United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 2005 No. 32

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 16, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEB BRADLEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend James P. Campbell, Pastor, Christ Life Church, Woodstock, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Almighty God, once more this esteemed body gathers to legislate for the people of this Nation.

The scripture states ''that government is God's servant for good.'' Remind hearts of this in all actions today. Help these great women and men to remember those who are less fortunate in all their decisions that they make.

We lift our Nation up to You for protection against terrorism and to protect our troops everywhere. Bring peace to our Nation, Father, and peace to all the troubled areas of the world.

Help those in this Chamber that struggle with illness, bring healing and health. Help those who wrestle with personal or family problems, bring solutions and peaceful resolve. Aid each Member of this House who is in the valley of indecision concerning matters of this Nation to make the right decision and action. Most of all, Father, let us feel Your love and care for all of us. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. SOLIS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1160. An act to reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program through June 30, 2005, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 114(b)(2)(c) of Public Law 100–458, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, appoints the following individual to the Board of Trustees of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development, for a six-year term:

MARSHA BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 105–83, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the National Council on the Arts:

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), vice the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID).

The message also announced that pursuant to Executive Order No. 12131, as amended, the Chair, appoints the following Members to the President's Export Council:

The Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS).

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 10 one-minute speeches per side.

HONORING RHEA TAYLOR, MAYOR OF FAYETTE COUNTY, TENNESSEE

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Fayette County, Tennessee, Mayor Rhea Taylor.

As the Fayette County Mayor since 2002 and a public servant for years, Rhea Taylor has been actively involved in planning for the rapid growth of Fayette County. And during their annual awards banquet, the Fayette

Printed on recycled paper.

County Chamber of Commerce named Mayor Taylor the 2004 Citizen of the Year.

During Mayor Taylor's tenure, Fayette County has been designated as a Three-Star Pilot Program county by the Tennessee Department of Economic and Community Development. In addition to facilitating growth planning and recruiting industries to the county, Mayor Taylor is working to create a county-wide fire system and a justice complex.

The list of achievements goes on and on, but it is clear that Mayor Taylor has worked tirelessly on behalf of the County's residents.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mayor Taylor on his record of achievement and thank him for his continued good service to the people of Fayette County, Tennessee.

NOT ONE MORE DIME

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, today the House is going to be asked to approve a supplemental appropriation of $82 billion, most of which will go to continue the war in Iraq.

We now know more than 2 years later that Iraq did not have weapons of mass destruction which was the immediate occasion of America's intervention. We know that Iraq had neither the intention nor the capability of attacking the United States. Yet this country has spent over $200 billion and today is determined to spend another $82 billion in furtherance of a war we did not have to fight at great cost of human life, the lives of our troops and the lives of innocent Iraqi civilians.

Yet while we are contemplating going ahead and spending $82 billion, we should be thinking about the fact that on January 30 the Special Inspector General for the Iraq reconstruction issued a report that the administration's Coalition Provisional Authority mismanaged $9 billion in a development fund for Iraq funds. Not a single penny of the $9 billion could be accounted for by the Inspector General.

The development fund for Iraq consisted of Iraqi oil revenues intended for reconstruction and humanitarian efforts in the war-torn country, but they cannot account for a single penny of it. Now this government is asking for $82 billion, most of it for Iraq. They could not account for a single penny of the money that the Coalition Provisional Authority, their authority, was responsible for. How can we give them another dime when they cannot account for $9 billion?

We have people who do not have decent education in this country, decent housing, our highways are falling apart except for our transportation bill. We need to focus on why they do not and have not produced a single shred of evidence of what happened to that $9 billion. The American people have a right to know.

SOCIAL SECURITY HAS TO BE FIXED

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, Social Security needs to be fixed. It is a system that is currently broken, and it must be fixed. It will go bankrupt by the time the eldest baby boomers retire. We need to act sooner rather than later to fix this program. Every day we wait it costs us more and more.

When Social Security began there were roughly 40 workers working for one retiree. During the 1950s it was 16 workers per one retiree. Soon it will only be two workers per one retiree. Without reform it will go bankrupt, and soon. So it is not a matter of I want to fix Social Security or I think it should be fixed. Social Security must be fixed. And the best way to dothat is to transform the system into one where workers can put a portion of their Social Security savings into personal accounts.

Investing in government bonds and stocks will give them a better return on their investment than the current system gives.

We must fix Social Security. We must fix Social Security now.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to oppose cuts to the Community Development Block Grant program in the Republican budget.

The Community Development Block Grant program provides critical funding for public safety, affordable housing, economic growth initiatives for cities, counties and Native American communities.

The district I represent strongly opposes these cuts. And I have heard from a lot of people, the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission, the League of California Cities, the Southern California Association of Nonprofit Housing, and mayors from various cities in California, in addition to the County Native American Indian Commission. All of them strongly oppose the proposed Republican budget which seeks to cuts back important funding for cities like mine, particularly onethat I represent.

The city of Rosemead has used this vital money to help provide residential rehabilitation assistance to over 100 elderly and disabled households. In addition, they have done testing for lead poisoning in low-income homes.

So I urge my colleagues to enact a budget package that contains sufficient funding for community development that helps the underserved neighborhoods, like mine in the 32nd district, throughout the country.I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt alternative.

GO GATORS

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to congratulate one of the Nation's top public universities, the University of Florida, and their men's basketball team on their first-ever SEC title.

This was a Gators 40th try for the SEC title against a team that has defined success in this event, the Kentucky Wildcats.

The Gators beat the No. 4 Wildcats 70 to 53 on Sunday, March 13 in Atlanta, Georgia's Georgia Dome in front of 25,000 fans.

This win marked the second time in 8 days that Florida had beaten Kentucky, which increased their winning streak to seven in a row. This winning streak comes at a very hot time, as the Florida Gators are heading into this year's NCAA tournament. The Gators are playing their first tourney game this Friday in Nashville, Tennessee, against Ohio. I wish them the best of luck in the NCAA tournament and congratulate them for their first-ever SEC title. Go Gators.

NOT AN INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday while testifying before a Senate committee, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan said on the tax cuts, ''It turns out we were all wrong'' about President Bush's tax cuts.

In his book, Ron Suskind quotes the Fed Chairman as telling Secretary O'Neill, ''Without the triggers, that tax cut is irresponsible fiscal policy.''

Despite his private views, Chairman Greenspan publicly supported the tax cuts without reservation. I only wish he had expressed publicly what he knew privately.

Mr. Greenspan went on to say that he wanted to use the tax cuts to eliminate the budget surplus. Well, he succeeded beyond his wildest imagination. We now have $2 trillion in additional debt because of those tax cuts. Now where do we send that bill, Mr. Greenspan?

The Fed Chairman would have us believe that no one could have seen this coming, that it was an honest mistake. I know something about spin. Mr. Greenspan, that is spin. Now, Mr. Greenspan advocates making tax cuts for millionaires permanent while advocating a cut in Social Security benefits for the middle class, all the while bemoaning the rising deficits this country has seen and $2 trillion of additional debt.

Thank you very much for that independent analysis, Mr. Greenspan. Mr. Greenspan, you know better.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

ADOPT A CUBAN POLITICAL PRISONER

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today I stand in this great Chamber of democracy to adopt a Cuban political prisoner. Although this idea may seem like an idea that has no effect, it actually has a profound and everlasting impact on those who are enslaved.

Three years ago, Castro, whom we know to be an evil dictator who abuses the human rights of his people, swept the streets of Cuba and imprisoned over 70 innocent men and women who were calling for democracy on the island.

One of these victims is Lester Gonzales Penton. This young man who will turn 28 next week was sentenced to 20 years and is currently held in one of Castro's most shameful prisons, Kilo 7.

I am honored to adopt Lester, and I urge my colleagues to join me in adopting these courageous, peaceful activists, activists who sit in squalid jails for crimes we consider to be some of the most sacred rights: freedom, democracy, and freedom of expression.

We stand here today to honor these heroic souls and demand their release. I invite my colleagues to join us at noon today at HC–7 to hear more about our Adopt a Cuban Political Prisoner Campaign.

□ 1015

AN ETHICS PROCESS IN LIMBO

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the integrity of the people's House supersedes the interests of any individual Member who is privileged to serve here, of either political party.

We bear an individual duty, as well as a collective obligation, to abide by the highest ethical standards and to conduct ourselves in a manner that instills public confidence in this institution.

Yet, today, the ethics process in this House is at a standstill. Our bipartisan process to address alleged ethics violations has been stymied by a partisan roadblock that is inconsistent with the purpose and history of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the ranking member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, has introduced a resolution that would remove this roadblock and restore the ethics rules that were adopted on a bipartisan basis in 1997. I urge my colleagues to support the gentleman from West Virginia's (Mr. MOLLOHAN) resolution.

Let us restore the ethics rules that guided us for the last four Congresses. Let us ensure that our ethics process is bipartisan and commands the respect of the American people. We ought to expect no less of ourselves.

CELEBRATING THE VALUABLE WORK OF ROTARIANS IN RUSSIA

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as a 30-year member of Rotary International, I am proud to recognize the valuable work of new Rotarians in Russia.

Although Rotary in Russia is only 11 years old, the 100-year-old Rotary organization is already strengthening Russian communities, helping to enrich multinational relations and improving economic conditions in the new democratic Russia.

Today, I met with a group of Russian Rotarians who are visiting our country hosted by Neil Young of the Towsontowne, Maryland, Rotary Club. Our visitors and their sponsors are enthusiastic to learn more about how American small businessmen organize and manage their businesses. They will be able to apply the lessons they learned to help Russian businesses survive, grow and create jobs and consumer products for their communities.

Rotarians throughout the world continue to promote networking for community development and leadership, they should feel proud that their efforts are making a positive difference for millions of people.

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

THE BUDGET

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, today, the House of Representatives will start its annual debate on the budget, one of the most important debates of the year.

I would urge all of my colleagues to vote against the rule setting up the terms of this debate. Why vote against the rule? Because the Blue Dog Coalition alternative, the amendment which had 12 key procedural reforms to get our Nation off its current drunken borrowing and deficit binge, none of those wise provisions were included for debate.

Why? Nine Republicans on the House Committee on Rules voted against such common-sense terms as, for example, having a cost estimate on every bill or allowing a recorded vote on items that spend more than $50 million. I do not know but it is very important that House Members vote against the rule so that we can have a fairer debate on our budget process and support the reforms in the Blue Dog Coalition.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in 2008, only 3 years from now, the first baby boomers will start collecting retirement benefits from Social Security, and for these people the system has worked very well, but when our children and grandchildren get set to retire, the only thing that will greet them is frustration, grief and heartache at what we did today or, better yet, what we did not do to fix Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I have practiced medicine for over 20 years, and I know that in order to treat the right disease you have got to make the right diagnosis, and the right diagnosis for the Social Security system is that we are on an unsustainable course. The right treatment is to fix the problem today rather than passing the problem on to future generations.

If we continue to postpone solutions, our only alternatives will be large tax increases or significant benefit reductions.

The goal of our ongoing discussion is not to pin blame on anyone. The goal is to have a system that will work for our children and our grandchildren, one that is stable, funded and secure.

A Social Security system that was designed for the world of 1935 will not work for the world of 2035 and beyond. Changes must be made, and the sooner we act the more secure we all will be.

VITAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF AFRICAN AMERICAN NEWSPAPERS THROUGHOUT OUR HISTORY

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to rise today to recognize the vital contributions of African American newspapers throughout our history and the continuing need for their perspective today. The Seattle Media in my district is a good example.

For nearly 180 years, black newspapers have provided their readers with not only the news of the day but with hope for a better tomorrow, and for the past 65 years the National Newspaper Publishers Association has been the standard bearer in that proud tradition.

A federation of more than 200 black community newspapers, the NNPA has provided outstanding service to its member papers and the 15 million Americans who rely on them for news.

Through its network, the NNPA makes stories that happen in one part of the country available everywhere, and on the pages of its member papers black reporters and columnists record critical events and render thoughtful and much-needed alternative viewpoints that both educate and inspire.

The NNPA is a great American institution in the rich history of African American newspaper gathering, and I am proud to pay tribute to them today.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, at the urging of the Democrat leadership in the Congress, political campaign veterans have formed a new liberal group that plans to raise $25 to $50 million to pressure lawmakers to vote against any Social Security plan that includes prepaid individual retirement accounts.

With straight faces, the Democrats call themselves ''Americans United to Protect Social Security.''

They say: ''The President and his supporters in Congress are messing with the third rail of politics; and we're going to be sure they get zapped'' good.

Mr. Speaker, this is about our children. The greatest disservice to our children and grandchildren would be to give in to groups like this who claim there is no problem and who simultaneously use Social Security as a political club to beat down those of us who would dare to strengthen it.

House Democrats have become the party of noes, and they are led by ''Minority Leader No.'' If we do nothing, as some Democrats would have it, today's young workers and future workers will face benefit reductions, payroll tax increases and unprecedented debt.

Mr. Speaker, we should be worried about the next generation, not simply the next election.

WHERE IS THE DEMOCRAT SOCIAL SECURITY PLAN?

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up the comments of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), because it is one thing for the Democrat Party and the liberal groups in Washington, D.C., the very, very special interest groups, to say we are against whatever the President wants to do. We understand that. But it is another thing when they do not offer their own plan.

What I would ask the Democrat Party is to put your plan on the table, because most people agree with the facts, and the facts are that Social Security is running out of money.

Most people understand life expectancy has changed since Social Security started in 1937 when folks lived to be 59 years old. Today, they live to be 77 years old.

Most people understand that in 1937 when Social Security started there was 60 workers for every one retiree, and today it is three to one.

Most people understand the changing demographics that caused it so that if you retired in 1980 it took you 2.8 years to get all of your money back that you put into the Social Security Trust Fund, and yet if you retired in 2003 it will take you 17 years to get your money back.

Most people understand that there is a generation-to-generation issue that needs to be addressed.

What I would ask the Democrat Party is just put your plan on the table. Let us take a look at it. Let us take the best of the Democrat ideas, combine them with the best of the Republican ideas for what is best to protect and preserve Social Security for the next generation.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 147) electing members to the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 147

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY.

(a) JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.—The following Members are hereby elected to the Joint Committee on Printing, to serve with the chair of the Committee on House Administration:

(1) Mr. Doolittle.
(2) Mr. Reynolds.
(3) Ms. Millender-McDonald.
(4) Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania.

(b) JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY.—The following Members are hereby elected to the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, to serve with the chair of the Committee on House Administration:

(1) Mr. Ehlers.
(2) Mrs. Miller of Michigan.
(3) Ms. Millender-McDonald.
(4) Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

I rise today in support of House Resolution 147, a resolution electing the House Members to the Joint Committee on Printing and Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

This important resolution names our House Members to these two committees, and once passed, we may begin to work with the other body, which has already organized, to organize the entire committee for the 109th Congress.

I want to thank my colleagues for agreeing to serve with me on these committees. I would just like to briefly mention that on the Joint Committee on Printing would be the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE); the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS); the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), our ranking member; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY).

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library is the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS); the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), our newest Member; the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), our ranking member; and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN).

I want to thank our ranking member for working with us on this resolution, and I ask for support of this resolution.

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

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. NEY. 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. Res. 147.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. 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 further consideration of H.R. 1268, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND TSUNAMI RELIEF, 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in

the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1268.

□ 1028

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1268) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, March 15, 2005, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 72, line 17.

It is now in order to consider the fifth amendment listed in the order of the House of March 15, 2005.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

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

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 7001. None of the funds provided in this Act for national intelligence programs shall be available for obligation until the President submits to the Congress a proposal or procedure to fully inform the congressional intelligence and defense committees of all clandestine military activities for which it is intended that the role of the United States Government will not be apparent or acknowledged publicly and that will be conducted in countries identified by the United States Government as sponsors of terrorism.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Clerk to read the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 5 minutes.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1030

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

I made clear yesterday that based on conversations with Andy Card, the President's staff director, I have agreed to withdraw this amendment pending the administration's getting together with the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations and working out a process by which activities of the Department of Defense that are classified will in fact be communicated to the Congress. I am not just talking about after the fact; I am talking about a communication prior to the activities.

I simply want to read one sentence from an article that appeared in the New Yorker about this matter. It reads as follows: ''The intelligence system is now designed to put competing agencies in competition. What is missing will be the dynamic tension that ensures everyone's priorities in the CIA, the DOD, the FBI and even the Department of Homeland Security. The most insidious implication of the new system is that the Secretary of Defense no longer has to tell people what he is doing so they can ask, 'Why are you doing this? What are your priorities?' Now he can keep all of the mattress mice out of it.''

Well, if the Congress considers itself to be mattress mice, then they will not be concerned about the reports that we hear about the Department of Defense's activities. If the Congress takes seriously its obligation to exercise the power of the purse, which is one of only two real powers that we have outside of actual legislating, and if the Congress feels we have an obligation to this institution that transcends our obligation to the committees on which we serve, then the Congress will see to it that the executive branch understands that we are not trying to dictate what they do; we are simply trying to see to it that what they do is consistent with American values and will not get the country in trouble in the first place.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to say upfront to the House that it is not my intention to speak on the time I have reserved in opposition to this proposition, so I am asking for a chance for an exchange here with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have spent a good deal of time behind closed doors in appropriate security to discuss matters like this, but especially to express our concern that the Department of Defense communicate regularly with the Congress relative to activities that might involve areas that are, indeed, secure.

I have never told the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) this before, but I will never forget as a mere member of the Subcommittee on Defense and a member of the Intelligence Committee discussing a program that was in the black that I knew about because I happened to be in the back room, but a program that the Department of Defense was not very excited about. We ended up advancing some money to have that program go forward. I have no idea if we would have been unsuccessful with that effort if they had known how serious we were.

It is important that we communicate with each other. Communication is a two-way street not a one-way street. So for those listening across the river, it is very important to know that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is serious about this, and the leadership of the House is serious about it as well.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to make clear that I assume good faith on the part of the White House, and I hope we can work things out. But if we do not, I will be pursuing every possible avenue to see that an amendment such as this is adopted because this Congress has an obligation to know what is happening in some of these covert and clandestine operations.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

It is now in order to consider the sixth amendment listed in the order of the House of March 15, 2005.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FILNER:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. (a) REQUIREMENT FOR VETERANS HIRING PREFERENCE FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTORS PERFORMING CONTRACTS FOR RECONSTRUCTION IN IRAQ.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with a private sector contractor to perform reconstruction in Iraq unless, as a condition of the contract, or any subcontract at any tier under the contract, the Federal Government requires the contractor and any subcontractor under the contract, when hiring employees who will perform work under the contract (or subcontract), to extend to preference eligible veterans a hiring preference equivalent to the preference extended to preference eligible veterans for civilian employee positions in the Federal Government.

(b) PREFERENCE ELIGIBLE VETERAN DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''preference eligible veteran'' has the meaning given the term ''preference eligible'' in section 2108 of title 5.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order on the amendment is reserved.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of March 15, 2005,

the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I call this the ''Let U.S. Veterans Rebuild Iraq and Afghanistan'' amendment. Once again, I rise in support of the veterans of our Nation. We have a major, major, major operation in Iraq and Afghanistan. The bill on the floor today appropriates a sum of $81 billion, and we will be spending over $200 billion. It seems to me that we ought to guarantee jobs to veterans with companies that are awarded government contracts from this fund. Our active duty are fighting, but those who volunteer to go and help in other ways should have the preference that their veterans' service offers.

We have all rallied to support our troops, but often after they come home, our veterans are not treated with the respect they deserve. I outlined yesterday the lack of respect that they will have and continue to have because of lack of adequate funding in the health care system. PTSD, post-traumatic stress disorder, for example, will not have the funding that is needed to treat what is expected to arise out of the current war. As I said yesterday, research funds are being cut, nurses' positions are being cut.

I tried yesterday to put an amendment on the floor that would supplement this supplemental with an additional $3 billion that the veterans groups think and have testified and have outlined is necessary. That $3 billion was not added in yesterday's supplemental. So today I ask that we ensure that there are jobs for our Nation's veterans, whether they are new or old. Let us give them the preference that they have in law at home with the preference for the contracts that are being awarded with such abandon in the Middle East today.

We know, if we do not serve our veterans with jobs or health care, what occurs. We know that up to half of the homeless on the streets today are veterans, mainly from Vietnam, because we did not give them the honor, the respect, the health care, the jobs, the housing that they needed. And so they are on the street after having fought for this country. One way to make sure that this does not happen to anyone else is to include veterans in the rebuilding of Iraq and Afghanistan. Many of them fought for freedom for those nations. Let us get them involved in the effort to build the future.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the rules are not invoked here once again to stop a commonsense approach to helping our veterans in this Nation.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment is most intriguing. The gentleman is interested in having opportunity for veterans to gain employment. I presume they are veterans, whether veterans of World War II or circumstances in Iraq or otherwise. I presume that is the case. I certainly would be supportive of ensuring every veteran has an opportunity to find work, wherever the veteran might have served. I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman.

Yesterday we had a discussion on the floor of the House relative to the gentleman's wanting to ensure there were additional funding flows for veterans. There was some resistance to that suggestion because some of us thought there was money in the pipeline that adequately serviced the hospitals; and in regular order we would make sure whatever was necessary would be available, at future hearings and markups of bills that affect funding. So I want to ask a question: There is a veterans hospital in San Diego County, is there not?

Mr. FILNER. Of course.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to remember, what is the name of that hospital. I am trying to remember.

Mr. FILNER. La Jolla.

