every 100,000 whites in America, 366 are in jail today. But for every 100,000 blacks,

2,209 are in jail today. We need to be putting more money into prevention and less money into prisons. And if we put it into prevention, we will not need the additional prisons.

Mr. OWENS. Do those figures apply to black males?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. African generally.

If we put more money into prevention, we would not have to build those two new prisons as we have to today.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentleman for his excellent presentation.

Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). The gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) has 31 minutes remaining.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman, my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President released his budget blueprint for the 2006 fiscal year. While many of us are still reviewing the document, one thing is evident. The President proposes Draconian cuts to scores of programs which millions of people depend on in order to protect the tax cuts which only benefit a few Americans.

The President's \$2.57 trillion budget calls for freezing or cutting the funding for nearly every domestic discretionary program except defense and homeland security in the hopes of reducing the budget deficit. However, this budget does virtually nothing to reduce the deficit this year or any other year. In fact, the President's budget is calling for a deficit of \$427 billion in 2005, a record high, and \$390 billion in 2006. And since the President fails to include the cost of many of his top priorities in this budget, which will cost at least \$2 trillion, the deficit will likely be either larger this year, next year and for many of the following years.

Mr. Speaker, as ranking Democratic member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity of the House Committee on Financial Services, I am extremely alarmed about the President's decision to transfer community development programs from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, that is HUD, to the Department of Commerce.

Under the President's misguided plan, nearly all of the programs that comprise the Community Development Fund, including the Community Development Block Grant, will be moved out of the HUD program and combined with 17 other programs in the Commerce Department.

Brownfields, section 108 loan guarantees, and the Renewal Communities/Empowerment Zone Program are all slated to move to Commerce.

Once these programs are relocated to the Commerce Department, the President proposes to fund the 18 combined

programs at 35 percent less than they are receiving now. This will be devastating to my home city of Los Angeles and many other urban and rural areas which depend on Community Development Fund programs to improve their communities.

Mr. Speaker, cities, States, and community-based organizations throughout the country depend on Community Development Block Grant funds because they are extremely flexible. In fact, Community Development Block Grant funds can be used for housing rehabilitation; new housing construction; down payment assistance and other help for first-time home buyers; lead-based paint detection and removal; the purchase of land and buildings; the construction or rehabilitation of public facilities such as shelters for people experiencing homelessness or victims of domestic violence; making buildings accessible to the elderly and disabled; "public services" such as job training, transportation, health care, and child care, public services are capped at 15 percent of a jurisdiction's CDBG funds; capacity building for nonprofits; rehabilitating commercial or industrial buildings; and loans or grant to businesses.

Mr. Speaker, the Commerce Department has no experience in community development programs, and it is likely that programs like the Community Development Block Grant with targeting provisions to focus on people with low and moderate incomes would receive far less consideration from the Commerce Department than other parts of the consolidated program. Thus, while the overall cut in community development funds is about 35 percent, the cuts to the Community Development Block Grant would be even larger.

The public may not know or understand the details of how the Community Development Block Grant funds are allocated to local community, but every mayor, every county official, every community development professional knows the indispensable role of Community Development Block Grant funds in funding housing, neighborhood improvements, and public services.

□ 2030

The proposed cuts to the Community Development Block Grant program will leave a huge hole in the budgets of our local governments, a hole they cannot and will not be able to fill with their own resources.

The net effect of cuts to the Community Development Block Grant program will be a huge decrease in housing and economic revitalization at the local level. When the public sees the programs and services that will have to be eliminated if these cuts are enacted, they will be outraged, as they should be.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot shoehorn \$5.6 billion in programs into a \$3.71 billion program without many people being hurt. Unfortunately, as is usually the case with this administration, it is

low- and moderate-income Americans who will suffer.

These cuts would devastate local efforts in my city, in my county and in local communities throughout America to provide housing, neighborhood improvements and public services to youth, the disabled, battered and abused spouses and the elderly.

These proposals are designed to decimate the CDBG program, to end it as we know it, not to improve the program. They must be resisted.