Mr. LEWIS of California. San Diego Veterans Medical Center in La Jolla. And does it happen to be in the gentleman's district?

Mr. FILNER. No, it is not.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that hospital needs a lot of work. I assume the gentleman suggests that veterans ought to be first in line if we do some refurbishing?

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, in last year's appropriation bill, that hospital was awarded close to $100 million for seismic refitting, retrofitting for earthquake safety.

Mr. LEWIS of California. And was the gentleman involved in that?

Mr. FILNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, did we successfully get money for that seismic retrofitting?

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, yes, in last year's appropriation bill, La Jolla Medical Center was one of a variety of hospitals, I think about two dozen.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would have discussed that with me at the time.

We had a similar problem at Loma Linda Veterans Medical Center, the sister hospital of the Jerry Pettis Veterans Hospital, and we found a way to do seismic retrofitting by way of using a laser. No portion of the hospital needs to be closed down while the work is being done. Thereby, patients can actually be in the hospital while the work is being done. We did not have that discussion.

Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman visited that hospital in the last years?

Mr. FILNER. Many times.

Mr. LEWIS of California. In the last year?

Mr. FILNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I attempt to visit my hospital regularly as well. And, indeed, visit the veterans who are now back at Walter Reed or Bethesda. Indeed, we all should be concerned about that priority.

But, frankly, I am a bit incensed by the gentleman's suggestion yesterday that would indicate that we do not give priority on a bipartisan basis to veterans. I would ask the gentleman to join me in a special mission. Would the gentleman consider the mission?

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, whatever the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) suggests, I would consider.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the mission is the veterans service organizations are a great voice for veterans here in Washington. Like the gentleman, they are constantly pounding their chest saying, I am calling for money, more opportunity for veterans. I insist that they help us go back to where the hospitals are and see that veterans are treated like real human beings in those hospitals. I cannot get the VSOs to do it. Maybe I can get the gentleman to do it because the gentleman is obviously more concerned than the VSOs are about those veterans benefits and the way they are being treated.

Mr. Chairman, I ask, would the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) join me in that effort, or does the gentleman believe the money is being spent very well at veterans hospitals?

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, look, everybody wants efficiencies in this system; but I will say, for a paralyzed veteran with a spinal cord injury, there is no better place than the VA to get care.

□ 1045

To keep that quality of care for those veterans requires investment in our system. We are all looking for efficiencies but I will tell you there is no independent person, including the VA.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time. . . .

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman asked me a question.

Including the VA that says that we have enough money.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Who says we do not have enough money? . . .

Mr. FILNER. The VA says we do not have enough money. . . .

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair has been trying to facilitate this colloquy, but the Chair will

now insist that Members follow regular order in yielding and reclaiming time Members will not speak at the same time.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) controls the time and is recognized for the remainder of his time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 15 seconds.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Let me say that we made a major effort to see that veterans in our hospital did not have to walk around with folders under their arm. We insisted on computerization within that hospital. The gentleman could help me a lot helping the VSOs to really work with veterans where they are being treated or not treated so well.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill which violates clause 2 rule XXI.

The rule states that an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if it changes existing law or imposes additional duties.

I ask for the Chair's ruling.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. FILNER. Once again we are using the rules to block a commonsense amendment. It seems to me that the chairman has deeper issues than a blocking of the thing on a procedural ground and feels that the VA is not doing its job. That is obviously a deep issue that we ought to discuss, but that should not lead him to block this amendment.

In addition, the only way I could judge the sincerity of the majority party in these issues is to see what they had done to the chairman of the committee I have sat on for the last 12 years; that is, the VA Committee. The chairman was removed from that job, purged from that job because he stood up for veterans.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman will join me on a mission as I join him on a mission for accountability and efficiency to convince the leadership of his party to put back on that committee members of the committee who actually fight for veterans.

Once again, I think the veterans of this Nation ought to understand that the rules of this House can be waived for anything that the majority party wants, but when it comes to the veterans of this Nation, they refuse to waive the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The Chair finds that the amendment, although in the form of a limitation, proposes a legislative contingency imposing new duties on the Executive.

As such, the amendment violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained.

It is now in order to consider the seventh amendment listed in the order of the House of March 15, 2005.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

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

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 7001. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund any contract in contravention of section 15(g)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)(2)).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of March 15, 2005, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

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

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, Federal contracts for overseas work have increased substantially over the last several years. This rapid increase in government buying is largely the result of the war in Iraq and combating terrorism. Since the spring of 2003, Congress has appropriated close to $200 billion for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The supplemental appropriations bill we are considering today provides an additional $81 billion.

Much of this funding will be spent on contracts for overseas work, and most of these contracts will be awarded to large corporations. Unfortunately, while 23 percent of contracting dollars spent domestically must include small businesses, there is no requirement that small companies have access to the bulk of overseas contracts. My amendment would change that by requiring that small businesses have access to international contracts just as they do for domestic work.

Federal agencies currently do not include overseas contracts when calculating their small businesses goals. Therefore, there are no means of holding agencies accountable for providing U.S. small companies with access to international work. As a result, only 1 percent of government overseas contracts are awarded to small companies, and barely 500 of the more than 23 million U.S. small businesses are performing work abroad. By requiring that contracts funded by this bill are calculated in the Federal Government's small business goals, we start to instill credibility in the system while ensuring that small firms receive their fair share.

These goals were enacted to ensure small business participation in the Federal marketplace. However, the Federal Government has failed to meet its small business goal in each of the last 5 years. In one year alone, this failure cost U.S. small businesses over $15 billion in lost contracting opportunities.

We have a lot to make up for with our Nation's small business owners. We can start by ensuring that they have access to overseas contracts.

Mr. Chairman, there are 23 million small businesses in the United States. They represent 99 percent of all employers, create three out of four new jobs, and employ more than half of all private sector workers. Historically, when the government has needed to build up for military operations, it has turned to small businesses to fulfill its procurement needs because of their flexibility and quick response time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate the gentlewoman from New York yielding. Como esta.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Gracias.

I am sorry. I thought this was English-only here.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I wanted to say to the gentlewoman, first, I very much appreciate the thrust of her amendment. While we are prepared to accept her amendment, let me add to that there could be some resistance, perhaps, on the part of the State Department. If there is resistance, it is because they have never seen fit to apply the existing law to overseas contracts. I think that is a small mistake on their part, frankly, if they have not. I think the gentlewoman is not just raising an important point but a point that needed to be made.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate the gentleman's support of this amendment. I would say that it does not surprise me that the Department of State would raise a concern because they are the worst offenders when it comes to fulfilling the statutory goals set by Congress regarding contracting practices on behalf of small businesses in our Nation. I would love to see that the gentleman work with me on behalf of small businesses and make sure that in this $81 billion there is small business participation. They can do the work and they can do it more effectively than many of the large corporations that are mismanaging and misappropriating much of the money that has been spent so far.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Let me say to the gentlewoman that her amendment is overdue. I am happy to accept it and I am happy to be her partner on behalf of small business in America.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARKEY:

Page 72, after line 17, insert the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 7001. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the following laws enacted or regulations promulgated to implement the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (done at New York on December 10, 1984):

(1) Section 2340A of title 18, United States Code.

(2) Section 2242 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (division G of Public Law 105–277; 112 Stat. 2681–822; 8 U.S.C. 1231 note) and any regulations prescribed thereto, including regulations under part 208 of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations, and part 95 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 2, answered ''present'' 3, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

AYES—420

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—2

Hayes
Souder

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—3

Price (GA)
Rohrabacher
Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—9

Baird
Baker
Boucher
Cubin
Larsen (WA)
McKinney
Portman
Roybal-Allard
Sweeney

□ 1122

Messrs. KLINE, PUTNAM, CARDOZA, TANCREDO, BLUNT, SMITH of Texas, GOODLATTE, MCHENRY, THOMAS, AKIN, FLAKE and EHLERS and Mrs. EMERSON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye''.

Messrs. PRICE of Georgia, WESTMORELAND and ROHRABACHER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''present''.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, due to a previously scheduled commitment away from Capitol Hill, I was unavoidably detained and regretfully missed rollcall vote No. 75, the Markey Amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, time and time again, the Bush administration has not been straightforward with Congress, the American people, or our soldiers about the costs of this war and what it will take to ensure stability and security in Iraq so our troops can return home.

Instead of disclosing the actual findings of field reports on contracting audits, troop needs, or the projected cost of the reconstruction effort, the administration has withheld, distorted, and even deliberately hidden information.

Just this week, despite the administration's refusal to turn Pentagon audits over to Congress, I obtained a report by Defense Department auditors concluding that Halliburton overcharged the U.S. Government more than $100 million for a single task order under its no-bid $7 billion contract to restore Iraq's oil infrastructure. I would like to know why unredacted versions of this audit report and the audit reports on nine additional task orders are still being withheld from Congress.

I have also learned that administration officials violated a U.N. Security Council Resolution by intentionally concealing these overcharges from international auditors. The administration only provided heavily redacted audits to the international auditors charged with overseeing the Iraqi oil revenue used to pay Halliburton's inflated costs.

Worst of all, correspondence between the Army Corps of Engineers and Halliburton officials indicates it was Halliburton that blacked-out references to egregious overcharges and other key audit findings regarding the unreasonableness of Halliburton's prices.

I am deeply disappointed that the House voted down an amendment calling for the investigation of reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan including contracting procedures, possible money laundering, and profiteering.

It is disturbing that the Republican leadership has been unwilling to assert its oversight responsibility and demand fiscal accountability.

The administration has not complied with Congressional mandates to provide a comprehensive breakdown of the $200 billion already spent in Iraq and Afghanistan and a detailed assessment of the projected costs of military and reconstruction activities in Iraq over the next 5 years.

The White House has failed to justify a permanent extension of tax cuts for the wealthy while paying for the war with mounting deficits and massive budget cuts to social programs.

And when it comes to our troops, it has been Congress, not the administration, prioritizing force protection needs and the procurement of safety essentials like armored Humvees, body armor, night vision equipment, and jamming devices to neutralize the improvised explosive devices that are among the biggest threats to U.S. patrols.

I am willing to support this supplemental precisely because it allocates a majority of funds for troop and equipment needs and training of Iraqi security forces. This is a vast improvement over the blank check requested by the administration to pursue its less accountable reconstruction efforts.

No matter how each of us feels about the administration's actions that led to war and its conduct since then—and I have been one of its strongest critics—we have an obligation to ensure that our troops have the support and equipment they need as long as they are in the field. In addition, the funding in this legislation for training and equipment for Iraqi and Afghan security forces is essential for these nations to take control of their own security so U.S. troops can come home.

Some who oppose this legislation believe that its defeat would hasten the return of our troops. Although it is critically important for the U.S. to develop an exit strategy, I am deeply concerned that a premature withdrawal of U.S. troops just after Iraq's democratic elections and as its leaders attempt the difficult task of forming a coalition government would only embolden the Al-Qaeda cells fueling the insurgency in Iraq.

I also strongly support other provisions of the legislation to pay for food aid and peacekeeping in the Sudan, as well as the more than $650 million allocated for relief and reconstruction to the countries devastated by the tsunami.

I fully support the $200 million included in this bill for economic revitalization and infrastructure development in the West Bank and Gaza. The end of the Arafat era presents a concrete opportunity for the Palestinian people to chart a future away from terrorism, corruption, and incitement and toward democracy, transparency, and the rule of law.

This aid package is a strategic and timely investment in the leadership of Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas. The accountability requirements in this bill will set an example for the international community for formulating assistance packages that protect against cronyism, embezzlement, and mismanagement, which in the past siphoned millions of dollars to Arafat loyalists and terrorist organizations.

And so, I will vote for this legislation to support our troops and to support these other worthwhile U.S. humanitarian endeavors, but we have an obligation to hold the Bush administration accountable for its policies in Iraq.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for this supplemental appropriations bill today.

I have been a critic of the Bush administration's policy in Iraq. But I think even those who have supported it should be deeply concerned about the escalating cost of our efforts there. If approved, the President's emergency supplemental appropriations request will bring the total cost of our operations in Iraq so far to over $200 billion. This amount gives me pause, but Congress must not fail to supply our troops.

When I visited Iraq last year, I met with our troops and it is clear to me that more resources, including body armor and military equipment, are needed to safeguard their lives. The bill we are considering today provides these resources. It includes important provisions to raise the military death gratuity from $12,000 to $100,000 and to increase funding for add-on vehicle armor kits, night-vision equipment, and electronic roadside-bomb jammers. It includes funding for contract linguists for the Army and additional body armor for the Army and Marines. And thanks to the passage of the Markey-Blumenauer amendment, which I supported, the bill reaffirms the U.S. commitment to the U.N. Convention Against Torture.

It also provides funding for tsunami disaster relief, $1.3 billion to train and equip Afghan security forces and the Afghan army, $92 million for Darfur and $150 million for food aid to Sudan and Liberia, and $580 million for peacekeeping programs, most of which are for Sudan. Importantly, the bill appropriates the President's request of $200 million for economic development in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

But large as it is, the bill still falls short in some respects. More funding is needed for veterans' health care and mental health care and helping members of the National Guard transition back to civilian life.

And most problematically, the House-passed rule incorporated into the bill the REAL ID Act, legislation that I opposed when the House passed it in February. I opposed it again by voting against the rule. I believe the REAL ID Act does not strengthen national security, but it does create undue difficulties for asylum seekers and excessively expands the powers of the Secretary of Homeland Security.

The bill also lacks answers to some tough questions. How many more supplemental requests like this one does the administration plan to present to Congress? What is our post-election strategy in Iraq? Can we account for the billions of dollars already spent in Iraq, and are the remaining billions of dollars in reconstruction funds being well spent? Why can't we get a solid answer about the numbers of trained and equipped Iraqi troops?

That lack of information is why I voted for an amendment proposed by Representatives TIERNEY and LEACH to create a Select Congressional Committee—based on the Truman Committee that existed during World War II—to investigate and study the awarding and carrying out of Government contracts to conduct military and reconstruction activities in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Adoption of that amendment would have improved the bill. The failure of this amendment makes it even more important that we continue to ask questions, not only to provide accountability to American taxpayers, but also to keep faith with the real needs of our troops in the field. Estimates of future U.S. costs in Iraq are mind-boggling—ranging from $400 billion to $600 billion over the next decade. That's why it's so important for us to do the job right this time, The more effectively we use these billions to train and equip Iraqi troops, the more quickly Iraqis will be able to fend for themselves, which means a ticket home for our troops.

So the bill could be improved—and I have supported amendments that would do that. But the bottom line is that we need to provide the funding necessary to keep our troops supplied and protected. With our troops stretched thin, forced to perform longer tours of duty and short of equipment and supplies, funding for our men and women in uniform must not be held hostage to disagreements about the wisdom or folly of Bush administration policies.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Emergency Supplemental Wartime Appropriations Act. It is unconscionable that the administration comes to Congress for another emergency supplemental when it has failed to account for previous emergency funding, and has failed to include the cost of the war in the FY '06 budget. How can this administration offer a budget that does not include funding for America's military operations overseas when we have more than 150,000 soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan for an indefinite period of time? Why does the administration continue to resort to supplemental funding to pay for this war instead of including the cost in the budget where it will sufficiently reflect the impact of Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom on our deficit?

Mr. Chairman, I did not support the Iraq supplemental request last year because I had serious concerns about no bid contracts in the bill. Unfortunately I was right to be concerned; just today it has been reported that Pentagon auditors have found excess billing for postwar fuel imports to Iraq by the Halliburton Company totaling more than $108 million. To add insult to injury Congress has not received any of the nine auditing reports from the Pentagon, but instead must resort to receiving this information through unofficial channels. Despite repeated requests, the administration has kept nine audits confidential from both Republican and Democratic Members of Congress. Accountability is a bipartisan issue.

This $81 billion emergency supplemental funding request for the Department of Defense's Iraq and Afghanistan operations comes on the heels of $25 billion of emergency spending already appropriated for this year. Enacting this request would mean that this Congress will have provided this administration with almost $300 billion for military and reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq. It is clear that this body is willing to live up to its end of the bargain and provide funding for our troops, but the administration is determined to continue to avoid serious questions and concerns about its spending.

Let me state outright that I opposed going to war in Iraq, but that is not my reason for opposing this supplemental request. I oppose simply because we cannot allow continued deception by the administration on every aspect of our engagement with Iraq. We were deceived with exaggeration of Hussein's weapons capabilities, and now we are being deceived about the duration of the engagement and its exact cost—on the American purse and the loss of our men and women in uniform. We have exacerbated the situation in the Middle East and put our country in a more

vulnerable position because of this war, and now we are asked to surrender the responsibilities of this body to hold the administration accountable for its actions.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. Chairman as a Member of Congress I must provide answers to my constituents about the money that Congress spends. Accountability is not a partisan issue, we must all demand answers. Our Constitution was carefully crafted so as to allow a balance of power in our Government. Congress is obligated to use appropriations and the oversight that accompanies it as a means of holding the executive branch accountable for its spending of American funds. Any attempt to usurp that balance of power is a betrayal of the moral fiber of our Government and must be taken as an attack on the integrity of this body.

The Department of Defense by law must submit reports to Congress with a detailed explanation of the spending and future costs of the Iraq war. These reports were due October of last year and at the beginning of this year. Despite this legal obligation clearly delineated in last year's Defense Appropriations Act, we have to date received no report accounting for the spending and detailing cost estimates of previous supplemental funding. Our Government should not fail to meet its legal responsibility without consequence. How can we justify more emergency appropriations without adequate assurance that what has already been appropriated has been shrewdly spent?

Sadly, we have no report directly from DoD but the Inspector General reported that almost $9 billion in reconstruction funding has been mishandled and poorly accounted for. In fact, the Inspector General suggests that thousands of ''ghost employees'' were on an unidentified ministry payroll.

In addition, DoD has stated in the past that 220,000 Iraq security forces had been trained and equipped, that number was then scaled down to 136,000. Moreover, the Pentagon has recently put into question if these troops are truly prepared for service.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, opposition to this bill is not a vote against supporting our troops. This body has proven over and over again through appropriations that it supports our troops. Congress has appropriated $20 billion for Iraq reconstruction despite the administration's claims that Iraq reconstruction would cost between $1 and $2 billion and could be financed by Iraqi oil revenues. With enactment of this bill Congress will have appropriated $300 billion for the efforts in Iraq without proper accounting of the spending of these funds. The administration claimed that we would be received as great liberators and that just a few short months after the invasion we could start withdrawing troops, but instead we have no exit strategy and over 1,500 troops have died and thousands seriously injured. I could go on and on about the disastrous miscalculations and misleading estimates. This bill is critically lacking in accountability. No more blank checks for this administration.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support the President's request to spend billions more for this protracted war in Iraq. It's time to bring our troops home.

Next week we will commemorate the second anniversary of the war and U.S. occupation. Over 1,500 American lives have been lost along with countless numbers of Iraqi civilians. Over 11,000 Americans have been wounded. The world is still not a safer place. What have we gained?

I disagree with those who claim a vote for this bill is a vote to support our troops. I stand behind these brave Americans and believe they ought to have every resource to protect them.

How is it supporting our troops to keep them in harms way without a plan to win this war?

How is it supporting our troops when we continue to allow the Bush administration to spend hundreds of millions of dollars at will on no bid Government contracts with no oversight?

How is it supporting our troops when we don't provide for mental health services for those troops traumatized in combat?

For all of these reasons, I'm voting ''no'' on the President's $81.3 billion supplemental request. It is time for a plan to bring our troops home, not give the President another blank check.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, in a few days we will mark the second anniversary of the invasion of Iraq and the start of a war that, in my judgment, did not need to be fought. At the time, the war was rationalized on intelligence estimates of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction capabilities that were wrong, and on suggestions that Iraq was somehow connected with the September 11 al-Qaeda attacks on our country that were never true.

The President now says that the war is really about the spread of democracy in the Middle East. This effort at after-the-fact justification was only made necessary because the primary rationale was so sadly lacking in fact.

The one constant in 2 years of combat has been the courage, dedication, and skill of the men and women of our Armed Forces. For more than 1,500 of our troops, service in Iraq required the ultimate sacrifice. That is a loss for which our country mourns each day.

Thousands more have been wounded—their lives, and the lives of their families changed forever by this war. Similar losses have been experienced by families in Spain, in Italy, and, of course, in Iraq.

The bill before us provides another $75 billion for military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. This enormous sum was not requested through the normal budget process, not subjected to any hearings, and not counted against our massive budget deficits. In fact, this will be the third largest appropriations measure this year.

And this $75 billion will be on top of the more than $200 billion previously appropriated, mostly by the supplemental appropriations process, for these military operations.

How much of this cost would have been unnecessary had the administration taken the time and the care to plan adequately for a war of choice? We will never know. But we do know—because these supplementals are evidence of it—that our troops were sent into combat without the equipment they would need for a protracted insurgency operation.

Our responsibility now is two-fold. First, to ensure that our troops have what they need to do their jobs effectively and as safely as possible. And second, to develop a strategy for success that will contain clear benchmarks by which the American people can measure progress toward the time when our forces will be brought home.

That strategy for success must include an aggressive plan for transferring responsibility for their country's security to the Iraqis, an improved plan for Iraq's reconstruction, and an intensification of diplomatic efforts in the region.

Other countries—the Netherlands and Italy among them—are making plans for the return of their forces. The United States does not need to adopt their timelines, but we do need clear criteria for judging certain fundamentals, including the capability and willingness of Iraqi security forces to deal with the insurgency and protect the country.

Somewhere between an open-ended U.S. commitment to Iraq and a timetable for withdrawal must be a strategy for ending our military involvement. That fact was the heart of the amendment by the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. MORAN, which this House adopted yesterday.

The President owes it to the American people and this Congress to develop such a plan, clearly describe it, and provide an assessment of how much it will cost and how long it will take.

I understand and share the frustration that will lead some to vote against this bill. We are being asked, again, to clean up a mess that many of us argued strongly against creating.

Putting aside our frustration with this administration so that we can provide our troops what they need does not, however, mean that we will forget the mistakes, miscalculations, and misrepresentations that brought us to the point where these billions are necessary.

The time is long past due for an accounting for those failures. We in Congress understand our responsibility to provide for the common defense. The administration must understand its responsibility to use the money this Congress provides effectively, and with a transparency that can withstand scrutiny.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1268, the Emergency Supplemental Wartime Appropriations Act for FY 2005. My opposition to this bill does not mean that I do not support our troops. I wholeheartedly support our troops and believe that we should fully fund our troops so that they have the necessary equipment to ensure their safety. Also incorporated into this bill is funding for Tsunami relief efforts for affected Southeast Asian countries. Having gone to Sri Lanka and personally seen the devastation, I know how important our relief efforts are for these countries.

Sadly, I'm opposing H.R. 1268 because it includes the REAL ID Act of 2005. The REAL ID Act of 2005 would deny drivers' licenses to immigrants, and slam the doors on refugees seeking asylum from persecution. The REAL, bad, ID Act has nothing to do with supporting our troops, let alone national security.

It is such a shame that Republicans had to incorporate the REAL ID Act in the Iraq Supplemental and Tsunami Relief when it has nothing to do with these two pressing issues. This is an unprecedented move on the part of the Republican leadership and this concerns me.

The REAL ID Act, H.R. 418 will not make us safer. What H.R. 418 will do is undermine several key security features that were dealt with responsibly in the Intelligence Reform legislation which was based on the 9–11 Commission Recommendations.

If the Republicans and this administration really want to strengthen national security, they should start by providing full funding for

the Department of Homeland Security, particularly the security improvements authorized in the Intelligence Reform bill. Yet the President's 2006 budget did not include funding for 10,000 new border guards, 40,000 new detention beds to hold people awaiting deportation, and 4,000 new immigration inspectors as the bill dictates. The administration merely funds 210 new border patrol agents.

As the proud daughter of immigrants, I am pleased to be serving my country as a Member of Congress. It is a great honor to be giving back to America, a country that has given my family so much. Like millions of immigrants, my parents came here in search of the American Dream and to give their children the opportunity to secure a promising future.

Again, I am outraged and saddened that Republicans are using the pretext of national security to attack immigrants who pose no real threat to our safety. America is a country built by immigrants, and we should remain a country that is open and welcoming to those seeking freedom. The U.S. has always been a beacon of hope and we must continue to guard the light of liberty for those who are oppressed or displaced.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005.

I have had the opportunity to visit Iraq twice over the last 2 years and visit with our military women and men and survey the operations of the U.S. reconstruction mission in Iraq. Never have I been more proud to be an American than when I visited our troops and observed them in the line of duty. My trips reconfirmed that we must give our troops the tools and resources they need to carry out their mission safely and effectively so they can return home soon. For this reason I am supporting the administration's supplemental request for $81 billion.

Specifically, I would like to highlight the good work of the 128th Infantry Division out of western Wisconsin, and the 1158th Transportation Company out of Tomah, Black River Falls, and Beliot. The 128th is on their first tour of duty in Iraq and is performing well, despite several equipment shortages and setbacks the unit has dealt with. The 1158th is on their second tour of duty, and is also performing above and beyond their mission. I am extraordinarily proud of their service to our country.

I am especially proud of young men like Andrew Carter. Today I had the opportunity to visit Andrew, a member of the 128th, at Walter Reed Hospital. He was recently injured in Iraq riding in a Humvee that was hit by an RPG. There is a good chance he would have been killed if it hadn't been for vehicle armor that was added to the Humvee. This supplemental appropriates more funding to continue to armor humvees, so that we can continue to save lives. One of the first things Andrew said to me was that he wants to heal quickly so he can get back to Iraq and serve with his unit. His resolve is a good reminder of the dedication of our men and women in uniform and why we need to renew our commitment to soldiers like Andrew.

While I do not endorse all of the supplemental's provisions, in the absence of a funding alternative, I support the need to provide for our troops. But we do need to start budgeting and paying for their obligations, such as the need for a new embassy in Iraq, instead of passing so-called ''emergency'' supplementals and leaving a legacy of debt for our children to inherit.

As our military effort continues, I and other members of Congress will work to ensure that our service men and women have all the resources necessary to fulfill their mission. Again, my thoughts and prayers are with those serving our country, as well as their families. America is firmly behind our troops and we're all hoping to see them home safe, secure, and soon.

May God continue to bless these United States of America.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1268, the Emergency Supplemental and Wartime Appropriations Act of 2005. This supplemental provides necessary funding for a variety of military operations and for equipment that will keep our troops safe while they fight the War on Terror. We are asking the brave men and women of our Armed Forces to put their lives on the line in defense of our freedom. In return, we should not hesitate to give them the best protective gear that we can provide.

However, I have serious concerns about providing additional non-defense and non-emergency items, such as money for facility construction and international peacekeeping efforts that are included in this supplemental. I believe that while these items may be vital to our Nation's interests, they are not true emergencies.

I commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. LEWIS, for his efforts to limit the amount of non-defense and non-emergency funding in this bill. But, far too often the Federal Government deems additional spending an ''emergency'' because it was not included in the original budget request. Any non-defense and non-emergency funding should be considered in the regular budget process.

As Members of Congress, we owe it to the American taxpayer to ensure any new request for emergency spending is thoroughly reviewed and considered in a fair manner on the House floor, especially when essential funding for our Nation's Armed Forces is at stake.

Despite my displeasure in allowing some of these additional items to be included in the supplemental, I support this legislation because Congress has a moral obligation to provide our troops with the safest equipment and most up to date training available.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this Wartime Supplemental bill but not without some hesitation after questioning why some funding is included in what should be a bill solely to support our troops and their ongoing efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I applaud my colleagues who are working to include at least some FY2006 funding for Iraq and Afghanistan in the FY2006 Budget. The Congressional Budget Office predicts that the cost of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq could reach $458 billion over the FY 2005 to 2014 period, on top of the more than $200 billion already expended. An emergency is something unforeseen, but these war costs can be estimated far in advance.

In his FY2006 budget request, President Bush did not include funds for construction of the U.S. Mission in Iraq. Instead, a week after submitting his FY2006 budget to Congress, the President sent Congress an FY2005 emergency supplemental funding request which included more than $1.3 billion for the embassy in Iraq. This hardly seems to be emergency funding since we have known we will need to operate and maintain an embassy in this country, yet there has been funding for the U.S. embassy in Iraq included in the previous two wartime supplemental bills, and again in this bill.

There is also $36 million dollars included for the construction of a new detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba in this supplemental. We have been detaining suspected terrorists at Guantanamo Bay since shortly after September 11, 2001; this is clearly a need seen far in advance and should be included in the Defense appropriations bill, not in this bill.

Additionally, this bill should not be used as a means to move controversial legislation, but the rule for this bill includes a provision to attach the text of H.R. 418. This bill was brought to the Floor of the House in February without a hearing in the Judiciary Committee, circumventing the legislative process.

H.R. 418 includes language that allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to waive any law necessary to construct barriers and roads along our borders. With over one thousand miles of border in Texas alone, I did not feel it was appropriate to allow the Secretary of Homeland Security to waive environmental regulations, undermine the competitive bidding process and threaten the ability of workers to be paid a prevailing wage on these projects.

The most important part of this issue is catching people who are here without proper documents. In December of 2004, I voted to authorize 10,000 new border patrol agents over the next 5 years, however the President's budget would fund only 210 of the 2,000 authorized border patrol agents, 143 of the 800 authorized interior investigators and only 1,920 of the 8,000 detention beds promised by the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004. H.R. 418 will not solve our immigration problem if we do not put agents on the border and increase the capacity of detention centers.

I do strongly support a number of provisions in this bill, however, which will better protect the men and women serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, better provide for the families of those who gave their lives serving in these countries, and better equip our troops.

It is time that we increase the military death gratuity benefit to $100,000 and the subsidized life insurance benefit to $400,000 for the families of soldiers who died or were killed on active duty while serving in Iraq and Afghanistan after October 2001.

We must take additional steps however, to improve benefits for the families of our troops not addressed in this bill. When families of our service members do not have access to healthcare because they cannot find a provider that has a contract with Tricare, there is a major problem We need to address the excess paperwork and low reimbursement rates in the Tricare system to ensure family members do not have to worry about their health care while their loved ones are serving our country.

In addition, after continually hearing stories from the men and women serving in Iraq about the lack of protective armor, this supplemental addresses these problems by providing

$75 million for body armor protection and $611 million for add-on vehicle armor kits which was $48 million more than requested. We also provide necessary oversight on the vehicle armor kits and several other procurement requests, while offsetting increases in funding for our troops with decreases in unnecessary foreign aid. In addition, we rightly increased the request for the family of medium-tactical vehicle, or FMTVs, to $735 million after recognizing wartime operations are causing much greater wear and stress on these vehicles than peacetime operations.

I support this bill because it provides necessary benefits and equipment to our troops, but I do not believe it should be used as a vehicle for projects that could and should be funded through the annual budget. During this time of soaring deficits, we must practice fiscal discipline; however this bill fails to do that by adding projects unrelated to the immediate wars in Iraq and Aghanistan. This bill should be solely about providing our troops with necessary resources for their mission in Iraq and Afghanistan. Anything not directly related to that does not belong in this bill.

Mrs. DAVIS of Californi. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to incorporating the unnecessary provisions of the REAL ID Act, H.R. 418, in the Emergency Supplemental Wartime Appropriations bill.

I intend to vote for the emergency -spending package today. It provides the equipment and armor our service members need on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan. H.R. 1268 also significantly improves our support of military families by increasing the death gratuity to $100,000 and improving the life insurance coverage we provide to those risking so much in the battlefield. Our service members need this bill. However, I was extremely disappointed to learn House Leadership was adding the text of H.R. 418 to the legislation. I voted against the REAL ID Act on the House floor for several reasons.

I am firmly committed to the security of the United States and the safety of all Americans. H.R. 418 does little or nothing to improve our protection. At the same time, the bill has a harmful impact on legal precedent and allows the federal government to undermine states' rights and state procedures. I also worry the REAL ID Act diverts attention from the crucial mission of securing the homeland by creating new demands on our agencies without providing the resources.

Finally, Congress passed many of the recommendations made by the 9/11 Commission. H.R. 418 is not only unnecessary and potentially harmful but also counters the hard work of the Commission and the Congress.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1268. I would like to thank the committee leadership for their efforts to provide our men and women in uniform with the equipment that they need to succeed. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have worked with my colleagues to provide much-needed force protection equipment to our troops. H.R. 1268 includes $75 million for body armor, $51 million for up-armored Humvees, and $611 million for add-on armor kits for vehicles. Having visited our wounded soldiers at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, I know that we can prevent further injuries by funding this important equipment, and I appreciate the committee's efforts in this area.

Furthermore, the bill raises the military death gratuity from $12,000 to $100,000 and increases subsidized life insurance benefits from $250,000 to $400,000 for families of service members who died or were killed on active duty, retroactive to October 7, 2001. As a cosponsor of legislation to increase the military death gratuity, I believe we must appropriately honor those that have made the ultimate sacrifice, and these benefit increases are one small gesture that Congress can make to demonstrate our respect. This legislation also demonstrates our nation's commitment to aiding those in dire need throughout the world. H.R. 1268 includes $656 million for disaster relief to the victims of the tsunami as well as essential peacekeeping and humanitarian assistance to Darfur.

However, I was deeply disappointed that the House leadership used a procedural move to attach the language of the REAL ID Act, which I opposed when the House considered it in February. The REAL ID Act would significantly alter our nation's asylum and immigration laws in the name of homeland security, though its provisions went far beyond the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. The Senate has already registered some opposition to the REAL ID provisions, and I fear that their inclusion in the House's supplemental bill will slow down the process and prevent us from sending assistance to those who need it most.

Our primary responsibility should be to assist our men and women in uniform and to fulfill our promises to the nations that were devastated in the December tsunami. I urge my colleagues to move swiftly to pass this measure and to drop any extraneous provisions that would hinder this important funding.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, my opposition to the war in Iraq and criticism of the Administration's rationale for engaging our troops in this conflict have been well documented. As U.S. casualties mount, it is my hope that the Administration will craft a plan to facilitate the timely withdrawal of our forces. For this reason, I am a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 35 which calls on the President to do so.

But in the meantime, despite these reservations, the cold, hard truth of the matter is that our soldiers are in Iraq not because they choose, but because they have been ordered there. And they are under fire every day. We must make every possible effort to ensure that our troops return home safely to their families.

The legislation before us today provides $51 million for "up-armored" Humvees which protect soldiers from anti-tank mines and armor-piercing munitions. It appropriates $611 million for add-on vehicle armor kits which provide critical protection to drivers and crews against attacks from Iraqi insurgents. Also included is $50 million for the radio jammers that are installed in our vehicles to prevent attempts by insurgents to explode remote controlled bombs and mines as our troops drive by.

This measure also provides critical increases in financial support to the families of our fallen soldiers. H.R. 1268 increases the military death gratuity from $12,000 to $100,000. This benefit provides an immediate cash payment to assist survivors of deceased members of the armed services. It also increases government subsidized life insurance benefits from $250,000 to $400,000.

The legislation also provides crucial assistance for emergency situations overseas. It would give $656 million in direct assistance for tsunami disaster relief for countries devastated by the December 26, 2004 earthquake and tsunami. In addition, $92 million in emergency funds are provided to respond to the humanitarian crisis in the Darfur region of Sudan where egregious ethnic cleansing has been occurring. Tens of thousands of men, women, and children have been killed during the violence and thousands more die every month in camps housing the nearly 2 million people who have fled their homes. $150 million in emergency food aid, mostly for Sudan and war-ravaged Liberia, was included in committee.

With a recent glimmer of hope and improved chances for a resolution in the Middle East, the bill provides $200 million for the West Bank and Gaza to help the forces for peace seize this opportunity. This includes $50 million for road and water infrastructure improvements, $50 million to improve the flow of people and goods into Israel, $24 million for trade promotion and capacity building, $20 million for schools and community centers, $16 million for democracy and rule of law programs, $15 million for agriculture production and marketing, and $13 million for health care.

Mr. Chairman, while I continue to have grave concerns about the President's war in Iraq, on balance this bill provides funds that will help protect our men and women under fire, gives additional help to the families of those who will never return home, helps consolidate the tentative gains in Israel and the Palestinian areas, and aids the peoples of other nations who face dire crises abroad. For these reasons, I will cast my vote in favor of the measure.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly voted against this supplemental, not because there aren't many important items included in it, but because a "no" vote is one of the few things in my power to signal my deep opposition to the administration's policy in Iraq. At its core, this bill gives too much money to the wrong people to do the wrong thing. As I made clear from the beginning of this war the administration continues to have no plan for success in Iraq. They have no blueprint for winning the peace and have not even adequately protected our troops in harm's way.

I fully support the assistance to the tsunami-affected region, and hope it will be used wisely for recovery, reconstruction, and mitigation of future disasters. While we cannot prevent natural events such as floods, mudslides, volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, or tsunamis, we can reduce or mitigate their devastating impacts by helping communities to rebuild in safer locations, construct sturdier dwellings, and enhance natural ecosystems that mitigate the impact of these natural disasters.

I am pleased to see that there is funding to provide additional armor for our troops and vehicles in Iraq. I hope that they will use the funding provided by Congress to give our troops the protection that they need.

An amendment that I offered with Mr. MARKEY to prohibit funds for torture and for sending detainees to countries that practice torture passed. The use of torture and rendition is morally reprehensible, puts Americans at risk, is a poor way to obtain reliable information in our fight against terrorism, and sets back the cause of democracy. This is the very least that we can do as Congress continues to abdicate its responsibility to investigate this horrific aspect of administration policy.

Regardless of the merits, everyone should be troubled by the use of supplemental legislation to pay for regular military action in Iraq and Afghanistan. Funding these operations outside of the regular budgeting process limits our ability for effective oversight and distorts the true budget picture.

The Rules Committee burdened this legislation with all the flaws of H.R. 418, the ''Real ID Act,'' which, among other things, placed the entire 7,514 mile border completely outside all legal protections. This is perhaps the most damaging single precedent since I've been in Congress.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1268, the War Supplemental Appropriations bill for FY 2005, which will provide funding for military operations and reconstruction activities in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as important funds for tsunami relief and recovery.

The bill before us includes important changes made by the Appropriations Committee to the President's original budget request. These changes are essential to providing our servicemen and women the equipment and support they need to help keep them safe as they fulfill their important mission. Committed to the fact that the well-being of our troops is our highest priority, the Appropriations Committee increased funding by 69 percent more than requested for add-on vehicle armor kits; $401 million more, or twice the amount requested, for new trucks; and $50 million in unrequested funds for radio jammers to disrupt attempts by Iraqi insurgents to explode remote controlled bombs and mines.

The bill also includes important provisions to increase the military death gratuity from $12,000 to $100,000 and to provide subsidized life insurance benefits from $250,000 to $400,000 for families of soldiers who die or are killed on active duty, and we make these important provisions retroactive to the beginning of military operations on October 7, 2001. No amount can compensate for the death of a loved one, but an increase in these benefits that can help a family cope with the financial impact of a combat death is long overdue.

When the Appropriations Committee met, I strongly supported the Jackson amendment to add $150 million in food aid for Sudan, and I am pleased we have acted again today to add $100 million in additional disaster assistance. The United States has an obligation and opportunity to assist this troubled country, and I believe this additional funding sets an important example for the United Nations and other countries that still need to respond to the crisis in Sudan.

I have been very concerned about the lack of accountability by the Defense Department and the Administration as we provide them with enormous, although necessary, sums of money. While there has been some improvement, I am troubled that the Department of Defense has not submitted the required biannual report on the military operations of the armed forces and on the reconstruction activities administered by DOD in Iraq and Afghanistan. I know that Chairman JERRY LEWIS, Defense Appropriations Chairman BILL YOUNG and ranking members DAVID OBEY and JOHN MURTHA, as well as my colleagues on the full committee, have expressed similar concerns about DOD's lack of responsiveness.

I'm also troubled that the Administration continues to request emergency supplemental funds for military operations. We have been engaged in Afghanistan for over three years, and nearly three years have gone by since we invaded Iraq. Therefore, it is no surprise that funds are needed to support our servicemen and women overseas. The Administration should be building these costs into their regular budget submissions.

I am also disappointed that the Republican leadership failed to make in order an important amendment by Representatives HOOLEY and DELAURO to expand veterans' health care and mental health care. Our returning troops deserve whatever help they need to successfully transition to civilian life.

Finally, I am particularly angry that the Republican leadership is using this bill as a vehicle to move an unrelated piece of legislation, the Sensenbrenner ''Real ID'' immigration bill. The important bill before us provides critical resources for our servicemen and women overseas and badly needed disaster relief. It should not be used by the Republican leadership to fulfill their political promises. I hope the Senate will oppose this legislative gambit and confine the bill to address the serious needs it is intended to address.

However, in spite of my concerns, I believe it is our responsibility to provide our servicemen and women the resources necessary for them to fulfill their mission and come home safely. Protecting our troops, who are sacrificing so much on our behalf, and providing for their families, will always be my first priority, and that is why I am supporting this bill today.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this $82 billion ''emergency'' supplemental bill. I also am opposed to the manner in which the REAL ID Act, H.R. 418, was attached to the Rule, thereby stealthily making the establishment of a national ID part of an ''emergency'' bill to which it is completely unrelated. Once again we see controversial bills being hidden inside another bill so that they are automatically passed where they otherwise might face opposition. I do not believe this is a wise practice.

This ''emergency'' supplemental is the second largest supplemental appropriations bill in United States history, second only to the one last year. The funds will be considered ''emergency'' funds so Congress can ignore spending caps that would require the billions in new spending to be offset by reducing spending elsewhere.

We are told that this is emergency spending, and that we therefore must not question this enormous expenditure. Does an emergency require sending billions of American taxpayers' dollars overseas as foreign aid an emergency? This bill is filled with foreign aid spending. If we pass this ill-conceived legislation, we will spend $656 million for tsunami relief; $94 million for Darfur, Sudan; $150 million for food aid, most to Liberia and Sudan; $580 million for ''peacekeeping'' overseas; $582 million to build a new American embassy in Iraq; $76 million to build a new airport in Kuwait (one of the wealthiest countries on earth); $257 million for counter drug efforts in Afghanistan; $372 million for health, reconstruction, and alternative development programs to help farmers stop raising poppy; $200 million in economic aid for the Palestinians; $150 million for Pakistan (run by an unelected dictator); $200 million for Jordan; $34 million for Ukraine.

Does anyone really believe that all this foreign aid is ''emergency'' spending? Or is it just an opportunity for some off-budget spending? Just the above foreign aid equals almost $3.5 billion. Does anyone believe that sending this much money abroad as international welfare is a good thing for our economy?