May I close, Mr. Speaker, by saying, it is outrageous that this so-called conservative President has been spending like a drunken sailor, and he has created this situation that we are in with this huge deficit; and now, after having given cuts to the richest 1 percent in America, he would try to fool the American people by saying he is going to cut back on programs or services that are not needed. It is shameful and it is unconscionable that he would balance the budget on the backs of the most needy, on the backs of working families who are trying to get along.

This country must be organized to deal with this issue, and I intend to be very active in the effort to educate the public about what this President is doing.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her statement, and I might want to consider also, and all of us should consider, the fact that in this area of Community Development Block Grants, it is one of the areas where great promises are being made to faith-based organizations; and I wonder if the movement of this program from HUD into the Commerce Department is partially to facilitate a movement of grants into faith-based organizations, without scrutiny, without any peer review process and with the maximum amount of favoritism. It is something we should bear in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) for yielding to me and for his leadership. I look forward to working with him and our other colleagues to propose a fix for the wrongs that are in the President's budget with the budget that the Congressional Black Caucus will present a little later in this process.

I have heard a lot of descriptions, Mr. Speaker, of the President's budget, but the word that keeps coming to my mind is shameful.

It is a budget of misplaced priorities that will only serve to widen the disparities that the Congressional Black Caucus and many other good Members of this and the other body have been working tirelessly to close, gaps that belie the values on which this country was founded and undermine our Nation's promise.

First of all, the budget we have been sent is unfair. The burden of the deficit, the war and homeland security is

thrust on the poor and the middle class, while the wealthy would reap the benefit of tax cuts, which further take us down the slippery slope of debt and deficit.

It is based on more of the trickle-down economics that have never worked because the trickle always stops just short of those who need it most. Let us have some trickle-up economics for a change, so that there would be shared burden and shared benefits, if any.

Further, the President's budget does nothing to reduce the deficit. It keeps and deepens our debt to China and other countries and defers payments on what we do today to our children and grandchildren. They should not have their future crippled by debts we can and must avoid in our time.

Try though the White House might, they cannot seriously think they can justify it by budget shell games and turning attention to certain past increases the President signed only after having been made to do so, kicking and screaming all the way, by Democrats.

If left as it is, this budget would deal a serious blow to health. As in years past, no mention is made by the Secretary of the most serious issue facing us in health care today, the inequality and injustice of health care disparities, especially in racial and ethnic minority populations.

Medicaid, which has been faced with increased demands due to the failed economic policies of this administration, takes a near fatal hit in the President's budget. This is the bulwark of health care in this country, and it needs to be strengthened, not weakened.

Further, the Centers for Disease Control, on whom the protection of our health, the prevention of disease and the strength of our bioterrorism shield depends, would see a severe cut, as would programs that train doctors, nurses and other health providers. It cuts bioterrorism medical training and preparedness in hospitals, many of whom cannot adequately meet their everyday demands, not to mention surge in the case of an attack.

Rural health programs are slashed; newborn sickle cell screening and Indian health facilities construction grants are eliminated; and there are even cuts to CDC's HIV and AIDS, STD and TB budget at a time when our communities continue to be plagued by these diseases. Just today, I read of a TB outbreak, a tuberculosis outbreak, in northeastern South Carolina.

No ounce of prevention; with this budget we will have to pay the full pound of cure.

Today, I shared a program with former Speaker Newt Gingrich. I would suggest that the President and the House leadership and Senate leadership speak with him on this. He gets it.

Here I am not quoting him verbatim, but I am doing so accurately. He said that this country must raise the level of health care of everyone, no matter

where they live, of all races and ethnicities on a par with our white population and continue to raise that bar as well. He further went on to say that unless we do so and place more emphasis on prevention, we will never contain the dramatic increases in health care spending or improve the health of this Nation overall.

This is the message that we in the Congressional Black Caucus, together with our colleagues in the Hispanic Caucus, Native American Caucus and Asian Pacific Island Caucus, as well as the Progressive Caucus, have been trying to get across all along. I hope that hearing it from a Republican leader can finally have that message break through.