Is there a baseball emergency? There must be, because this ''emergency'' supplemental contains a provision to allow Washington, D.C. to use taxpayer money to build a baseball stadium.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is almost unimaginably expensive. It is our out-of-control spending that really is the greatest threat to the United States and our way of life. I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant support for the $81.1 billion emergency supplemental funding bill we are considering today. The only reason I am voting for the bill before us today is because it provides much needed equipment for our forces in theater, increases death gratuity to $100,000 for families of soldiers who have died or were killed on active duty. My support for this measure is tepid at best.

What troubles me the most about this bill are two key concerns: One, there are no mechanisms for tracking if the money is properly spent. There is simply no mechanism for improving accountability of how taxpayers' dollars are spent. The Defense Department wants to take the money and provide little detail to Congress on how these dollars are being used or abused. The American people have a right to know how these dollars are spent. And, two, by increasing investments in our war and defense efforts, we further constrain budgetary resources for investments in education, highways, community development, first responders, health care, public health and more. What is at stake here is the very welfare of our states and communities, who find themselves financially strapped because of the economic policies of this administration. Our domestic economy cannot continue to pursue this trend.

Despite my many misgivings over this spending bill, I will vote for its passage. We in Congress must call on the Defense Department to provide better accountability for the spending decisions it makes.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, today I voted in support of the Fiscal Year 2005 Iraq and Tsunami Relief Supplemental.

This decision was difficult for me. I strongly opposed the REAL ID Act of 2005. The REAL ID Act has no place on a bill to fund support for our military families and tsunami victims. In fact, I voted against H.R. 418 when it was considered by the U.S. House of Representatives on February 10, 2005. This type of political game was vicious attempt to portray those who believe REAL ID is a bad policy as unpatriotic, and I refuse to make servicemembers and their families' losers of that game.

I voted for this spending bill because it includes equipment and services that our troops and their families need desperately. It includes additional funds for health care services, mental health for veterans, active duty servicemembers and their families, and financial assistance to help members of the National Guard transition back into civilian life. This legislation also provides an increase in the amount of life insurance for troops, an increase in the death benefit for families of fallen military members, and provides additional funding so our troops have the armored

humvees and personal protection they need while serving in Iraq.

With the knowledge we have today about the lack of protective equipment and inability of our system to serve military families, I do not believe that withholding funds from our military families and tsunami victims is the right way to solve the predicament the Bush Administration has created. I remain very concerned about the Bush Administration's lack of a clear exit strategy in Iraq and I will continue to fight for real immigration reform and for a clear plan so our troops can come home and democracy can thrive in an Iraq run by Iraqis.

The CHAIRMAN. There are no further amendments in order. The Clerk will report the last three lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005''.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1268) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 151, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MS. HOOLEY

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. HOOLEY. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. HOOLEY moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1268, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

THE MILITARY HEALTH CARE AND JOB RETRAINING TRANSITIONAL BENEFITS AMENDMENT

On page 6, line 7, after the dollar figure, insert ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

On page 35, line 10, after the dollar figure, insert ''(increased by $100,000,000)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a motion to recommit that would provide $100 million in health and $50 million in job training transitional assistance to help active duty forces make the transition to the veterans benefits system.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and I have been working on this issue together and trying to add $1.3 billion for VA health care and reintegration services. While our amendment was ruled not in order, we now have a chance to ensure that this supplemental includes at least some funding for vital health and employment services.

America is currently asking more of its all-volunteer military force than it ever has before. Yet even as America prepares to continue its large and prolonged military campaign in Iraq, it has done very little to provide for the veterans of this war. Our obligation to support our troops does not end when they leave Iraq.

But how are we supposed to provide adequate health care to these new veterans when we did not even meet the needs of our current veterans? The fiscal year 2005 Omnibus was $1.3 billion short in the amount that then Secretary Principi, as well as the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, stated was needed to just maintain the current level of veterans health care.

We also need to make sure that our returning soldiers have the readjustment assistance they need, particularly for members of the Guard and Reserve. You have to understand, these members do not go back to a base, they go back to their home State and then are scattered throughout that State. Members of the National Guard returning home face immense challenges in transitioning out of active duty deployment and back to civilian life. While the State Guard offices are working to provide these returning soldiers with important information regarding their health care, employment assistance and other transitional services, they simply do not have the money they need to complete the education and counseling necessary for a smooth transition back to civilian life. I think our returning soldiers deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to recommit and keep our promise to our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply congratulate the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) for her motion. I would hope that every Member supports it. I think that the contents of it are important. In fact, we need to go further. We have increased in this bill insurance benefits for servicemen and women who die up to $400,000, but servicemen and women who come back from combat who are brain damaged, who have lost their sight, who have lost their arms, who have lost their legs, they come back to really very little assistance from Uncle Sam.

In addition to what the gentlewoman is talking about, we also need to be looking at the huge hole that still exists in the earning power of those individuals, and we need to do a whole lot more than we are doing today.

I think the Hooley amendment is a great start, and I would urge every Member of the House to vote for it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit largely because I believe on both sides of the aisle the body recognizes that the reason for this supplemental is to provide as quickly as possible money flows in support of our troops.

This is a supplemental dealing with our challenges in the Middle East especially. It is a supplemental dealing with the crises that have resulted from the tsunami. But, in the meantime, the gentlewoman is suggesting that we should recommit this bill to add $150 million. The best thing that we can do for our troops is to move this bill very quickly and send it on its way for a conference with the Senate. There is absolutely no question that to have a recommittal motion be successful that would add $150 million to an $82 billion package, the vast percentage of which is in support of our troops, at best is a technical exercise.

□ 1130

To recommit for the sake of recommitting is not a reflection of how seriously we are taking the challenge we have of supporting our troops. So I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit, and I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to recognize that we must move forward with this supplemental.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 229, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

AYES—200

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—229

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cox
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Baird
Cubin
Roybal-Allard
Smith (NJ)
Sweeney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1153

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 43, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—388

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)

Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—43

Abercrombie
Baldwin
Blumenauer
Capuano
Clay
Coble
Davis (IL)
Duncan
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Holt
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kucinich
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Maloney
Markey
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Miller, George
Owens
Pallone
Paul
Payne
Rangel
Sanders
Schakowsky
Serrano
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Velázquez
Waters
Weiner
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—3

Baird
Cubin
Sweeney

□ 1201

Mrs. JONES of Ohio changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 151, the text of H.R. 418, as passed by the House, will be appended to the engrossment of H.R. 1268.

(For text of H.R. 418, see prior proceedings of the House of February 10, 2005, at Page H536.)

THANKING STAFF AND MEMBERS FOR ASSISTANCE ON H.R. 1268

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the Chair giving me a moment to express my deepest appreciation to the entire House for the way they handled the discussion on the bill that has just been passed.

I especially want to express my appreciation for the fabulous staff work on both sides of the aisle who allowed us to move this bill as expeditiously as we have.

The bill involves sizeable amounts of money designed essentially to support our troops, wherever they may be, but especially in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also express my deep appreciation to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who cooperated every step of the way, a demonstration that we do not have to agree on everything; but in terms of supporting our troops we are in agreement. I very much appreciate the work of the House, as well as the committee.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later in the day.

AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 EXTENDING LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND FINANCING RATE

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1270) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1270

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND FINANCING RATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 4081(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate) is amended by striking ''April 1, 2005'' and inserting ''October 1, 2005''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHOCOLA. 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1270, which would extend financing for the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund. The Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund is financed with an excise tax of 0.1 cent per gallon imposed on the sale of gasoline, diesel, and other motor fuels. This tax is set to expire on March 31, 2005.

This bill would extend the trust fund's financing through September 30, 2005, the same date that the other motor fuels excise taxes expire. The administration supports the extension of this financing.

Monies appropriated from the leaking underground storage tank trust fund are used for detention, prevention, and cleanup of leaking underground storage tanks. Leaking tanks can contaminate groundwater that is ultimately used for drinking.

Since this program began in 1984, the program closed nearly 1.6 million tanks and reduced the severity of leaks from underground storage tank systems that remain in service. Approximately 675,000 tanks remain in service and are subject to regulations. However, there remains a backlog of over 100,000 sites that require remedial action. Extending the tax for 6 months will allow us time to discuss possible reforms to the program while not allowing for the disruption of the collection of the tax.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how long has it been since we have really had any fun around here, and would it not be a lot better if we just cut out this leaking underground storage tank stuff; we are talking about a LUST bill. I thought we might as well get that on the record and endure whatever the smirks are, because it is really an important bill. It is not controversial. It is a straightforward extension for 6 months, and I got a smile from Mr. Speaker.

It is a 0.1 cent per gallon excise tax. It will go to clean up drinking water and the environment. I appreciate the support of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) for this bill and look forward to its passage.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House is continuing the funding mechanism for the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Fund or LUST fund.

Across this country there are hundreds of thousands of leaking underground storage tanks.

Many, if not most, of these have MTBE in them and have been linked to the contamination of groundwater in thousands of communities.

So it is important that we continue funding for the Trust Fund that helps communities get these messes cleaned up where responsible parties can't be found.

But I agree with my colleagues who, noting the needs that are out there, have called for a longer extension of this funding mechanism.

Clearly, we have to give states more support and the ability to know that the LUST fund will back up their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is also important to note how inadequate the efforts of this Administration have been in addressing the problem of leaking tanks.

For example, the LUST fund could take in approximately $200 million in revenues this year alone.

And yet the Administration proposes to spend only slightly more than a third of that to address the problems caused by these leaking tanks.

This is a completely inadequate response to addressing the 136,000 spills across the country.

We should be spending more to help these communities clean up.

We should also be enacting common sense reforms like requiring secondary containment for underground storage tanks.

We should be requiring more frequent inspections of all underground tanks.

And we shouldn't be taking steps like those in the energy bill that would weaken "polluter pay" laws.

The energy bill as currently drafted weakens EPA's ability to recover the money they spend to clean up sites.

We have to continue holding polluters accountable for the damage they cause.

So while I will support this bill, I believe we should be doing much more.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of cleanup of leaking underground storage tanks and this bill to extend part of the funding source for this program. However, I am concerned that this resolution only guarantees this funding source through October 1, 2005.

Leaking gasoline tanks are a major problem in this country. There are currently 136,000 leaking tanks across the country. More than 36,000 of these are in California—more than 100 currently leaking in my district alone. Seventy-five percent of these leaking tanks could release MTBE into our groundwater supplies. This problem is not going away.

The EPA estimates that over the next 10 years 120,000 more tanks could leak. That means 120,000 more communities polluted—harming their soil and water and public health and leaving communities with the cleanup bill.

To put it in perspective, cleanup from MTBE alone could cost at least $28 billion.

So while I support this legislation, the cleanup problem is much bigger than a 6 month extension—our communities and states deserve a real funding commitment.

Ironically, while we are here today talking about ensuring funding for 6 months, the current energy bill, like last session's bill, threatens to gut the program.

Last year language was inserted in the energy bill which would largely gut this program which our communities and water providers depend on.

Changes to this program in the energy bill restrict the Environmental Protection Agency from getting money for cleanups from polluters—therefore rewarding polluters at the expense of working families, communities and states.

Taxpayers should not shoulder the burden of cleanup costs.

Language in the energy bill also fails to require that tanks be inspected every 3 years as recommended by the General Accounting Office. In fact, under the energy bill, it could be six years before these tanks are inspected.

Adopting more stringent inspection requirements is a common sense proposal, one that will save taxpayers money and prevent unnecessary threats to our water supplies.

Finally, the energy bill fails to require secondary containment.

More than 20 states already require at least secondary containment because these states recognize the savings to taxpayers, water providers and redevelopers from preventing contaminated soil and water.

So while we are here today committing ourselves to a 6 month funding of the program, we are also preparing to unnecessarily gut important principles.

This program helps protect the health and water security of my constituents.

Changes to this program should not be done haphazardly in the energy bill. We owe it to our constituents and communities who deal with leaking tanks to not shove random provisions into legislation.

Mr. Speaker I support this bill and urge my colleagues to support it to guarantee at least some funding for cleanup, but I also urge my colleagues to seriously reject the changes to the Leaking Underground Storage Tank program included in the energy bill.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of H.R. 1270, legislation to extend, for 6 months, the tax that finances the Leaking Underground Storage Tank, LUST, Trust Fund.

As chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials, I have spent the last couple of Congresses getting familiar with the LUST program. I think the goal behind this program—and its tax—is important. The LUST program, though well intentioned, is unable to realize its full potential because of the way Congress operates it.

Congress first initiated this tax in 1986 primarily through a 0.1 cent-per-gallon motor fuels tax. The LUST tax generated roughly $150 million per year over a 9-year period, and more than $1.6 billion was collected for the fund before the taxing authority expired in December 1995. Congress reinstated the LUST tax through the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, Public Law 105–34, from October 1, 1997, through March 31, 2005. In fiscal year 2004, the LUST tax generated $192.9 million in revenues, and the fund earned $66.7 million in interest on an accrual basis. At the end of 2004, the fund's net assets were $2.33 billion.

This is all well and good, but Congress has had a history of making annual appropriations in an amount that is close to the amount of interest that the LUST Trust Fund earns each year. In fact, the appropriated amount is much less than the annual revenues created each year by this tax. The LUST Trust Fund has been used by Presidents and Members of Congress in both parties to balance their books rather than protect and clean up groundwater pollution that was released from these tanks.

Mr. Speaker, myopic views of LUST have helped to create the program deficits facing LUST and extending the LUST tax cannot be thoughtfully considered unless it is looked at as a whole. Several experts, including the Government Accountability Office, have testified before the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials that the LUST Trust Fund should be spent in greater quantity and that these amounts should help encourage inspection requirements, operator training, and more cleanup. These are important LUST program reforms that must be secured in order to make the justification of a LUST Trust Fund, and the tax that finances it, solid public policy arguments.

Again, while I am not going to oppose this bill on this day, it is essential that prior to another extension of the LUST tax that, at a minimum, reform to the LUST program be coupled with any extension of the tax. These reforms have passed the House on two occasions last year and are currently contained in the energy bill discussion draft currently before the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I am hopeful we can get these reforms enacted soon.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1270.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXPRESSING GRAVE CONCERN OF CONGRESS REGARDING PASSAGE OF ANTI-SECESSION LAW BY NATIONAL PEOPLE'S CONGRESS OF PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the recent passage of the anti-secession law by the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 98

Whereas on December 9, 2003, President George W. Bush stated it is the policy of the United States to "oppose any unilateral decision, by either China or Taiwan, to change the status quo";

Whereas in the past few years, the Government of the United States has urged both Taiwan and the People's Republic of China to maintain restraint;

Whereas the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China passed its anti-secession law on March 14, 2005, which constitutes a unilateral change to the status quo in the Taiwan Strait;

Whereas the passage of China's anti-secession law escalates tensions between Taiwan and the People's Republic of China and is an impediment to cross-strait dialogue;

Whereas the purpose of China's anti-secession law is to create a legal framework for possible use of force against Taiwan and mandates Chinese military action under certain circumstances, including when "possibilities for a peaceful reunification should be completely exhausted";

Whereas the Department of Defense's Report on the Military Power of the People's Republic of China for Fiscal Year 2004 documents that, as of 2003, the Government of the People's Republic of China had deployed approximately 500 short-range ballistic missiles against Taiwan;

Whereas the escalating arms buildup of missiles and other offensive weapons by the People's Republic of China in areas adjacent to the Taiwan Strait is a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area;

Whereas given the recent positive developments in cross-strait relations, including the

Lunar New Year charter flights and new proposals for cross-strait exchanges, it is particularly unfortunate that the National People's Congress adopted this legislation;

Whereas since its enactment in 1979, the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.), which codified in law the basis for continued commercial, cultural, and other relations between the people of the United States and the people of Taiwan, has been instrumental in maintaining peace, security, and stability in the Taiwan Strait;

Whereas section 2(b)(2) of the Taiwan Relations Act declares that ''peace and stability in the area are in the political, security, and economic interests of the United States, and are matters of international concern'';

Whereas, at the time the Taiwan Relations Act was enacted into law, section 2(b)(3) of such Act made clear that the United States decision to establish diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China rested upon the expectation that the future of Taiwan would be determined by peaceful means;

Whereas section 2(b)(4) of the Taiwan Relations Act declares it the policy of the United States ''to consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means, including by boycotts or embargoes, a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States'';

Whereas section 2(b)(6) of the Taiwan Relations Act declares it the policy of the United States ''to maintain the capacity of the United States to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people on Taiwan''; and

Whereas any attempt to determine Taiwan's future by other than peaceful means and other than with the express consent of the people of Taiwan would be considered of grave concern to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the anti-secession law of the People's Republic of China provides a legal justification for the use of force against Taiwan, altering the status quo in the region, and thus is of grave concern to the United States;

(2) the President of the United States should direct all appropriate officials of the United States Government to reflect the grave concern with which the United States views the passage of China's anti-secession law in particular, and the growing Chinese military threats to Taiwan in general, to their counterpart officials in the Government of the People's Republic of China;

(3) the Government of the United States should reaffirm its policy that the future of Taiwan should be resolved by peaceful means and with the consent of the people of Taiwan; and

(4) the Government of the United States should continue to encourage dialogue between Taiwan and the People's Republic of China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. 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 concurrent resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice strong support for a resolution authored by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) which expresses the grave concern of the Congress over the adoption by the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China on March 14 of an anti-secession law. Beijing's ill-advised action constitutes not only a unilateral change in the current status quo in the Taiwan Strait, but also provides a legal framework for military action against Taiwan when ''possibilities for a peaceful reunification have been completely exhausted.''

Adoption of this law followed upon by a threat, made in China's Defense Policy White Paper, released on December 17, 2004, to ''crush'' any attempt to split Taiwan from China, noting its ''sacred responsibility'' of the People's Liberation Army to stop any attempt at splitting the country.

We are all aware as to how seriously the PLA takes its ''sacred responsibility'' to further the goals dictated by the Communist regime in Beijing. When the PLA was presented with a clear choice between serving the people or obeying the orders of the leaders of the Communist party on June 4, 1989, a day of infamy, the tanks rolled into Tiananmen Square and Chinese blood was spilled by fellow Chinese.

Thus, we should not assume that the attempt in the anti-secession law to provide a legal justification for the use of force against the people of Taiwan is an idle threat. History shows that this is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush, in welcoming the Chinese Premier to Washington on December 9, 2003, made Chinese policy crystal clear with regard to this issue. President Bush stated, ''We oppose any unilateral decision by either China or Taiwan to change the status quo.'' At the time the President spoke firmly concerning attempts by Taiwan's President to unilaterally change the status quo.

Well, what is good for the goose is good for the gander. Beijing's unilateral attempt to change the status quo must be vigorously opposed by both the administration and the Congress. The Congress, in particular, is obliged, under commitments made in the Taiwan Relations Act, not to remain silent when confronted by this challenge from Beijing. The Taiwan Relations Act clearly and unequivocally states: ''It is the policy of the United States to consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States.''

Beijing's new anti-secession law clearly qualifies as such an effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means and thus represents a grave concern to the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, Beijing's reckless action comes at a time when there were signs of renewed thawing in the cross-strait relations which gave some cause for optimism over the ultimate peaceful resolution of this issue.

The commencement of the Lunar New Year's holiday of cross-strait charter flights, the continued movement of Taiwanese to the mainland, increasing cross-strait commercial investment, and the arrival of mainland representatives in Taipei to attend the funeral of a leading negotiator for Taiwan on cross-strait issues were all extremely positive signs.

It is unfortunate, however, that Beijing has chosen once again to be its own worst enemy by dissipating all the goodwill generated through such gestures by stubbornly pursuing this provocative and ill-timed measure.

Contrary to the observation of Chairman Mao, cross-strait issues will never be solved by resorting to the barrel of a gun.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and first I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for introducing this important and timely resolution and for moving it so expeditiously to the floor. I also want to express my gratitude for his support to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). I am proud to be the lead Democratic sponsor of this important measure.

Mr. Speaker, I just returned from visiting both China and Taiwan a few weeks ago. I cautioned in both places prudence, moderation, stability, no precipitous action, no turmoil. The lives of the people of Taiwan and the People's Republic of China are increasingly intertwined. More than half a million Taiwanese now live on the mainland. Nonstop charter flights between Taiwan and the mainland were launched during the Lunar New Year, and both sides are actively exploring new options for a variety of exchanges across the Taiwan Strait.

This is the main reason why the Chinese Government's decision to move forward with the so-called anti-secession law is so profoundly unfortunate. By codifying the potential use of force against Taiwan, Beijing has thrown a bucket of ice water on the warming relations that had been developing between the people of China and Taiwan.

The Chinese Government should be using their best and brightest young leaders to build new bridges between the people of China and Taiwan. Instead, the government has bowed to pressure from hard-line elements in the Chinese military to ratchet up the pressure on Taipei.

Passage of this law, Mr. Speaker, is a wasted opportunity. The anti-secession

law mandates military action against Taiwan when ''the possibilities for a peaceful reunification would be completely exhausted.'' In other words, whenever Beijing decides there is no longer any point in talking to Taipei, the new anti-secession law requires the Chinese military to take action against Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of the anti-secession law is a threatening move by Beijing which will undoubtedly heighten tensions across the Taiwan Strait. It will decrease the chance that either side will be willing to resolve differences peacefully. The law is reprehensible, and it should be reconsidered by the National People's Congress in Beijing.

Mr. Speaker, both Taipei and Beijing have a paramount responsibility to maintain restraint and to avoid any action which could increase tensions across the Taiwan straits. With passage of this law, Beijing has failed this critically important duty, and it is my profound hope that China's top leaders will find a way to repair the damage that the law's adoption has caused.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

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

□ 1215

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary, and cochair of the House Taiwan Caucus.

Mr. CHABOT. I very much thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to first, Mr. Speaker, commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), chairman of the full committee, for bringing this timely and important resolution to the floor. The so-called anti-secession legislation adopted by the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China will unilaterally change the status quo in the Taiwan Strait, in direct contradiction of the policy of the United States Government.

The Taiwan Relations Act, enacted by this Congress in 1979, declares that peace and stability in the Taiwan Strait are in the political, security and economic interests of the United States. The legislation adopted by the Chinese People's Congress which states that China ''shall employ nonpeaceful means'' in the event of Taiwan's moving toward independence clearly threatens that peace and stability.

The people of Taiwan want peace. Taiwan's democratically elected President, Chen Shui-bian, whom I have met with many times, has repeatedly shown his determination to maintaining peace, stability and the status quo across the Taiwan Strait, and the Beijing dictatorship has responded by pointing over 600 missiles at Taiwan, and now by enacting a threatening anti-secession law.

The future of Taiwan should be determined by the people of Taiwan. Any effort by the Communist leadership in the People's Republic of China to deny a free people in Taiwan a safe, prosperous and democratic future should be condemned.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important issue. I am very pleased that it is being taken up by the Congress here today. It deserves the utmost attention. I want to thank again the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for bringing this forward. I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for whom I have great respect and has been a leader in this area for many years and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) as well.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to thank the committee members and the staff, especially Dennis Halpin, Sarah Tillemann and Peter Yeo, for their work on this resolution and Dan Freeman, who is our counsel and parliamentarian, for his work, and his expertise on this and so many other resolutions. We are so grateful for them.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my distress over anti-secession legislation recently passed by the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China (PRC). The new law reaffirms the PRC's sovereignty over Taiwan and threatens peaceful and non-peaceful means to defend its "One China" policy. In passing this law, the PRC imperils the status quo and durability of the delicate cross-strait truce that has been established.

The United States has consistently maintained that differences between Taipei and Beijing should be resolved diplomatically and with the full involvement of the people of Taiwan and China. I subscribe to this position and the view that the status quo must be preserved until a peaceful resolution can be achieved. The anti-secession law disturbs the status quo and creates and unnecessarily tense situation that may lead to an escalation of hostilities.

While the anti-secession law may have originated as a reaction to political rhetoric in Taiwan, the Taiwanese government supports the status quo, further obviating the need for the anti-cession law. The new law also seems at odds with recent positive developments between China and Taiwan that seem to signal closer relations. For example, direct flights between Taiwan and mainland China were initiated during the Chinese New Year holidays and two senior representatives from the People's Republic of China attended the memorial services for Koo Chen-fu who was instrumental in moving cross-strait dialogue forward 10 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, in light of these positive events, it is unfortunate that the PRC has chosen to take a step backwards in the effort to improve cross-strait relations. The anti-secession law has made it necessary for us today to pass this resolution, which expresses the Congress' grave concern that China is establishing legal justification for the use of force against Taiwan. The resolution rightly urges U.S. officials, through appropriate diplomatic channels, to express our nation's grave concern to the PRC, and it reaffirms U.S. support for fostering cross-strait dialogue in an effort to resolve this international issue peacefully.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 98, which expresses the concern of the U.S. House of Representatives regarding China's Anti-Secession Law. This misguided law effectively authorizes use of military force against Taiwan if Taiwan moves toward formal independence.

I believe the anti-secession law is a dangerous and unnecessary escalation of tensions between China and Taiwan. The future of Taiwan should be resolved by peaceful means and with the consent of the people of Taiwan. The United States should continue to encourage dialogue between Taiwan and China. In today's world, we should strive to ensure peace, liberty and democracy. I am proud to join my colleagues in support of this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 98.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXPRESSING CONCERN REGARDING VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS BY SYRIA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the continuing gross violations of human rights and civil liberties of the Syrian and Lebanese people by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 18

Whereas the Syrian Arab Republic is governed by an authoritarian regime which continues to commit serious human rights abuses, including the use of torture and arbitrary arrest and detention;

Whereas the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2004 states that Syria's ''human rights record remained poor, and the Government continued to commit numerous, serious abuses'', the government ''significantly restricts freedom of speech and of the press'', ''freedom of assembly does not exist under the law'', and ''the Government restricted freedom of association'';

Whereas Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that ''Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression. This right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.'';

Whereas Article 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that ''Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.'';

Whereas Syria's September 2001 press law permits the government to arbitrarily deny or revoke publishing licenses for vague reasons and compels media to submit all material to government censors;

Whereas Syrian authorities have arrested, or, in the case of foreigners, expelled journalists for writing critically about Syria's policies;

Whereas Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International have reported that the security forces of Syria are targeting emerging Syrian human rights organizations, as well as their attorneys, in an apparent attempt to intimidate those organizations;

Whereas, on March 8, 2004, Syrian security forces arrested more than 30 human rights dissidents and civilians at a sit-in in front of the parliament;

Whereas a United States diplomat who was watching the peaceful demonstrations was also arrested and held for an hour in what the United States called an unacceptable violation of diplomatic practice and which the United States protested ''in the strongest terms'';

Whereas Article 7 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that ''All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law.'';

Whereas the criminal law of Syria provides for reduced sentences in cases of ''honor'' killings, and spousal rape is not illegal;

Whereas the infringement by Syria on human rights and civil liberties extends into the Lebanese Republic, which it continues to occupy in violation of United Nations Security Council resolutions;

Whereas hundreds of Lebanese civilians are believed to have been killed or ''disappeared'' by Syrian occupation forces or its secret police;

Whereas hundreds of Kurdish civilians were injured or killed in clashes with the Syrian authorities in March 2004 in Qamishli, a city in northeastern Syria, and Syrian security forces arrested and tortured Syrian Kurdish civilians from the town of Al-Malikiyah on January 9, 2005;

Whereas Syrian authorities continue their harassment of Aktham Naisse, Syria's leading human rights activist, President, and founding member of the Committees for the Defense of Democratic Liberties and Human Rights in Syria, and the 2005 winner of the Martin Ennals Award for Human Rights Defenders, one of the most prestigious awards in the global human rights community, by charging him with spreading false information, forming an underground association with links to international human rights groups, and opposing the Baath Party;

Whereas, in November 2004, upon his release from prison, Kamal Labwani, a 48-year-old physician in Syria, stated that there are at least 400 political prisoners in Syria, 100 of whom have been jailed for at least 20 years;

Whereas Mr. Labwani urged ''all defenders of freedom and human rights, whether individuals, associations, or bodies, or international, Arab, or local organizations to participate with us in this campaign to call for the immediate release of all political prisoners and detainees of opinion and conscience'';

Whereas, in November 2004, Syrian journalist Louai Hussein was banned from writing by the Syrian Interior Ministry's political security office;

Whereas, in November 2004, the arrest in Germany of a Syrian embassy official for espionage and issuing threats against the Syrian opposition in Europe is evidence of a campaign reportedly launched by Syrian dictator Bashar Assad, aimed at intimidating the regime's opposition abroad;

Whereas thousands of Syrian citizens, along with their families, children, and grandchildren, live outside their country in forced exile, solely because of their political views, or because of the views of members of their families; and

Whereas human rights and democracy groups in Syria have sponsored a petition urging greater freedoms and the release of all political prisoners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) condemns the consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic;

(2) calls on the international community to adopt a resolution at the upcoming session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights which details the dismal human rights record of Syria;

(3) expresses its support for the people of Syria in their daily struggle for freedom, respect for human rights and civil liberties, democratic self-governance, and the establishment of the rule of law;

(4) encourages the President and the Secretary of State to reach out to dissidents, human rights activists, and the nonviolent democratic opposition in Syria, and to assist them in their efforts; and

(5) urges the adoption and pursuit of these and other policies to seek a democratic government in Syria that will—

(A) bring freedom and democracy to the people of Syria;

(B) cease the illegal occupation by Syria of the Lebanese Republic;

(C) abandon support for terrorism;

(D) not pursue research, development, acquisition, production, transfer, or deployment of biological, chemical, or nuclear weapons, will provide credible assurances that such behavior will not be undertaken in the future, and will agree to allow United Nations and other international observers to verify such assurances; and

(E) live in peace and security with the international community.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to thank the leadership for bringing up this resolution.

H. Con. Res. 18, Mr. Speaker, addresses the continued gross violations of human rights committed by the Syrian regime. The terrorist regime in Damascus is one that not only supports and facilitates terrorist attacks against innocent civilians throughout the world but also engages in a widespread campaign of terror and human rights suppression among its own people.

According to the most recent State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, the government of Syria continues to commit numerous serious abuses and remains with a poor record on human rights overall. Any activity by human rights activists and organizations is stifled and activists are sentenced to lengthy prison terms, tortured or even forced into exile, only to be harassed and intimidated in exile as well.

Domestic human rights groups cannot exist legally. According to a recent world report by Human Rights Watch, the dictatorship of Syria strictly limits freedom of expression, association and assembly and treats ethnic minority Kurds as second-class citizens. The government has a long record of arbitrary arrests, systematic torture, prolonged detention of suspects and grossly unfair trials. Women face discrimination and have little means for full redress when they become victims of rape or domestic violence.

However, Syria's deplorable human rights record is not limited to its immediate borders. The repressive apparatus also extends into neighboring Lebanon, which has been a captive nation for 25 years. Hundreds of free-thinking Lebanese civilians are believed to have been killed or disappeared because of Syrian occupation forces throughout these years. U.S. policy must support the Syrian people. It must support its dissidents, human rights activists, and the pro-democracy advocates so that they, too, can free themselves from the shackles of tyrannical rule.

This resolution also addresses, Mr. Speaker, two overarching vital U.S. national security requirements regarding the Syrian regime; that is, that Syria must immediately and unconditionally cease its support for terrorism and its development of unconventional weapons and advanced missile capabilities.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this important resolution to express U.S. support for those in Syria and Lebanon who continue to toil for freedom and democracy, and ensure the regime in Damascus that we will continue to increase the pressure until these goals are met.

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

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

I rise in strong support of this resolution. I want to commend my friend from New Jersey for his leadership on this issue. The resolution before the House supports the people of Syria who live under a violent and repressive regime. The last Congress, this body passed the Syria Accountability Act with 297 cosponsors. That bill primarily addressed Syria's behavior in the Middle East, including its sponsorship of terrorist groups and its continuing occupation of Lebanon. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, focuses on Syria's domestic misbehavior for which Damascus must also be held fully accountable. After all, nobody has suffered more from the brutality of the

Syrian government than the Syrian people.

According to the State Department's annual human rights report released recently, Syria continues to commit egregious human rights abuses, including torture, arbitrary detentions of political prisoners without trial, censorship and harassment of journalists, protections for spouse-rapists, and light sentences for so-called honor killings. According to Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, Syria is engaged in an unceasing campaign to harass and intimidate human rights organizations.

In recent days, the world has focused on Syria's outrages against the Lebanese people and, indeed, another resolution we are considering today deals directly with that issue. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot credibly say we favor political reform in the Middle East if we ignore Syria's depredations against its own citizens.

Syria is certainly, and I quote, one of the world's most repressive regimes, as the United Nations Commission on Human Rights has indicated. Accordingly, it is important that this Congress be on record not merely in condemning the Syrian government for its actions against its neighbors but, more importantly, to express our support for the Syrian people in their struggle to achieve the kind of government they deserve.

When I met with Syrian President Assad in Damascus, I urged him to change his government's behavior at home and abroad so that Syria could rejoin the ranks of the civilized world. This resolution is one result of his failure to heed that advice.

Mr. Speaker, a Syria that is accountable to world standards and norms, a Syria that respects its own citizens and no longer occupies Lebanon or supports terrorism against Israel must be a central goal of our project of reforming the Middle East. In the long run, a Middle East in which people are stakeholders in public life offers the greatest hope for peace and safety in the region and beyond.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 18.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield such time as he may consume to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this resolution and his leadership in bringing it forward. I am going to support the resolution. I, too, am troubled by what we have seen with the Syrian government. I am heartened by some activities in the Middle East. I think there is some real progress. But I would step back for a moment and ask us to reflect on something that has been happening that does not reflect so well on our government.

Just moments ago, the House overwhelmingly approved an amendment advanced by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and me that dealt with making sure that money that we approved in the supplemental was not used to torture suspects of terrorism. We have this sense, and it is one that the people I represent feel very strongly about, that we have a responsibility and an obligation as the world's oldest democracy to be upholding our standards of rule of law, of due process. We have made torture illegal not just because people are concerned that it is an immoral practice, we do so because it is not a good way to get useful information.

Dictatorships torture indiscriminately, but it is not a way, as the Intelligence Community well understands, that we get good information upon which to base activities that may put our men and women at risk and to protect United States interests. Furthermore, we do not torture suspects of terror because if we do so, then any information that is gathered from that process taints any potential case and we cannot bring people to justice in a court of law.

Last but not least, we do not torture because we want a standard established where we can use our moral authority to make sure that Americans abroad are protected, whether they are in uniform or they are civilians.

There are a variety of moral, practical reasons why we are against torture. Yet I would note that there are too many press accounts for us to ignore, too many reports from nongovernmental organizations that the United States is participating in and condoning torture on behalf of prisoners that we have taken to other countries. There is a famous case that now the Canadian government wants investigated where the United States kidnapped a Canadian citizen and rendered this person to Syria where he was tortured. We have called for this Congress to get on top of what is, I am afraid, an emerging scandal, where we use extraordinary rendition, where we kidnap and transport people, where there is not effective oversight, where Congress does not know what is going on, where there are people who are not being held accountable, where there are problems that we have seen with people who have been in custody of the CIA and some of the American prisons that we have had in Afghanistan and Iraq.

□ 1230

We, as a Congress, need to be doing our job because we do not believe in torture; it is illegal; it is against international conventions; it is against the interests of the United States. And I must re-emphasize the irony when we come forward with a resolution that points out the problems, legitimate problems, the abuses in Syria, and then it appears as though the United States is willing to offer up people to countries like Syria, where we thought they are in fact going to be tortured.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that Congress gets ahead of this issue, that Congress does its job to investigate these widespread reports that are coming through now our own legal system, that are coming through the media, that are coming from nongovernmental organizations, that we exercise our oversight to make sure that we have our own house in order. There should be no prospect that we are on one hand going to be a Congress that condemns torture and abuse of human rights in Syria, and on the other hand we are going to look the other way when we may be offering up people who are suspects, not convicted of anything, to be turned over to the hands of these same torturers.

I would sincerely hope that we will have activity on the part of all of us to make sure the many committees in Congress do their job to provide this oversight and that we are not relying on the media, nongovernmental organizations, and what trickles through the legal system to do a job that we should be doing.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, while I rise in support of this resolution, I do so with serious concerns.

Torture is a crime and a vile human rights abuse. Syria should be condemned in the strongest possible terms for committing acts of torture against detainees and prisoners. This is why I support the resolution. Yet, the fact that our government has sent detainees to Syria knowing that these individuals would be tortured and abused is morally repugnant and violates international, as well as U.S., law.

The practice of extraordinary rendition—our government's practice of outsourcing torture to countries like Syria must also be condemned, repudiated and immediately ordered stopped by President Bush. Human Rights Watch, which is frequently cited as an authoritative source in this resolution, has stated that the U.S. policy of "denouncing torture in Syria, and then handing over prisoners to Syrian torturers sends the ultimate mixed message."

Syria is a notorious violator of human rights that should be condemned. The hypocrisy of our government using Syrian torturers as a subcontractor to immorally and illegally commit human rights abuses is shamefully absent from this resolution.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 18 to express Congress' concern about the treatment of the Syrian and Lebanese people by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic. I want to thank my colleagues from Florida and New York for introducing this resolution and bringing it to the floor today.

Earlier this body considered H. Con. Res. 32, which expresses support for the liberation movement in Lebanon. Now, under this second resolution, we take into consideration the effect of Syrian rule of its own people. The Syrian Arab Republic is governed by an authoritarian regime which continues to commit serious human rights abuses, including the use of torture, arbitrary arrest, and detention.

Within Syria both freedom of speech and freedom of the press has repressed through systematic intimidation. Syrians are prohibited to publicly assembling in order to express discontent of any kind. Political prisoners are

known to have been held in detainment for up to twenty years. Ruling authorities continue to allow honor killings. In the North, Syrian forces have attacked unarmed Kurd populations with live ammunition. Human rights organizations working in opposition these injustices are targeted by Syrian authorities with intimidation tactics.

The Syrian government's treatment of its people can no longer be tolerated. I encourage my colleagues to pass the resolution in question and in doing so condemn the Syrian government's gross human rights violations upon its own people and support the Syrian people's struggle for a free and democratic government.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 18, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. 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. Con. Res. 18, the concurrent resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING GRAVE CONCERN OF CONGRESS REGARDING OCCUPATION OF REPUBLIC OF LEBANON BY SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 32) expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the occupation of the Republic of Lebanon by the Syrian Arab Republic, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 32

Whereas since its invasion of the Lebanese Republic in 1976, the regime of the Syrian Arab Republic has implemented a systematic policy of occupation over Lebanon that has transformed the political, social, and economic character of Lebanon;

Whereas on July 20, 1976, President Hafez al-Assad of Syria stated that ''Syria and Lebanon were one state and one people'';

Whereas, on October 13, 1990, the Syrian occupation of Lebanon was complete, when Syrian troops launched aerial and ground attacks and occupied the Lebanese presidential palace and the Ministry of Defense, ousting the constitutional government of Prime Minister Michel Aoun of Lebanon;

Whereas the Syrian regime appointed their own proxy government and president in occupied Lebanon, and started a large-scale persecution operation against the Lebanese people by arresting, abducting, torturing, and killing opponents of the occupation;

Whereas, on May 22, 1991, following the occupation of Beirut, Lebanon, Syria concluded the Brotherhood Treaty for Coordination and Cooperation with Lebanon;

Whereas this treaty solidified the integration of the two countries in matters of security and intelligence, finance and trade, and industry and agriculture, by establishing the mechanism for Syrian command under the cover of ''joint'' decisionmaking;

Whereas the Syrian regime has continued to employ a wide range of policy means to transform Lebanon into a ''client state'' and a Syrian political satellite;

Whereas Syria clearly tampered with the Lebanese parliamentary elections of 1992, 1996, and 2000, by amending electoral laws which delineated voting districts and laid down intricate procedures for the elections, which were rigged in a way to guarantee results favorable to Syria;

Whereas Syrian-backed ad-hoc modifications to the Lebanese constitution extended by three years the presidential tenure of Lebanese president Elias Harawi, allowed Emile Lahoud, commander of the Lebanese army, to become president, and extended Lahoud's term in contravention of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1559;

Whereas Lebanese judicial institutions have been utilized and mobilized to impose Syrian control, including the routine issuance of death sentences *in abstentia* against expatriates and opposition leaders;

Whereas Lebanese Broadcasting Law No. 382 of 1994 provided the legislative framework for controlling and restricting Lebanese radio and television;

Whereas the restrictions on the free flow of information and opinion in Lebanon is in sharp contrast to the legacy of journalism in that country;

Whereas it is widely reported that Syria has utilized the practices of kidnapping and arresting Lebanese citizens, using torture against them, and causing their virtual disappearance;

Whereas Human Rights Watch reported that in November 1999 Syrian authorities in Damascus, Syria, offering no explanation whatsoever, returned to his family the dead body of Lebanese citizen Adel Khalaf Ajouri, aged 52, who had ''disappeared'' in 1990;

Whereas within Lebanon itself, Syria reportedly operated detention facilities in Tripoli, Beirut, Shtaura in the Bekka Valley, and Anjar on the Lebanese-Syrian border;

Whereas ''Syrian order'' in Lebanon was institutionalized when Damascus led the process of disarming the Lebanese militias, except for Hezbollah, which Syria retains as a terrorist proxy engaged against the State of Israel;

Whereas Lebanon, under the control of Syria, continues to serve as a major training center for terrorist organizations such as Hezbollah, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, Hamas, and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine–General Command;

Whereas a number of Lebanese government officials have actively facilitated and contributed to the Syrian occupation and its activities, thereby threatening regional and global security;

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 1559 calls for the ''strict respect of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity, and political independence of Lebanon under the sole and exclusive authority of the Government of Lebanon throughout Lebanon'', the withdrawal from Lebanon of ''all remaining foreign forces'', ''the disbanding and disarmament of all Lebanese and non-Lebanese militias'', and ''the extension of the control of the Government of Lebanon over all Lebanese territory'';

Whereas, on February 14, 2005, a bomb exploded in Beirut, Lebanon, killing at least 15 people, including Rafik Hariri, former Prime Minister of Lebanon, and wounding approximately 100 other innocent victims;

Whereas after the bombing, President George W. Bush stated during an address in Brussels that ''Our shared commitment to democratic progress is being tested in Lebanon, a once-thriving country that now suffers under the influence of an oppressive neighbor'', called on Syria to ''end its occupation of Lebanon'', and reiterated the provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1559;

Whereas Lebanese opposition leaders gathered after Hariri was killed and issued a statement demanding Syrian troop withdrawal from Lebanon within the next three months, calling for the resignation of the current Lebanese cabinet, and declaring that ''we will fight the current regime and demand our right for a neutral government that makes sure Lebanon steps forward from being a captive state to regaining its full independence and sovereignty''; and

Whereas the ongoing mass demonstrations by the Lebanese people resulted in the dramatic resignation of the Lebanese Cabinet on February 28, 2005: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Lebanese Republic is a captive country;

(2) the occupation of Lebanon represents a long-term threat to the security of the Middle East and United States efforts to promote political and economic liberalization in the region, and this issue should be raised by the President and the Secretary of State in all appropriate bilateral and multilateral forums;

(3) the President should direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to present and secure support for a United Nations Security Council Resolution classifying Lebanon as a captive country and calling for the immediate release of all Lebanese detainees in Syria and Lebanon;

(4) the President should freeze all assets in the United States belonging to Lebanese government officials who are found to support and aid the occupation of Lebanon by the Syrian Arab Republic;

(5) all countries should fully and immediately implement United Nations Security Council Resolution 1559;

(6) it should be the policy of the United States to—

(A) support independent human rights and pro-democracy advocates in Lebanon; and

(B) seek the full restoration of sovereign democratic rule in Lebanon; and

(7) the United States should provide assistance through the Middle East Partnership Initiative and the Broader Middle East and North Africa Initiative for broadcasts and civil society efforts to assist individuals, organizations, and entities that support Lebanese sovereignty and the promotion of democracy in Lebanon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and ask unanimous consent he be permitted to control the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ROS-LEHTINEN. 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. Con. Res. 32, expressing the grave concern of Congress regarding the occupation of the Republic of Lebanon by the Syrian Arab Republic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the leadership for bringing this important resolution before the House today at a time when hundreds of thousands of Lebanese are flocking to the streets issuing cries for freedom. It is critical that the United States Congress reaffirm its commitment to the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty and independence and specifically acknowledge the plight that Lebanon has endured as a captive nation. House Concurrent Resolution 32 does exactly that, Mr. Speaker.