When the Congressional Black Caucus met with President Bush a few weeks ago, we tried to impress upon him the urgency of acting, not talking, but acting with budget and programs, to close the gaps in health care that weaken this country morally, economically and in terms of our national security. As we also told him, we tell our colleagues: Every year that we fail to live up to what is our moral obligation to do good, to heal, to feed and to clothe the least of these, as we have been called, we as a Congress, through our omission, are complicit in the premature, preventable deaths of close to 100,000 African Americans and other people of color every year.

The submission of the President's budget is only the beginning of a process. It began wrong, but we can and must make it right. All we are asking for is a budget that is fair, that is just and that finally brings about the equality for all that our country has promised.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is sort of an expert in this area.

What does my colleague think of the fact that repeatedly the Republican message has begun to bang away at the fact they are going to provide more money for Community Health Centers? I have several good Community Health Centers in my district, but they are offered as a substitute for any of the real health care benefits financed by the Federal Government.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, with the level funding, from Maternal and Child Healthy Starts with cuts in many of the prevention programs, with the elimination of funding for training the physicians, the doctors and nurses and other health providers, from our communities who have the cultural sensitivity to deal with the diverse populations that use the Community Health Centers, there will be empty buildings.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, they are robbing Peter but not giving it all to Paul.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Yes, exactly.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), for organizing, really, this opportunity to educate the public and the administration and, of course, Congress with regard to the most pressing issues confronting our country as it relates to this budget, especially as it relates to those who have not benefited from the huge tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, few traditions are more significant in our democracy than the President's annual submission of the budget. It provides us really a window on the President's and the administration's values and their priorities for this term. It also sets the tone and the standard for us in Congress by marking the spending levels for this year.

Now, I quite frankly had to go back and reread the President's State of the Union speech, because I wanted to see how consistent this budget was in terms of what he presented to the country in his State of the Union address. So I would like to mention a couple of those points tonight.

First of all, of course, in his State of the Union message he said that one of the deepest values of our country is compassion. I think we have heard that tonight this President's 2006 budget shows very little compassion. Instead of sending us a budget for the American people, for the people, this President has sent us a budget that really turns our back on the people and on their future. It sacrifices our children, our seniors, our security, our veterans, our environment and our economy in order to advance special interests and to make permanent tax cuts for the wealthy.

In his State of the Union speech, the President also said over the next several months on issue after issue, let us do what Americans have always done and build a better world for our children and our grandchildren. Well, let me tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, how does cutting \$5 billion in housing, how does eliminating funding for Hope VI, how does cutting funding by 50 percent for the disabled in terms of housing, how does this create a better world for our children and for our grandchildren?

The assault on the poor in this budget is appalling, and the cuts keep coming. The President's budget has cut Community Development Block Grants, has cut housing assistance for people living with HIV and AIDS. It has cut the lead paint abatement program. It cuts the fair housing program. It cuts rural housing initiatives. It cuts Native American housing. It cuts the Youth Build program. It has eliminated the empowerment zone and brownfield programs, and this is just the tip of the iceberg.

Again, going back to the President's State of the Union speech, how does this budget build a better world for our children and for our grandchildren?

Also in his State of the Union speech, the President acknowledged, rightfully

so, the devastatingly high rates of HIV and AIDS in the African American community, and Mr. Speaker, we acknowledge the President's leadership in calling on Congress to reauthorize the Ryan White CARE Act. During last week's State of the Union speech, the President indicated this, but again, I must say, looking at this budget, it offers very little for our minority AIDS initiative.

He proposes a \$10 million increase in the Ryan White CARE Act, \$10 million. This is far short of what is needed. We need at least \$513 million more this year to keep people off of waiting lists and to prevent new infections. In short, we need a budget that provides a minimum of about \$2.6 billion if we are really serious about addressing this HIV and AIDS crisis here in America. A \$10 million increase in the Ryan White CARE Act really does not signal the seriousness of this crisis.

Furthermore, we need more money for the minority AIDS initiative. Ever since this President has been in office, we have flat-funded the minority AIDS initiative at \$407 million. We need at least \$610 million this year if the President is really serious, again as he said in his State of the Union address, if he is serious about addressing the HIV/AIDS pandemic in our communities.

□ 2045

The budget does not reflect what the President has said in terms of the seriousness of this in our country.