For too long Lebanon has been denied its independence by the regime in Damascus, a regime that has imposed its will upon the Lebanese people through electoral intimidation, through political persecution, through assassination of opposition leaders and brutal military force. But the Lebanese people's desire to be free and sovereign could not be silenced and could not be repressed any longer.

The protests that have followed the Valentine's Day bombing in Beirut that killed former Prime Minister Hariri ushered in an immediate demand from a unifiable and diverse Lebanese opposition for Syria to withdraw from Lebanon. The streets of Beirut earlier this week boasted the largest anti-Syrian demonstration in Lebanese history and possibly the largest pro-democracy rally in Middle East history in response to the Syrian and Iranian-sponsored Hezbollah rally a week earlier.

For the first time, a number of moderate Shiites joined the Druze, Sunnis and Christian groups whose anger and grief over the brutal tactics of the Syrian occupiers and their Lebanese collaborators have galvanized them into action, into a coordinated effort to reclaim Lebanon's sovereignty.

House Concurrent Resolution 32 clearly articulates the threat to U.S. national security interests and to regional stability posed by Syria's presence in Lebanon. And the threat is not limited to Syrian intelligence and military, but to its terrorist proxy, Hezbollah, which uses Lebanese territory as a launching pad for attacks against Israel and a training ground for terrorists targeting U.S. and other Western interests.

Thus, at a time when this body has clearly articulated our stand regarding Hezbollah just a few days ago, let us underscore that we will not tolerate an appeasement of Hezbollah in Lebanon.

House Concurrent Resolution 32 builds on recent developments and calls for the President to instruct the U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations to present and secure support for a Security Council resolution classifying Lebanon as a captive nation.

It calls for the President, pursuant to existing law, to freeze all assets in the U.S. belonging to Lebanese Government officials who are found to support and aid in Syria's occupation of Lebanon.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it calls for the United States policy to include support for the independent human rights and pro-democracy advocates in Lebanon and for the full restoration of sovereign democratic rule there.

The resolution underscores the U.S. position against Syria's brutal occupation of Lebanon and U.S. policy about holding state sponsors of terrorism accountable for their actions. Calling for Syria to depart from Lebanon once and for all is in keeping with the post-9/11 approach of forcing terrorists out of their caves and placing them on the run. The U.S. position on Syrian withdrawal forces the terrorists to retreat to their own soil; and in doing so, it seeks to limit their impact so that freedom and democracy can flourish once again in Lebanon and throughout the region.

The Lebanese people have had enough, and they will not allow their territory to continue to be used as a staging ground for terrorists and their state sponsors. Let us stand with the Lebanese people and overwhelmingly adopt this resolution.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 32 and send a clear message to the Syrian terrorist regime to get out of Lebanon. Not to the border; not to the Bekaa Valley. Completely out.

God willing, as our Arab-speaking Lebanese brothers and sisters would say, inshallah, we will soon witness a free, independent, sovereign, and democratic Lebanon.

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

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the time in opposition to this resolution not so much to object to the well-intended notions of the gentlewoman and the promotion of freedom and liberty. It is just that I do not think this is going to achieve it. As a matter of fact, when we pursue resolutions like this and a more aggressive foreign policy of telling other countries what to do, I see it as more of a threat to our security rather than helping our security.

I, for one, would admit I personally do not know what is best for the Lebanese and the Syrians, the Iraqis, or anybody else in the region; but I would argue the case that traditionally in this country up until probably the past 100 years, we took a different position on foreign policy. We took a position of nonintervention, one where we strived for neutrality, and we argued the case that we did not have any business in the internal affairs of other nations. No matter how well intended, there always seem to be ramifications. There seem to be unintended consequences. There seems to be a condition called ''blow-back,'' where it comes back and ends up where we suffer more than anybody else.

For instance, we are in Iraq right now with all these good intentions. We have been there for a couple of years. We have spent over $200 billion, and this week they came out with a survey and they talked about the most dangerous city in the world and where security is the worst, and that city is not Beirut.

In the last 2 years, every one of us would have rather have been in Beirut than we would have been in Iraq. And yet we have 140,000 troops there protecting the Iraqis and promoting freedom and liberty and elections, and it sounds good. But I think if we are honest with ourselves, the results are not nearly as wonderful as we would like them to be.

The other thing that concerns me is that we lose credibility when we talk about what we want and what we will impose on other nations, because when we are claiming that the Lebanese cannot possibly have elections with the presence of foreign troops, at the same time we daily hear the bragging about the great election in Iraq where we had these 140,000 troops and total martial law in order for an election to take place. I am all for the elections, and I am a strong supporter of self-determination; but I do not correlate that with our policies.

We saw demonstrations, first a little at a demonstration orchestrated in support of getting Syria out of Lebanon, and then there was a response to that where 500,000 showed up supporting Hezbollah claiming they supported Syria, and then of course following that there was a much bigger demonstration. So the people have had freedom to express themselves. But the one thing about all the demonstrations, we never saw a sign that said,

America, come save us, come in here, tell us what to do, tell us what to do with our elections. They have had elections going on for you in Lebanon without any violence directed against Syrian troops as we see daily in Iraq. They have an election coming up in May. It has been scheduled all along. It is not like they have been avoiding them.

We complain a lot about the Syrians being there, and if I have a personal preference, since I believe in self-determination, I would have the troops out just as I would have our troops out of most other places. But I would have foreign troops out of the Golan Heights. Why are we so excited about the Syrian troops, who were invited by the Lebanese Government? Why are we not excited about foreign troops in the Golan Heights and in the over 100 countries where that we have troops?

So I think we lose credibility. I think the Arab people just laugh at us and say, oh, yes, they are for these wonderful elections, and they have got to get these troops out; and at the same time we have troops all over the place.

The Syrians went into Lebanon in 1976, and if we go back and look at history, it was at the urging of the Government of the United States because there was about to be an election. And at that time, it was perceived that the election would undermine the minorities, the Christians and the Druse. So, therefore, it was in our interest at that time to interfere with the election, just as we have interfered so many times since then over the world.

Just think of the elected leader in 1953 in Iran, the elected leader, Mossadeq. But he did not follow what we wanted him to do with regards to oil. So what did we do? We sent in the CIA. We overthrew him, and then we had our puppet government, the Shah, for 25 years, which did nothing more than provide fodder for the radicals, and we radicalized the ayatollahs against us.

In a conversation with a veteran of the CIA, an expert in this region, he explained, at least he sincerely believed, that we did a tremendous favor for Osama bin Laden, and that is to go into Iraq, expose ourselves, and then create the chaos of Iraq. Where there was no al Qaeda before, it is now a haven for al Qaeda.

□ 1245

It has served as a recruiting ground for al Qaeda. So no matter how well the intentions are, we should look at the conclusions; what finally happens.

Our problem very simply comes from the violation of the basic principle that we should follow, and that is that we should be friends with nations and trade with nations, and that we should be neutral in foreign affairs, because it does not serve our interests. It costs a lot of money and it costs a lot of credibility and it costs a lot of lives.

Just think of what the interference in Iraq has cost us: Over 1,500 men; over 11,000 battle casualties, with another 9,000 sent home because of illness; and over $200 billion. And there is no end in sight. Today we had to pass another $82 billion, which was not put into the budget, to continue this process. My argument is it comes not because we make a misjudgment, not that this resolution is simply a misjudgment of the day; it just is that is part of the misjudgments that we have made now for many, many decades in overall foreign policy.

It is fully endorsed. The American people certainly have not been up in arms about it and have endorsed it, along with the large majority in the Congress. But long term it does not work. Just look how long the American people supported Vietnam, until finally they had to throw up their arms and demand an end to the senseless war.

But, ultimately, not only do the people get very angry and upset and frustrated with the loss of life, there are economic limitations to this as well, and that is something that I do not think anybody here hardly pays any attention to; that is how long can we continue to spend this money and not have this come back to really haunt us economically? The 1960s came back to haunt us in the 1970s, and the basic financial condition of this country is much worse than it was in the 1970s. Yet there is no hesitation.

I see resolutions like this as not restraint, but encouragement, without looking back and seeing how we participated in contributing to the problems that we have in the Middle East. So I am making the suggestion, why do we not think about overall policy with consistency, and think almost what is in our best interests?

I would like to read a quote from Ronald Reagan, because he was involved in Lebanon and our government was involved in the early 1980s. In his memoirs he admits it was a serious mistake, and we ought to take advice from Ronald Reagan on what he said about his misadventure in Lebanon. We were in there in 1983. This is what he writes in his memoirs several years later.

''Perhaps we didn't appreciate fully enough the depth of the hatred and complexity of the problems that made the Middle East such a jungle. Perhaps the idea of a suicide car bomber committing mass murder to gain instant entry into paradise was so foreign to our own values and consciousness that it did not create in us the concern for the Marines' safety that it should have.''

Further quoting Ronald Reagan, ''In the weeks immediately after the bombing, I believed the last thing we should do was turn tail and leave . . . yet, the irrationality of Middle Eastern politics forced us to rethink our policies there.''

He concluded with advising us to stay clear. I would like to suggest that I believe that is pretty good advice.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution. Let me first pay tribute to my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her work on this resolution, and for her outstanding leadership on our Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House expresses the grave concern of the Congress regarding the ongoing occupation of Lebanon by Syria.

Mr. Speaker, I first visited Lebanon and Syria in 1956, almost half a century ago. Lebanon was a prosperous, free, open and democratic society. I remember going to the Bekaa Valley, to the City of Ba'albak, where among the ancient Roman ruins Shakespeare was performed on alternate nights in English and French.

Since 1976, Syria has occupied Lebanon with brutal force. Our resolution appropriately demands that the occupation end now.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the people of Lebanon tore down gigantic billboards in Lebanon that portrayed the former and current Syrian dictators, Mr. Assad and his father. Just imagine having in the United States huge billboards of Joe Stalin or the ayatollahs of Tehran, how we would feel about this? Well, that is how the Lebanese people felt about having these gigantic billboards pay tribute to a country which occupies their land.

As we speak, there is no Syrian embassy in Lebanon. What could speak more eloquently of the colonial outlook that the Syrian regime has towards Lebanon? In colonial times, the colonial power did not have an embassy in its colony because it did not recognize it as an independent, sovereign nation. That is precisely the attitude of Syria towards Lebanon today.

All of us have been inspired by what the Lebanese call their ''independence'' uprising. By passing our resolution, the Congress will express its solidarity with the brave anti-Syrian occupation, freedom-loving demonstrators in Martyrs Square in Beirut.

Mr. Speaker, Bashar Assad, Syria's ruler, continues to play games with the international community. As his speech earlier this month showed, he still believes he can ignore the international community's demand that Syria withdraw immediately and totally from Lebanon. Let us not be fooled by his promises of gradual withdrawal delinked from time tables. If you can tell a man by his friends, all you need to know about Assad is that his only friend in Lebanon is the terrorist gang Hezbollah.

Mr. Speaker, Syria has not only persecuted the Lebanese people, arresting, abducting, torturing and killing opponents, most recently the Prime Minister of Lebanon, it has also destroyed Lebanon's lively institutions, rendering them little more than outposts of Syrian control.

These crimes have taken place on the soil of what was once the Arab world's lone democracy. That is why it is vital that the Lebanese people succeed in throwing off Syrian rule and that the Lebanese be allowed to conduct free and fair parliamentary elections this spring, unimpeded by the fist of Syria's military or the brutal machinations of its intelligence agents.

Mr. Speaker, we stand shoulder to shoulder with those who seek full restoration of sovereign, democratic rule in Lebanon. I strongly support this resolution, and urge all of my colleagues to join me in sending a message of hope to the Lebanese people.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few points regarding the unintended consequences of our foreign policy, as well as what might happen in Lebanon.

It has been said about our administration that we hope the Lebanese people will be able to express their view at the ballot box through free elections without interference and outside intimidation. That sounds like a pretty good suggestion, with the conclusion by the administration that when there is outside interference the elections are unreliable.

Once again, I ask the question, does that not raise the question of whether or not the elections in Iraq are as reliable, as is supposed?

Also, President Bush said that these elections must take place without external forces, and all the troops must be out. The UN resolution calls for the troops out as well as the security forces, but the resolution also calls for disarming the people of Lebanon.

In other words, this resolution takes the position that we should go in Lebanon and repeal the Lebanese Second Amendment rights so that nobody has any guns. I just see that as an interference that is going to lead to trouble.

We see civil strife precipitating a civil war in Iraq, and I think what our involvement here now is liable to lead to that type of situation, rather than peace and prosperity and elections.

It is said that this has all come out from the murder and killing of Hariri, and most people now just assume that the government of Syria had something to do with that. Yet there is no evidence for that. There is absolutely zero benefit for the Syrian government to have killed Hariri.

But there is a theory that some of the radical Muslims in Syria that object to Assad, because he is too moderate, because he endorsed the Persian Gulf War and because he takes some of our prisoners and he participates in the interrogations of our prisoners, that he is seen as too liberal, too friendly with the West, and some suppose that that could have been the reason that the murder had occurred, believing that it would bring down the government of Assad.

Now, that could be an unintended consequence, that consequence that could have a great deal of significance, and that is that the radicals end up taking over, some individuals more radical than Assad, end up taking over Syria, which is always the possibility. But too often these unintended consequences occur and then we do not know how to respond to them.

In Iraq in January of this year there was some polling done, an expression by the people on what they thought about foreign occupation. Eighty-two percent of the Sunnis, I guess understandably so, said that all foreign troops ought to leave, and 69 percent of the Shiites said all foreign troops ought to leave. I wonder why that is not important to anybody?

Instead, we are talking about occupation for years, about building 14 bases in Iraq. How long do we stay in these countries and why is it so necessary for us to be telling other people what to do and when to do it and how to do it and stirring up nothing but anti-American sentiment, while at the same time, even though our goals may be well-intentioned, they are never achieved? We just do not achieve them. And to think that the election under the conditions that we are condemning in Lebanon is the salvation, is the evidence that we are having tremendous achievement, I think is something that we are just pulling the wool over our eyes.

□ 1300

John Adams gave us some pretty good advice about what we should do overseas. And I think that when we have resolutions like this, and we do have them continuously, and we have done them for decades. It was a preliminary to our invasion of Iraq starting specifically in 1988; But Adams advised, he made a suggestion and he made a statement, he says: ''America goes not abroad seeking monsters to destroy.''

That statement is so appropriate. It looks like we are just looking for problems; and since the results are so poor and we cannot afford it, once again, I want to state my position that I am suggesting not so much that I know or we know exactly what is best for other people. It is that precisely we do not know and we do not have the authority, the moral, the legal, the constitutional authority to do what we do. And besides, it is a threat to our national security.

Jefferson's suggestion was for peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations and entangling alliances with none. And we have way too many entangling alliances, making these huge commitments which will come to an end not because anybody is going to pay much attention to what I say, but they will come to an end because this country is on the verge of bankruptcy.

We cannot continue to raise our national debt by $650 billion a year and pretend that we can police the world and at the same time increase entitlements here at home. So one day we will have to face up to these realities, and it will all come to an end.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to make one point about the resolution. The statement toward the ends says: The President should direct the United States Representative to the United Nations to present and secure reports for the United Nations Security Council classifying Lebanon as a captive country in calling for the immediate release of Lebanese detainees in Syria and Lebanon.

Now that is pretty interesting that we are going to tell them who they can release and who they should release. But the question I have, and maybe the sponsors of the resolution could answer this: Will that include that we insist that they release the prisoners that we have sent to Syria?

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Yleem Poblete and Paul Ostburg Sanz, long and dedicated, hardworking members, staffers on our committee on these measures and the work of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia.

I would like to thank Chairman HYDE of the International Relations Committee, for understanding the need to support the Lebanese people at this critical time, and moving this resolution quickly through the Committee.

I would also like to commend our leadership for their commitment to freedom and democracy for all the people of the Middle East.

Lastly, I must make special mention of the efforts and cooperation of our Subcommittee Ranking Member, GARY ACKERMAN, and especially our Full Committee Ranking Member, TOM LANTOS.

TOM LANTOS has experienced first hand what happens when one appeases dictators and ignores the oppression of human beings. We cannot stand idly by and allow Syria to continue to deny the Lebanese people their rights and their nation.

Thanks to the cooperation of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we are able to send a clear and unified message to both the Syrian oppressors and to the Lebanese people. As we did with the Syrian Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration, we have an opportunity today, by supporting H. Con. Res. 32, to demonstrate a united front and show that freedom transcends party lines, geographic borders, and language barriers.

When it comes to freedom and democracy, the U.S. is speaking with one voice, as the Lebanese people are speaking with one voice.

In so doing, we become one with our brothers and sisters in Lebanon as they seek to remove the shackles of Syrian tyranny and occupation.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage U.S. support of the people of Lebanon in their struggle to free themselves from Syrian occupation. Syria has illegitimately held control over its neighbor for 25 years, a situation which can no longer be permitted to continue.

Syria has proved itself an utterly destructive force upon its neighbor, Lebanon. Syria has systematically deprived the Lebanese people of their many liberties. It has illegally extended the terms of pro-Syrian officials within the Lebanon government by altering the Lebanese constitution. It has and continues to intimidate Lebanese dissenters with threats of political persecution. Lebanese citizens with views not in keeping with Syrian authorities have been arrested, kidnapped, tortured and in some instances even killed. The Lebanese press has been effectively stifled in order to repress anti-Syrian sentiment. Finally, and most reprehensively, Syria has allowed and even funded the continued existence of the terrorist group Hezbollah within the southern Shebaa farm region of Lebanon. Today Hezbollah is the largest international terrorist organization on the globe, with cells in Asia, Europe, Africa, and the Americas. The presence of Hezbollah ensures continued turmoil within Lebanon and throughout the international community.

When it first sent troops to help quell the Lebanese civil war, Syria claimed its purpose was to stabilize the country. Instead Syria has consistently prevented Lebanon from becoming the stable and prosperous state for which many Lebanese patriots, including the late former Prime Minister Rafik Hariri, have toiled.

Today the people of Lebanon are taking to the streets, crying out for their freedom from this foreign oppression. As an American of Lebanese descent, my heart is with them. My ancestors came to this country in search of greater freedom. Now, as I watch the Lebanese freedom movement, I am filled with the hope that the citizens of my country of origin will soon have the chance to claim the liberties for which my ancestors sought in coming to the United States.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I urge my fellow members to pass H. Con. Res. 32 in support of the Lebanese struggle for independence. Syria must be made to know in no uncertain terms that we expect the complete withdrawal of its troops from Lebanon, the immediate dissolution of Hezbollah, and the immediate termination of interference within Lebanon's government.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 32, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REMEMBERING WILLIAM LEHMAN

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and I ask Members in their offices who knew the person that I rise to speak about to take cognizance of the fact that we regret to announce the death of one of our revered former Members.

William Lehman died today. A real giant among human beings has passed and is transitioning. I am sure I speak for all of us in this body that knew him and especially those of us in the Florida delegation in expressing our heartfelt condolences to the Congressman's family.

The funeral arrangements are pending. It is my understanding that the funeral will be at 1 p.m. on Sunday. Those that knew Bill, he was referred to some times as Alabama Bill, he was a mentor, friend, humanitarian, and humble servant of humankind.

He provided transportation for thousands through his variety of auto dealerships and then as a distinguished Member of this body chairing the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. He helped to provide the funding for those of us that have seen his vision come alive in the form of transportation measures in south Florida and around this Nation. He will be sorely missed.

I can assure Members that it would be appropriate to stay in contact with his family with their condolences.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 154 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 154

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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed five hours, with four hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Saxton of New Jersey and Representative Maloney of New York or their designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by an opponent and a proponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. After adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 95, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 and to consider the Senate concurrent resolution in the House. All points of order against the Senate concurrent resolution and against its consideration are waived. It shall be in order to move to strike all after the resolving clause of the Senate concurrent resolution and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 95 as adopted by the House. All points of order against that motion are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a great day in our great Nation, and it is an honor to be here to begin the debate about the fiscal blueprint for our Nation, the priorities of our Nation.

House Resolution 154 is a structured rule that provides for consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 95, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of both the Committee on Rules and the Committee on the Budget, I am pleased to bring this resolution to the floor for its consideration. This rule provides for 5 hours of general debate with 4 hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by the gentleman of New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) or their designees.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution.

This rule makes in order four amendments which are printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution. Each is debatable for 40 minutes, the time equally divided and controlled by the proponent and the opponent.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report, except that the adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. It also permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to offer amendments in the House to achieve mathematical consistency.

This is a fair rule. The Committee on Rules has allowed substitute budgets to be considered on the House floor. They range across the political spectrum affording Members of varying philosophies within each political party and across political parties an opportunity to support the budget they deem appropriate for our Nation.

Since before my time in this body, the Committee on Rules has consistently afforded the minority the opportunity for its alternative to be heard, with the only exception being the fiscal year 2003 budget when there was not a budget alternative offered. I am pleased this rule provides a chance for all our Members to express their views on how our Nation should prioritize its spending.

The congressional budget is an important tool of the Congress, allowing us to set priorities for the coming fiscal year. Therefore, this budget provides for America's most urgent needs. The driving forces behind this budget are continued strength, continued growth, and restrained spending.

The congressional budget is the ultimate enforcement tool, allowing Congress to clearly identify its priorities for how taxpayer dollars should be spent. It allows us in a time of war to ensure that our Nation's soldiers are sufficiently equipped. Prioritizing guarantees that our economy continues to expand, providing jobs and opportunities for more Americans each and every day.

Finally, this tool allows us to make certain that our government acts in a fiscally responsible manner to ensure opportunities and safety for future generations of Americans. This budget ensures that our Nation remains strong in the face of terror. We continue the multiyear plan to enable the military to fight the war on terrorism now and to transform itself to counter unconventional threats in the future. This budget works to prevent attacks, reduce vulnerabilities, and improve readiness.

Continued economic growth is vital for our Nation to fund her priorities and give opportunity to her people. Today, the general consensus of both private and public forecasters is that the U.S. economy is in a sustained expansion with solid growth of real GDP and payroll jobs and with low unemployment and low inflation.

The speed and strength of the economic recovery of the last several years has been due in large part to the tax relief packages given to the American people along with the extension of that tax relief passed last year. These policies continue to promote sustained economic growth and job creation.

I am proud to be a member of the Committee on the Budget that this year reported out a historic budget that sets in motion a glidepath to cut the deficit in half both in dollars and as a percentage of gross domestic product in 5 years. This budget wisely targets both discretionary and mandatory spending in an effort to set priorities.

The Committee on the Budget calls for a reduction in total nondefense, nonhomeland security discretionary spending. And for the first time since 1997, the budget includes reconciliation instructions to authorizing committees calling for the slowed growth of mandatory programs.

Mandatory spending is the guaranteed spending that grows each and every year, mostly without reform or review. It currently consumes 55 percent of the budget; and if it continues unchecked, it will reach 61 percent of the budget by 2015.

□ 1315

More than half of the government's spending today is on automatic pilot. This is neither sound policy nor sustainable fiscal policy. Congress is on its way to losing control over spending priorities as entitlements squeeze the budget more and more. Reconciliation instructions are the critical step to begin the process of getting our mandatory spending back to a sustainable level.

I am hopeful that while the authorizing committees are reviewing their programs they may also conclude that many of these mandatory programs would be better suited as discretionary and, therefore, subject to greater oversight by the Congress.

I am proud of the work the Committee on the Budget has put forward this year. I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE), the chairman of that committee, for pushing forward with fiscal discipline and bringing us this outstanding budget for consideration.

I urge Members to support the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, 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, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), my colleague, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, every day from this floor we hear our Members talk about values and morals that guide our Nation, but nothing reveals our true values as legislators more than how we choose to spend the American taxpayers' money. Each decision to fund a program or not to fund another is a conscious choice that we make.

These choices have real consequences for the hardworking Americans we serve, and so, really, those choices are about our values and our morality. We, as legislators, choose to fund what is most important, what has the most value. That is why the Federal budget of the United States is a moral document.

When we establish the financial priorities of the government each year, we show the American people in black and white what and who we value most.

As the budget resolution we debate today shows with startling clarity, the majority's priorities I think are out of step with the values of the American people.

The majority's budget resolution throws an additional $106 billion in tax cuts to the Nation's wealthiest, while cutting billions in crucial funding for health care, education and housing programs; programs that help the hardworking Americans get by from day-to-day; programs that give hope to mothers and fathers that they, too, may one day share in the American dream.

I believe this budget resolution sends the wrong message, values the wrong priorities and shortchanges too many of our hardworking taxpayers that we should, in fact, be helping.

What message are we sending about the values of this House when we cut more than $20 billion from Medicaid, threatening the health care of millions of children, seniors and disabled Americans?

What message are we sending about the values of this House when we cut student loans, Pell grants and other educational spending by more than $21 billion?

What message are we sending about this House when we cut more than $5 billion from farm and nutrition programs, slashing the food stamp program that so many Americans depend on to feed their children?

How can we hurt all these people, cut all this funding, slash all these programs and still afford $106 billion in

tax cuts for our wealthiest, a tax cut that balloons the deficit and shifts the financial burden to pay those taxes to our grandchildren and our children?

That is right. Every penny we give away in this budget's massive tax cut to the wealthy shifts the burden of those taxes to the middle class and to the working poor who cannot even get unemployment benefits extended or an increase in the minimum wage out of this Congress.

What will it take for this House to get its priorities in order? How much debt will we strap to the backs of our future generations before we get smarter? How much must we borrow from foreign countries to feed the majority's insatiable appetite for economic Darwinism?

In 5 short years paying the interest, and this is so important I want to repeat this, by 2009, the interest that we pay on the Nation's debt will cost by itself more than all the domestic, nondefense, discretionary spending combined. That is very close by. Simply put, for every dollar we could be spending on roads and schools and putting more cops on the street, fifty cents of it will be passed on to foreign countries to finance the deepening debt with which this majority continues to encumber us. That is on top of the debt we incurred earlier today of $80 billion that we are hoping the Chinese will finance.

If the majority had its way our grandchildren would end up having to use those privatized Social Security accounts they have been pushing for the past few weeks to pay off this massive new debt that Congress keeps throwing at them. What is the problem?

What is included in this budget is just as horrifying as what is excluded from it.

In a disingenuous attempt to conceal their own economic short-sightedness, this majority has purposely hidden the harmful effects of their Social Security privatization plan, a plan that could cost the taxpayers trillions over the next 10 years, from this budget resolution.

They have low-balled the cost of the war in Iraq, spending only $50 billion over the next year, which just today we voted for $80 billion. Let me compliment the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) because if he had not put $50 billion in, there would have been nothing because the President did not include it at all in his budget. I call on any Member of the majority to stand here today and tell me we will spend just $50 billion and $50 billion alone next year.

Rather than show the true cost of their budgetary unmindfulness, the majority has chosen to conceal from the public the true cost of their plans, and as they prepare to pass this resolution and further cripple the financial viability of our Nation, the real knockout punch looms on the horizon.

Social Security privatization, while not detailed in this budget, would have disastrous, long-term, far-reaching impacts on the budget. The plan would cut Social Security benefits, make solvency problems worse and require massive borrowing, mostly again from the foreign countries, to the tune of $4 to $5 trillion over the next 10 years, and we have no less authority than Vice President CHENEY who verifies this.

In order to make certain that we are able to meet future budget obligations for the health and well-being of our children, our seniors, our veterans and disabled, we must protect Social Security from privatization.

Therefore, at the end of this debate, I will be asking for a ''no'' vote on the previous question so that we can consider legislation by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), our colleague, that will prohibit the use of the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for the administration's ill-advised private accounts plan.

Whether my friends on the other side of the aisle want to admit it or not, the administration plan to divert Social Security payroll taxes to private accounts will cut future Social Security benefits and make it nearly impossible to meet the future needs of so many Americans. That is why it is so important to stop this potential hemorrhage of Social Security in its tracks. The Salazar bill is a good step to show the American people that we will not allow their retirement checks to be slashed to pay for private accounts.

It is time for this House to show the American people what we truly value. This is our choice today. Will we stand with the people we represent or with the CEOs, corporations and special interests that stand to gain from the tax cut and the plan to privatize Social Security?

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the budget resolution. The rule allows for debate, along with three substitutes, two of which were offered by the minority. I think it is a good rule.

I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) and members of the Committee on the Budget on a good product that addresses several of the concerns that I have had with President Bush's budget.

I am pleased that the budget provides for extension of tax cuts that have brought 20 months of job growth to our Nation's economy. I also agree with the increases for our national defense and homeland security to provide for our troops fighting the war on terror and to keep our communities safe.

One source of concern for me was the Community Development Block Grant program. It is crucial to city and rural areas across my district. The President's budget proposed reducing funds to the CDBG and 17 other economic development programs from $5.31 billion to $3.71 billion. I am pleased that the Committee on the Budget added an additional $1.1 billion to the President's request for the functional category encompassing these programs. This budget resolution makes no assumption on the President's proposed Communities Initiative.

Our veterans deserve the very best health care and services our Nation can offer them. Funding for veterans have increased by 47 percent over the past 4 years, and I am pleased that the committee added $297 million this year to the President's budget proposal for veterans, and I will continue to seek further and additional funding for our veterans and their health care.

I continue to have some concerns with the budget. I am a strong supporter of vocational education and TRIO programs. The President's budget proposal would combine these into a high school intervention initiative and reduce funding. TRIO programs are very successful. I actually worked in one in helping low income students with their transition to college.

Vocational ed programs offer many high school students the motivation to work hard in all of their classes and provide job skills who do not go on to college. I look forward to working with appropriators to ensure adequate funding levels for both TRIO and vocational ed.

Medicaid funds are very important also to all West Virginians, particularly low income West Virginians, and I urge my colleagues to avoid cuts to Medicaid as the reconciliation instructions found in this resolution are implemented.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that these priorities like veterans education, economic development and Medicaid are adequately funded as the process continues.

I support the rule and the resolution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my New York colleague for extending me the 5 minutes.

I rise in opposition to the rule because it appears to be inconsistent with all of the things that the President is talking about.

The President is talking about relieving the tax burdens of working Americans, and yet there is no provision at all for the alternative minimum tax that is going to grab the middle income people with a tax that they do not deserve, and the Committee on Ways and Means and this Congress never intended that they have to carry this burden.

I am glad that the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) saw fit to put the $50 billion in because it is an indication that they know that a war is going on, and I only wish that they would put something in there to help those veterans that are fighting the war.

Lastly, if the President is going around the country selling this concept that we ought to eliminate this Social Security system and set up a new system, everyone agrees that it is going to cost a lot of money to do this. The transition is very, very costly. It runs into trillions of dollars, and yet there is not one scintilla of evidence that the President's legislative ideas are considered by the House in this budget.

The President had a press conference today, and he has indicated that the personal accounts, as he called them, and private accounts, as we called them, actually will not do anything to make the Social Security system solvent. So, in support of the President's position, what we are saying here in defeating the rule, give us the opportunity to bring legislation to my colleagues that would prohibit us from taking the contributions that are made to the Social Security fund out of that and putting it into a private fund, which the President agrees with us has nothing to do with saving Social Security.

As a matter of fact, he says that personal accounts will make sure that individual workers get a better deal in whatever emerges as a Social Security system, which means that if it is separate and just to make someone feel good because they have private investments, then come, Mr. President and my fellow colleagues of the other side of the aisle, and let us talk about it by taking personal private accounts off of the table and, in a bipartisan way, help us to get something that emerges out of Social Security.

Then, if we want to encourage incentives for savings, since the third rail that the President has grabbed is changing the income tax system, then let us work together and put incentives in the tax system that would encourage low and middle income workers to have a savings.

It just seems to me to have a budget today that excludes the real cost of the war, that punishes veterans that suffered in the war, that makes no provisions for relieving the economic pain that is going to be caused by the alternative minimum tax, and to act like the President going for 60 cities in 60 days will have no legislative impact, then let us save a lot of money and say that we cannot deal with Social Security reform today, not because we do not have a problem, but the President is committed in making certain that we do not find a bipartisan solution.

□ 1330

But the President going into districts knocking Democrats because they are not coming forward to work with him is inconsistent with what our President has said when he brought this subject up, and that is keep your powder dry, do not be critical because I will be coming up with a bill, and then after that come to us.

The President has changed his position three times. First, he says there is no crisis; and we agree with him that there is a problem. Two, he indicates that the personal accounts really are not the solution and have nothing to do with the solution of solvency. And, three, he is now saying he wants ideas instead of coming up with what he thinks should be the solution.

It just seems to me that it is up to us to make certain that we still work for a bipartisan solution; and if the President does not believe that his personal and our private accounts are going to help us in resolving this problem, then for God's sake let us get on with Social Security and with the help of the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), a personal friend of the President who listens to him, tell him we agree with the President that if it does not solve the problem, get out of the way and let us together, Republicans and Democrats, solve this problem.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concern of the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means in regard to the alternative minimum tax. The gentleman will be delighted to learn that this budget makes accommodation for a further AMT extension of relief so that middle-class Americans are not impacted by that AMT provision that originated in the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman from New York will be further delighted to know that the budget process allows the flexibility and the discretion for that authorizing committee to make those changes rather than having the Committee on the Budget direct them for them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) who is doing a superb job, along with our colleague from Dallas, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). As members of the Committee on Rules, they are also serving in the very important capacity on the Committee on the Budget where they have played a key role in fashioning this work product that we are going to see.

Let me speak about the rule itself. I am happy to see the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking minority member from Rochester, New York. I am happy this rule has been able to report out every single substitute that was submitted to the Committee on Rules calling for an opportunity to be considered here in the House. I am also happy we have been able to include an additional amendment which is unusual in that as Members know from the perspective of both sides of the aisle, when Democrats were in the majority here, Republicans in the majority, we have traditionally only made substitutes in order. But out of deference to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, we have chosen to make in order an amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

I believe this rule is extraordinarily fair, extraordinarily balanced and will provide an opportunity for a wide range of public policy discussions to take place as we move ahead with consideration.

Let me say when it comes to the budget itself, I think we have a clear choice. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) came before us and discussed the questions that relate to the budget proposal that have been assembled by the members of the committee under the very able leadership of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE). I know the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), as we proceeded with questions in the Committee on Rules, talked about the gentlewoman's concern over things like tax cuts.

I will say it is very important as we proceed with this budget for us to recognize what it is that tax cuts have brought about. I know in the eyes of many people it is counterintuitive in a sense that if we reduce tax rates, we can somehow increase the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury and reduce the size of the Federal deficit. I know it is counterintuitive because there are many who unfortunately are stuck with this notion that the way to deal with the deficit problem, the way to increase revenues to the Treasury is to dramatically increase taxes.

One of the points that I think is important for us to make, and I mentioned this yesterday in the Committee on Rules, the director of the Office of Management and Budget, Joshua Bolton, has on more than a few occasions reminded me, and I am sure he has said this to other groups, that if we did not have the tragic attack on September 11 against our Nation, September 11, 2001, if we did not have the horrendous cost of the war in Iraq with which we have had to contend, we would still have a Federal deficit.

We often hear during this debate that we saw under President Clinton a dramatic improvement in the budget and a surplus created. It was during the leadership provided by a Republican Congress that we got to that point, but the issue that needs to be brought to the forefront was that it was the economic slowdown, not the attack of September 11, not the war in Iraq, as painful as that has been, that led to the deficit itself.

It is the economic slowdown that began the last two quarters of the year 2000. The recession, the slowdown that we saw in early 2001, of course exacerbated as is regularly said by the attacks of September 11, by the corporate scandals we have seen, and the other challenges we have had to contend, but that economic slowdown is what led to the deficit itself.

So the single most important thing that we can do is to ensure that we expand our economy. That is the best way to deal with the deficit. That is not to say we should not be reining in Federal spending. I believe at my core as a Republican that the reach of the Federal Government impinges on individual initiative and responsibility, two very, very important things that need to be encouraged. If we can couple focusing on economic growth with responsibly reining in Federal spending, it is very clear that is the most effective way to deal with the deficit.

So what have we seen? When we had the debates in 2001 and then in 2002 and 2003 and 2004 on the issue of tax cuts, we constantly heard the argument from our very distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle that the Bush tax cut would ruin the country. It would dramatically increase the deficit itself. I am very happy to report, as I know most of my colleagues know, based on the projections we had for the last fiscal year, because of the economic growth that we saw, because of the unanticipated revenues that came into the Federal Treasury, because of the tax reduction that brought about that economic growth, we have seen the deficit itself actually reduced by $109 billion over what had been projected. That reduction in the anticipated level of the Federal deficit demonstrates that reducing rates is, in fact, the best way for us to deal with this. That is just a philosophical difference that we have between the two political parties.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to believe a Democrat, John F. Kennedy, was absolutely right when he argued this in the early part of the 1960s. It was successful. We saw dramatic economic growth as President Kennedy brought about a dramatic reduction on capital gains in the early 1960s. We have empirical evidence. It happened during the 1980s when we saw a doubling of the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury following the implementation of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for us to recognize that this package is one which is deserving of bipartisan support. It is a responsible budget which will rein in the kind of profligate Federal spending that we have seen in the past and which we know is very easy to engage in, regardless of political party. Under Republican leadership, we are reining in that growth in Federal spending and at the same time we are focused on very important priorities.

Last night in a speech the President gave to an event we had, he talked about the importance of an ownership society, how homeownership is at an all-time high. It is approaching 70 percent. Minority homeownership is at an all-time high.

One of the things we want to do, we want to make sure that younger workers have an opportunity to have confidence in the Social Security system. We have all been forced to pay into the Social Security system. Anyone who has been around since 1937 when it was implemented has been forced to pay into that system. We need to make sure that it is solvent.

We know in 13 very short years more will be going out of Social Security than is coming into Social Security through the FICA taxes. We also know while people talk about the so-called $2 trillion hole, the other night the Treasury Secretary told me if nothing is done on Social Security, that borrowing level will be even greater than the $2 trillion that those who are critical of the President's proposal argue is out there on the horizon.

I think if Members look at these very important issues and then focus on what is our number one priority, the national security of the United States, this budget is one which should enjoy broad support across the board from Democrats and Republicans alike. I urge support of this rule which allows alternative proposals, those that I have just discussed, to be considered. I think the rule itself is one which is modeled after the rules that our friends when they were in the majority put together for consideration of the budget.

I look forward to strong support for the rule, and I hope at the end of the day there is strong bipartisan support for the budget resolution.

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, just a brief word about the gentleman from California's remarks about unprecedented deficits. The gentleman points to 9/11, it was one of the causes; so was the recession that occurred under the Bush administration, and also policies that were adopted by this Congress and the President and the tax cuts that went predominantly to the very wealthy. When Mr. Greenspan was confronted with this, he said, ''I relied on the projections that most people made,'' but he was reminded he was wrong. A lot of us here said that at the time.

I want to say now a word about this rule. It completely ducks the issue of Social Security and what the costs would be if privatized. The President said just a few hours ago, ''personal accounts do not solve the issue.'' I am glad that the President acknowledged that privatization does not solve the issue. What he did not say is it makes it worse, far worse if it were to occur.

When we take their own figures and project them through the first 20 years if privatization were to occur, and we are going to make sure it does not, it would mean that this 2042 shortfall year, 2052 according to CBO, but take 2042, the shortfall would occur 11 years early. It is fiscally irresponsible.

Secondly, the President said, ''I have not laid out a plan yet intentionally; I have laid out principles.'' But they have also had briefings and endorsed plans and called them a good blueprint, and the impact would mean, it would mean there would be a deduction from Social Security benefits of 70 to 100 percent what would be in private accounts.

□ 1345

What it also means is that there would be a mammoth cut in benefits under Social Security, worse and worse the younger you were, $152,000 for a younger worker over their lifetime. We know enough about these proposals that come out of the White House, come out of their briefings or words of the President to know massive debt, major benefit cuts, and they would not, for most younger workers, help but hurt.

The President also said, ''A nest egg you could call your own.'' Those are his words. No, that is not correct. Because it would be under a government managed account and most workers would have to annuitize what was left in their private accounts and there would be nothing to pass on. No, it would not be a nest egg. It would be, for most people, an empty egg.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR).

Mr. SALAZAR. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the effort to defeat the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, my bill, H.R. 1330, the Social Security Trust Funds Protection Act, will be brought before the House for debate and a vote.

My bill would ensure that Social Security payroll contributions cannot be diverted to establish private accounts. I know that people say that Social Security was not meant to be the only source of retirement income, but the sad reality is that for too many people it is the only source of retirement.

Amelia Valdez from Pueblo, Colorado, gave me this photograph about 2 weeks ago. As she gave it to me, she looked up into my eyes with tears as she said, ''This is a photograph of Franklin D. Roosevelt signing the Social Security Act in 1935. Please hang it in your office as a reminder.'' She continued and said, ''Please do not let them dismantle my only source of income.''

In rural America, Social Security keeps tens of thousands of people from falling into poverty. My Democratic colleagues and I are committed to keeping our promises to American workers. We will fight to strengthen

Social Security so that American worker gets the benefits that they were promised.