Also, in the State of the Union, the President devoted a large portion of his speech to address Social Security. And as he described it, Social Security is one of America's most important institutions, a symbol of trust, he said, between the generations, and that it is headed towards bankruptcy. Well, even if we discount the fact that the President simply is incorrect, and I believe he is and many of us do, in his assessment about Social Security's solvency, his budget for 2006 does not even include the cost of his estimated \$1.3 trillion proposal for Social Security privatization over the decade after its enactment. This is a critical omission.

And the President said in his State of the Union speech that a taxpayer dollar must be spent wisely or not at all. Well, let me just say parenthetically, I believe not only should tax dollars be spent wisely but they should be spent with compassion, as he talked about earlier, not or not at all. But in this budget, these cuts that the President has proposed are not even wise, let alone compassionate.

Also, the President's State of the Union speech was about freedom and democracy; very grandiose statements he made. But I wondered when I was listening to him why justice, as a value, why this was omitted really from these grand statements in the State of the Union. Well, quite frankly, after reading and reviewing this budget, I can see why. It explains why. Because there is no justice in this budget.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we need to go back to the drawing board, and we need to remind the President about his State of the Union message. And I would say, as many have said before, that we want not just a budget but a just budget.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments, and I would like to go back to my introduction where I said that the budget is a statement of the morality of America. What our moral position is is stated in the budget. The beautiful rhetoric of the inaugural address, the beautiful rhetoric of the State of the Union address, they must be followed up with concrete statements of how we spend our money. That is not the case. We spend our money quite differently from the high standard that was set in the President's inaugural address and in his State of the Union address.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I have a couple of questions for the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and for the chairman, but before that we have had several discussions about the budget and what the budget reflects.

Mr. Speaker, when you are in a group or organization, or in the church, you can tell something about the people as to how they spend their money. It is clear that this Bush administration does not value the people that are paying the bills. They do not value the people that are paying the bills. All you have to do is follow the dollars. Every single domestic program is cut under this administration.

My question has to go back to starting with Social Security. My question, one, pertains to the Social Security program that we just celebrated a few years ago, how many years it has been in existence, the most successful program in the history of this country. I guess I am the only Member that remembers that the Republicans said that they want to see the program wither on the vine.

Would my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), explain how old the program is and why it was started in the first place.

Mr. OWENS. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentlewoman that it is more than 60 years old. And if I had a glass of wine here, I would drink a toast to it. Let us drink a toast to an aging lady in her 60s. That is really the prime these days. The most beautiful program that ever was developed, Social Security. It does not need an extreme makeover. It may need a few repairs here and there, but it does not need the kind of demolition that the President is planning for Social Security, the greatest program we have ever had. And we should all work and fight together to keep it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I might add that we would have 50 percent more of

our seniors living in poverty were it not for Social Security. Our disabled rely on Social Security. Our survivors rely on Social Security, as a result of Social Security benefits. This does not need to be dismantled or privatized. It is a program that provides a safety net.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my chief of staff and I were talking today about the program. He is a young man in his 40s, but his father died when he was a young man, and he was able to get that benefit that took care of him until he went to college. That is a benefit of the Social Security program. So it helps those people that have parents who die, and it also helps the disabled; is that correct?

Ms. LEE. That is correct. And I know many individuals who are disabled who would have a very dismal life had it not been for Social Security. Young people who are disabled are able to receive Social Security. It ensures a quality of life for those who, for whatever reason, have not been able to move forward. I do not want to see this touched for the disabled or for young people whose parents have died or for our senior citizens.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I thank the gentleman for this discussion tonight.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that among the programs eliminated, and I will submit a list of programs proposed for elimination in the education area, but among those programs are the Arts in Education program; Community Technology Centers, designed to close the digital gap between the poorer communities and the middle-class communities; the Javitz Gifted and Talented Education program, a tiny program, but many people complain there is nothing for the gifted, and so we need that. Regional Education Laboratories, which have existed for a long time, are going to be phased out. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants, a program popular all across the Nation, which is proposed for elimination. TRIO Talent Search; TRIO Upward Bound program. The Vocational Education State Grants.

Drastic reductions are proposed in order to save money, as I said before. In order to save money to give more to the military, we are going to guarantee the security of the Nation by wiping out the programs that are the most beneficial for the development of our own population. The greatest resource that any nation can have is its own people, the people's development, the people's talent, the people's education. And we are turning our backs on that in this budget, which is a bad moral statement in comparison with what the President has said in his rhetoric in the inaugural address and in the State of the Union address.

The budget is a concrete statement. It is evidence of just how moral we are, and this budget falls short in many ways.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me the opportunity to have this discussion with my colleagues on a very important journey, road map, debate that will take place both in the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have been able to come to the floor and begin a discussion on the bipartisan efforts to pass a budget that would impact the American people in a positive way, but I think it is important to reiterate why we are standing here today. It is not because we want to cite the failings of the administration, but because we are concerned about the negative impact that this budget will have on millions and millions of Americans.

Let me refresh your memory, Mr. Speaker. We are going to be cutting in the President's budget, which will be debated now on the floor of the House, \$60 billion for Medicaid. That is not \$6 billion, not \$16 billion; but it is \$60 billion which includes those dollars for nursing home residents, those dollars for indigent mothers and their children, those dollars that cover the Children's Health Insurance Program that many States are already suffering because there is not enough money.

We will see a cut of 43 programs in education up to \$1.3 billion. That means that the extra burden on school districts will now accelerate. And those schools that are looking for additional funds for the increased population, it will not be there.

Veterans, the very people who have fought in Iraq and Afghanistan, now will find their care cut by \$1.2 billion over 5 years. And we note that that House committee has been reconfigured and therefore we do not have the kind of advocacy we look for.

Environmental Protection Agency, \$300 million. Department of Justice, the DNA labs the President spoke about, \$1.1 billion.

Let me say this: I applaud the community health clinics that will have a positive impact on Houston, and Texas in general, and many other cities the President has proposed. I applaud the dollars for Homeland Security. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot in this budget pay for the needs of the American people by making the tax cuts permanent and taking \$1.5 trillion to \$2 trillion to change the Social Security System to a private special account.

I close by saying this to those who are listening to this debate: get engaged. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York and ask my colleagues to be a part of this debate. This budget can be changed. Social Security can be saved. And for those who think that the private account is worthy, spend for 40 years \$1,000, to the young people who might be listening; have invested \$99,000; give back to the United States \$79,000, and only receive \$21,000 for your annuity.

This budget must be changed. It must be a budget that is invested to help the American people. I thank the Speaker, and I look forward to the debate. I also thank the distinguished gentleman from New York and my colleagues who have been on the floor for their participation in this very worthy debate.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith the list of programs slated for elimination, which I referred to earlier:

III. PROGRAMS PROPOSED FOR ELIMINATION

The 2006 request continues the practice of the Bush Administration—also consistent with previous administrations over the past 25 years—of proposing to eliminate or consolidate funding for programs that have achieved their original purpose, that duplicate other programs, that may be carried out with flexible State formula grant funds, or that involve activities that are better or more appropriately supported through State, local, or private resources. In addition, the government-wide Program Assessment Rating Tool, or PART, helps focus funding of Department of Education programs that generate positive results for students and that meet strong accountability standards. For 2006, PART findings were used to redirect funds from ineffective programs to more effective activities, as well as to identify reforms to help address programs weaknesses.

The following table shows the programs proposed for elimination in the President's 2006 budget request. Termination of these 48 programs frees up almost \$4.3 billion—based on 2005 levels—for reallocation to more effective, higher-priority activities. Following the table is a brief summary of each program and the rationale for its elimination.

<i>Program Terminations</i>	
[2005 BA in millions]	
Alcohol Abuse Reduction	\$32.7
Arts in Education	35.6
B.J. Stupa Olympic Scholarships	1.0
Byrd Honors Scholarship	40.7
Civic Education	29.4
Close Up Fellowships	1.5
Community Technology Centers	5.0
Comprehensive School Reform	205.3
Demonstration Projects for Students with Disabilities	6.9
Educational Technology State Grants	496.0
Elementary and Secondary School Counseling	34.7
Even Start	225.1
Excellence in Economic Education	1.5
Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners	8.6
Federal Perkins Loan Cancellations	66.1
Foreign Language Assistance	17.9
Foundations for Learning	1.0
Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs	306.5
Interest Subsidy Grants	1.5
Javits Gifted and Talented Education	11.0
Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnerships	65.6
Literacy Programs for Prisoners	5.0
Menal Health Integration in School	5.0
Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers	2.3
National Writing Project	20.3
Occupational and Employment Information	9.3
Parental Informational and Resources Centers	41.9
Projects with Industry	21.6

Program Terminations—Continued

Ready to Teach	14.3
Recreational Programs	2.5
Regional Educational Laboratories	66.1
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grant	437.4
Schooll Dropout Prevention	4.9
School Leadership	14.9
Smaller Learning Communities ..	94.5
Star Schools	20.8
State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders	21.8
Support Employment State Grants	37.4
Teacher Quality Enhancement	68.3
Tech-Prep Demonstration	4.9
Tech-Prep Education State Grants	105.8
Thurgood Marshall Legal Educational Opportunity Program	3.0
TRIO Talent Search	144.9
TRIO Upward Bound	312.6
Underground Railroad Program ..	2.2
Vocational Education National Programs	11.8
Vocational Education State Grants	1,194.3
Women's Educational Equity	3.0
Total	4,264.4

Program Descriptions

[Figures reflect 2005 BA in millions]

Alcohol Abuse Reduction	\$32.7
Supports programs to reduce alcohol abuse in secondary schools. These programs may be funded through other Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs and State Grants for Innovative Programs.	
Arts in Education	\$35.6
Makes non-competitive awards to VSA arts and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts as well as competitive awards for national demonstrations and Federal leadership activities to encourage the integration of the arts into the school curriculum. Eliminating funding for the program is consistent with Administration policy of terminating small categorical programs with limited impact in order to fund higher priorities. Arts education programs may be funded under other authorities.	
B.J. Stupak Olympic Scholarships	\$1.0
Provides financial assistance to athletes who are training at the United States Olympic Education Center or one of the United States Olympic Training Centers and who are pursuing a postsecondary education. Athletes can receive grant, work-study, and loan assistance through the Department's postsecondary student aid programs. Rated Results Not Demonstrated by the PART due to lack of performance data and program design deficiencies, including its duplication of other Federal student aid programs.	
Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to vehemently state my disappointment, frustration, and objection to the FY 2006 budget submitted by President Bush.	

When President Bush submitted his 2006 budget to Congress on Monday he said, "The taxpayers of America don't want us spending our money into something that's not achieving results." I couldn't agree more. The unnecessary tax cuts for the rich and an optional war with Iraq are not producing results.

The President's 2006 budget request slashes social programs while increasing military spending. Yet not a single dime of his FY 2006 budget is earmarked for Iraq. Instead, those costs are hidden from the American people in the form of an \$80 billion emergency supplemental request to Congress. This budget will severely impact Texas citizens negatively, as well as other American citizens. They deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, never before has America faced such an array of issues that demand creative, competent leadership. But the Administration has pursued solutions that serve only to escalate the problems we are facing. Programs and policies that not only provide assistance for the poor but for a large portion of the American people who need help to keep their heads above water are under attack. On the cutting block by this Administration are grants for college tuition; housing assistance under Section 8; food stamps; health care for the uninsured.

Eight million Americans are unemployed. But Republicans passed a new set of tax breaks that reward corporations who send jobs overseas. About 45 million Americans have no health insurance. But Republicans have proposed Health Savings Accounts that benefit a wealthy few, encourage employers to drop insurance coverage and will increase the number of uninsured by 350,000. Over 8 million children nationwide are struggling to meet new national education standards. But Republicans refused to provide promised help to our schools, leaving millions of children without the help they need in reading and math.

America needs a national security policy that is as strong and brave and as decent as the heroes who serve in uniform. We must make sure that they have the training and equipment they need to get the job done right.

Democrats are working to build a future that is worthy of the trust of the American people, the sacrifices of our men and women in uniform, and the aspirations of all of America's children.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a privilege to stand here tonight and to talk with my colleagues