Creating private accounts will only hasten the demise of Social Security by draining trillions of dollars from the Social Security Trust Fund. We cannot forget the lessons that we learned from Enron. A retirement fund that relies on the stock market is simply not a secure benefit. The proposal to privatize Social Security would mean a 40 percent cut in benefits. It simply does not make sense to change the Social Security system program so that it cuts benefits. The first step towards saving Social Security is to make sure that the payroll moneys are only used to pay Social Security benefits.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we can protect the retirement security of every American.

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

I thank the gentleman and the previous speakers for drawing attention to the looming crisis that impacts people my age in Social Security, the people who frankly have come to the conclusion that unless Congress acts sooner rather than later, there will not be that program and that dramatic and important action is needed. But coming back to the rule on the budget, which is the order of the day, it is also good to know that it is more about what reforms we will be taking up later this year are dominating the discussion, which I take to mean and assume to mean that the overall and underlying budget itself is a sound one and that the rule is fair.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the budget resolution sets the priorities of the Congress. It is a moral compass for what we stand for, what we believe in. It shows if our priorities are in the right place. It shows whether we are going to provide for the less fortunate or if we will continue to reward the rich and the powerful at the expense of people in need. The mundane minutia that are detailed as budget authority and outlays are actually the blueprints of our Nation. I do not like what the Republicans are building. They are creating a government without a conscience.

The Republicans control the White House, they control the Senate, and they control the House of Representatives. It is their agenda that determines the future direction of this country. That agenda includes slashing Medicaid, food stamps, education programs and veterans benefits. That agenda includes protecting tax breaks for the very wealthy in this country. That agenda also includes privatizing Social Security. Today, they will have an opportunity to put their vote where their rhetoric is. As we just heard, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) has introduced a bill that frames this issue plainly, that no payroll taxes may be diverted to privatize Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose privatization as do most if not all of my Democratic colleagues. The position of our Republican friends is not quite as clear. They say that all options are on the table and that they are open to listening to various ideas. They talk about the impending doom facing Social Security, creating a crisis out of thin air. They extol the virtues of Wall Street. They are desperately trying to find a way to make Social Security privatization more palatable. Their problem is that the more the American people learn about privatization, the less they like it. I believe that Social Security is a sacred compact between the Federal Government and senior citizens. It is an insurance program, a safety net intended to keep our senior citizens out of poverty. It has worked for 60 years. The privatizers want to unravel that safety net. They want to slash guaranteed benefits, run up trillions of dollars in debt and decrease the solvency of the trust fund. That is their plan.

Today we will have a chance to see if those privatizers have the courage of their convictions. So far, we have not seen that courage, because the budget resolution before us does not include the trillions of dollars in transition costs required to privatize Social Security. The Republican majority claims to support the President's privatization scheme. They say they want to do it this Congress. But they are not willing to put it in a budget.

Maybe the vote on the previous question will help them. If you believe as I do that we must not privatize Social Security, then you must vote ''no'' on the previous question. If you believe in privatizing Social Security, then you will vote ''yes'' on the previous question. It is that simple.

Social Security does face long-term funding challenges. Everyone recognizes that. As Democrats, we stand willing to work in a bipartisan way to meet those challenges. But we will not stand idly by and let the Republican majority destroy Social Security in the name of saving it. I urge my colleagues to say no to privatizing Social Security by voting ''no'' on the previous question.

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

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

This is a vigorous debate about the priorities that are embodied in our budget blueprint. But for the second day in a row now, we have had this characterized as a government without a conscience. Yet since 1995, we have seen dramatic and historic increases to IDEA, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Title I, historically high numbers. Veterans health care, $18.9 billion in fiscal year 2000, $30 billion today. Education numbers, up in double digits. HHS and NIH, doubled. That is not a government without a conscience. That is a government that has seen unsustainable rates of increases to discretionary domestic spending. This budget turns that corner and begins the process of slowing the growth in mandatory and discretionary but continuing to provide for those priorities, continuing to make those tough decisions in ways that have been avoided by prior Congresses.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. First, I must comment on the gentleman's remarks that if things were so good, then why is it that we have parents of children with special needs decrying these budgets? Why is it that we have firefighters coming to us decrying this budget? Why are we seeing so many people saying that we have our priorities in the wrong place? Certainly we should look at this budget resolution because it should be defeated.

Even though Social Security privatization is the President's number one priority, this Republican budget resolution hides the cost of the harmful effects of Social Security privatization. It refuses to include any details on the President's privatization plan and it further continues to spend every single cent of the Social Security surplus reserve on things other than Social Security. That means over the next 10 years under this budget that we have before us, $2.6 trillion of worker contributions that are supposed to be dedicated to Social Security will be spent on something other than Social Security. Like what? To pay for these tax cuts that are going principally to the wealthiest Americans in this country.

Even with that being done, using all the Social Security surplus moneys, we still have deficits never seen before in this country. This year alone we will have the biggest deficit this country has ever seen, more than $400 billion. That is more than $1,000 on the head of each and every man and woman in this country. They are gleeful. They believe that that is what we should do.

Mr. Speaker, many of us believe that we should have a plan as the Salazar legislation would propose that we save every single cent of the Social Security surplus which this year alone the surplus in Social Security contributions that will not be needed to spend for benefits to Social Security recipients will equal $169 billion. We can start by saying that $169 billion of Social Security moneys will not be spent, because this budget spends every single cent of the $169 billion coming in this year for Social Security on something other than Social Security. That is why so many Americans are so insecure about

Social Security and insecure about what the President proposes to do about Social Security.

Not more than 2 hours ago, one of the President's Cabinet secretaries, Secretary Elaine Chao of the Department of Labor, said before the committee, Social Security is not guaranteed.

I asked the Secretary, ''Can you clarify? Do you mean in the future perhaps if we don't do something to make it stronger, it won't be guaranteed?''

She just continued to say, ''It is not guaranteed.'' That is why people today feel so insecure about what the President is proposing, especially with privatization, because he will not tell us what it will cost. We know it could end up costing some 46 percent in benefit cuts if we privatize. We also know that it would require massive government borrowing, some $5 trillion over the next 20 years, if you try to privatize the system.

Where does all that money come from? Mr. Speaker, the reason people are so insecure about Social Security is not because the system is not there for them, it is because we have leaders talking about changing it without giving us the facts. Mr. Speaker, it is time for us in our budget documents to speak to the people, to give them the facts. This budget resolution does not do it. We should defeat it.

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

I am delighted to provide the gentleman some facts. Fact number one, title I has grown 10 percent per year since 2000. Pell grant funding, grown 10.3 percent per year since 2000. No Child Left Behind funding, grown 40 percent. Special education since 1996 has more than quadrupled. Funding for IDEA has quadrupled since 1996. IDEA funded only 8 percent of the per pupil expenditure in 1994 and 1995. Now it is nearly 20 percent. The Education Department discretionary budget authority has increased 146 percent since 1995. Those are the facts.

Was there not a conscience in the Congress prior to 1995? Is a 146 percent increase unconscionable? The commitment to education, the commitment to health care, the commitment to the NIH, the commitment to defense and the commitment to policies that expand and grow our economy and give Americans tremendous opportunities have been embodied in our budgets and are embodied in this budget.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question and a ''no'' vote on the rule. The minority has an issue we want to discuss in the course of this budget. That issue is whether or not we should stand by and allow the continued diversion of revenue assessed taxpayers for the specific purpose of Social Security.

Social Security means a lot to me. I have received a Social Security check. I have received that survivors benefit when my dad died. It meant so incredibly much to our family. One in six North Dakotans that I represent, 114,000, get a Social Security check every month. Well over half of North Dakotans pay into Social Security. They say what we have heard all across the country, and that is, ''My Social Security taxes are for Social Security. Don't raid those Social Security dollars.''

Now, of course, given the discussion on this radical overhaul of Social Security, we have the other prospect that these dollars will be taken away from Social Security and placed into private accounts, resulting in either massive additional borrowing to continue Social Security benefits or very draconian budget cuts. Massive additional borrowing or budget cuts if the revenue coming into Social Security is diverted into private accounts.

We think right now is the time to have this discussion. I support so much the amendment brought up by my friend from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), a new Member.

□ 1400

He wants to have this body move immediately to a debate on his amendment which would prohibit the diversion of Social Security money upon our completion of the budget. I think this is a good idea. I would like to hear one reason why we ought not move to discussing this diversion of Social Security money away from the Social Security trust fund, why we should not discuss today the prospects of massive additional Federal borrowing if we divert the Social Security money, why we should not discuss today the Draconian budget cuts that would reduce benefits potentially to people who desperately need them if we divert money that is coming in to pay benefits into private accounts.

There is a lot of explaining to do, in my opinion, for those who are advancing this privatization scheme on Social Security; and I know the Nation would feel an awful lot better, certainly those I represent, if we conduct this debate having first adopted the preservation of Social Security. Let us move to the discussion on how we shore up and maintain and strengthen Social Security, but not in ways that would cause massive additional borrowing, massive benefit cuts.

Vote ''no'' on the previous question. Support this opportunity to debate the Salazar amendment.

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

There will be that opportunity, this being the rule on the budget; but I will engage in a bit of discussion about the Social Security because I am one who will gain or lose a great deal, being someone who will reach that retirement age at that year of insolvency. And it is shocking to me that the party who gave us Social Security, and should be very proud of it and are, are almost in complete denial about the looming crisis that it faces and refuse to accept the fact that, regardless of which option we choose to solve the problem, that it is something that should be kicked down the road to future generations, to future Congresses, to future years.

And there is a stone wall of resistance to any discussion at all about for once Congress getting ahead of a big issue, for once Congress actually dealing with the problem before it is crashing down around our heads, for once Congress actually being bold and looking into the future beyond the next budget cycle, beyond the next election, beyond the next short-term problem and actually tackling it and dealing with it.

Anyone who has been through their freshman orientation upon being elected has a bipartisan group give them the long-term unfunded liabilities of this government, and we acknowledge that there are vast differences in the approach to saving Social Security. But, unfortunately, largely with one bold, brave exception in the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), there has been total resistance to have any constructive effort to bring about a solution to this problem.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me and very much appreciate the constructive tone of his debate.

We actually have advanced provisions for the safeguarding of Social Security. This Democratic Party which stood so strongly in preserving surplus dollars saved Social Security first, walling them off, the lockbox. We saved Social Security revenues for Social Security. And it is the Democrat Members of this body who are prepared to enter discussions when going-in principles are agreed to. Those principles: there shall be no insecurity added into Social Security and that there should be no additional Federal borrowing, no vast amounts of Federal borrowing.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I look forward to that constructive effort because we share that passion that those 55 and older, those at or near retirement, will not be impacted. But by golly, we have got an obligation to those people who are under 35 or under 45 or whatever number we finally arrive at, people who have time to plan and people who know, and all of us know, of all stripes, that there will be a problem in either 2040 or 2041 or 2042. We can argue over months and weeks all day long, but the point is we are not doing anything to take care of that first-year teacher, that first-year firefighter, that first-year soldier that all of us stand up on a regular basis and claim to speak for.

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

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

Let me just say to the gentleman from Florida that we do not believe that the way to increase the solvency of Social Security is to decrease the solvency of Social Security. Everybody on our side of the aisle is prepared to work in a bipartisan way to increase the solvency of Social Security. What we are objecting to is this privatization scheme.

Let me also say to the gentleman, because he questioned why I said that the Republican majority of this Congress has a budget that will create a government without a conscience, the reason why I say that is because this budget would cut $5.3 billion from the Department of Agriculture, cutting food stamps and other programs that are vital to America's farmers. This budget would cut 21.4 billion from education, cutting student loans and higher education spending.

He brags about the increase in money for No Child Left Behind, but we never properly funded No Child Left Behind. And our teachers and our principals and our superintendents are screaming about the fact that we have passed an unfunded mandate to them.

This bill would cut $20 billion, mostly from the Medicaid program. It would cut $270 million in spending from section 8 and other housing and homelessness programs. It would cut money from the Witness Protection Program, $103 million from transportation. It would cut $798 million for veterans health care. It would cut the earned income tax credit. It would cut money for unemployment insurance programs.

I mean, this is why I say that this is a budget that creates a government without a conscience. We are turning our backs on people who need our help, and I think that is wrong.

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

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

I would respectfully request that the gentleman give us the page number and paragraph of this budget blueprint that cuts the Witness Protection Program.

As the gentleman knows, the budget document is a broad blueprint for spending that directs the authorizing committees, those committees of members who have developed expertise in their areas, to find savings through reconciliation instructions. It allows Members like the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) on the Committee on Ways and Means to best formulate those revenue measures that avoid AMT taxing; that allows members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce to deal with the issues facing Medicaid program, which all of the Governors acknowledge is swallowing up State budgets; that allows the Committee on Agriculture to fund within their committee's jurisdiction those savings in a variety of programs.

This budget blueprint is a sound document that sets the course for our Congress and for our Nation for the coming year; and the cuts that the gentleman refers to are reductions in the rate of growth in those programs, with the exception of the reconciliation instructions, which are a remarkable and historic first step to this Congress restraining spending and funding priorities and simultaneously getting our arms around the deficit that both parties are understandably concerned about.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me first say to the gentleman that only in Washington would one call a cut a reduction in the rate of increase in spending. The bottom line is that this budget is more than just a general blueprint. There are specific directions in this budget that not only cut to the bone but cut through the bone. And, again, I repeat that this is a budget that creates a government that will have no conscience, and it needs to be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, I will modify this rule to provide that immediately after the House passes the budget resolution, it will take up H.R. 1330, the Social Security Trust Fund Protection Act. This legislation, introduced by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR), would ensure that Social Security contributions are used to protect Social Security solvency by mandating that trust fund moneys cannot be diverted to create private accounts.

Mr. Speaker, while Members of this House may differ on what is the best long-term solution to ensure solvency of Social Security, I think we probably all agree that we need to protect the money that goes into the trust fund and that any diversion of these funds must be undertaken with great care. Private accounts do not help the trust fund solvency. In fact, it is estimated that they would cost the system more than $5 trillion. H.R. 1330 will give us an opportunity to vote up or down on whether we want the Social Security trust fund to be used to pay for these fiscally irresponsible private accounts.

Let me make it very clear that a ''no'' vote on the previous question will not stop consideration of the budget resolution, nor will it change the process by which it is to be considered. But a ''no'' vote will allow the House to vote to prevent the siphoning off of the Social Security trust fund to pay for private accounts.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately before the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The untrained observer would believe that we were debating a Social Security bill here this afternoon. In fact, it is the rule on the budget blueprint for this country for fiscal year 2006, a budget blueprint that does a number of things important to the American people.

It puts our soldiers and sailors and airmen and Marines and Coast Guard and Reservists and Guardsmen foremost, fully funding the President's defense request, budgeting for the continued global war on terror to the tune of $50 billion; prioritizing, even making tough divisions, something that we are loathe to do often in this process, but it is what we are here for, making tough decisions about priorities, priorities in government, priorities in households, priorities in our individual lives, something every American is accustomed to.

It continues to invest heavily in our Nation's defense and homeland security. But it also recognizes that these challenges that have come about since 2001 have also required us as a Nation to make some tradeoffs. And so for the first time since the Reagan administration, it calls for an eight-tenths of a percent reduction in nonsecurity discretionary spending. It directs the authorizing committees to find savings on the mandatory side of spending, discretionary being just over a third of the budget anymore; mandatory nearing two thirds, essentially on auto pilot.

So a balanced approach to finding savings in our government such that we may begin to get our arms around the deficits and cut the deficit in half in 5 years so that we do not shoulder young people just entering the workforce, school-age children, children not yet born with these massive debts. We begin the difficult process of fiscal restraint, something that is anathema to this body oftentimes, all too often.

It has been said in the context of the Social Security debate that the other side does not believe the solution to solving Social Security's problems is to privatize it. We do not believe the solution to Social Security's problems is to do nothing. We have led with our chin on this issue, and I am very proud of that effort; and I am proud of the manner in which we have conducted this debate because it will undoubtedly be an extensive debate occupying a good part of the 109th Congress.

It is an opportunity for this Congress to lead, to lead the American people to an understanding of an issue that is at a total insolvency point occurring in 2042, but its impacts on the Federal budget beginning as soon as 2008. And as a young person who will be impacted by that, it gives us an opportunity to look beyond the short term and be truly visionary in the great ways that this Congress is capable of being.

We have done a lot of great things over the past several years: doubling NIH, continuing to invest in research and cures and trials to make the human condition better. And, frankly, we have succeeded to the point that the reason why Social Security faces insolvency is because the life expectancy of Americans continues to grow. Every 5 years that pass, life expectancy goes up a year. This budget continues to fund our priorities, continues to invest in people, and continues to lay the groundwork for policies that allow people to pursue their own version of the American Dream, to find opportunity in a growing, expanding economy; that allows for job creation, that does not punish entrepreneurial spirit, that allows people to continue to invest in their businesses, to have more money in their own pocket to make decisions about their own children's future, about their own opportunities, and about their own hopes and dreams.

And with that I urge my colleagues to support the rule, which is a very fair and balanced rule, and to support the underlying budget produced by the committee.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 154, RULE FOR H. CON. RES. 95

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision in this resolution, immediately after disposition of the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 95, the Speaker shall declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1330) to provide that Social Security contributions are used to protect Social Security solvency by mandating that Trust Fund monies cannot be diverted to create private accounts. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. 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 Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill. 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.

SEC. 4. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill H.R. 1330, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of that bill.

□ 1415

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). 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.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the rule if ordered, H.R. 1270, by the yeas and nays, and H. Con. Res. 98, by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 202, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—230

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cox
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—202

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—2

Cubin
Radanovich

□ 1442

Mr. PALLONE and Mr. REYES changed their votes from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. FORTENBERRY changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 196, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

AYES—228

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cox
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—196

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—10

Cubin
Honda
Hostettler
Jefferson
Melancon
Radanovich
Rush
Watson
Watt
Weldon (FL)

□ 1451

Mr. SPRATT changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 EXTENDING LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND FINANCING RATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1270.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1270, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 431, nays 1, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—431

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant

Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—2

Cubin
Hostettler

□ 1500

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING GRAVE CONCERN OF CONGRESS REGARDING PASSAGE OF ANTI-SECESSION LAW BY NATIONAL PEOPLE'S CONGRESS OF PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 98.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 98, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 4, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—424

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—4

McCollum (MN)
McDermott
Oberstar
Paul

NOT VOTING—6

Cubin
Gilchrest
Johnson, Sam
Melancon
Neal (MA)
Tiahrt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1507

Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota changed her vote from ''present'' to ''nay.''

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week on March 9 during the discussion of the transportation

bill, I was detained out of the building and away from the Capitol, and I missed the following votes and would like to have recorded in the appropriate place of the transportation bill that on the Graves amendment if present I would have voted ''no''; on the Kennedy amendment if I was present, I would have voted ''no''; on the Osborne amendment if I was present, I would have voted ''no''; on the Moran amendment if I was present, I would have voted ''aye''; on the Conaway amendment if I was present, I would have voted ''no.''

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 161) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 161

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON RULES.—Ms. Matsui.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 525

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 525.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUSSLE. 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 fiscal year 2006 budget resolution.

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

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 154 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 concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 95.

□ 1508

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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) to assume the chair temporarily.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 5 hours, with 4 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 2 hours of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

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

Mr. Chairman, today we are here to debate the budget resolution for 2006, the Federal Government spending blueprint that will guide all of this Congress' spending and revenue decisions for the coming fiscal year.

Let me start by thanking my staff on both sides, Republicans and Democrats. What Members will hear today, this is probably one of the heartiest debates of the year when we talk about the priorities for the coming year. As Members might imagine, because we come from different backgrounds and different States and different philosophies, we have different ideas of what is important, Members will hear quite a bit of debate from time to time that will sound rancorous. It will sound like we do not agree on anything and everything is going to be difficult, and I do not think it is quite that bad.

We have some pretty important priorities that we all agree upon, and we share a number of the goals. How to achieve those goals is in part the budget process: how are we going to get it done, and how are we going to accomplish it. That, unfortunately, gets into the details where we may disagree.

I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), my partner and friend who will come forthwith his own budget today, and we appreciate that. Members will hear his ideas and our ideas. We will get to debate those ideas, and we will come out at the other end with a better understanding of exactly how both sides will approach the problem, the challenges we will have; and we will hear about some of the ways to solve this.

Long before today, long before this debate started and quite honestly before we received the President's budget, we knew what the priorities were going to have to be. If you attend any town meeting in Iowa or across the country, Members are going to hear these same kinds of themes: we have to keep the country strong and defended. If we are not strong, we are not free; and if we are not free, we have lost everything. We have lost the most important gift we have been given, that has been bestowed on us, and that we feel so passionate about being able to bestow on generations to come here in this country and around the world. We need to continue to be strong.

Second, we need to continue to grow the economy. We really do. We need to create jobs and keep the opportunities flowing for our kids and grandkids because we know when we are strong and growing, we are able to accomplish so much in the world. Our economy must continue to grow.

Last but not least, and I can tell Members this is true wherever you go, people around the country are frustrated by the attitude and almost arrogance that government can solve all of our problems, that somehow another government program will solve the problem, or more government bureaucracy or more government regulations or just another law or more employees working in fancy white buildings downtown, if we would only do that we would solve the problem, and that means spend much more money, too much money.

So America's continued greatness comes from, I believe, the unlimited opportunities that our freedom provides, but we have to get our hands around this out-of-control, unsustainable spending. Right along with our well-meaning folks who come along, we have created a government that is too big and spends too much, and we have to get control of that spending if we are going to be successful.

As I have said, these must be our Nation's highest priorities, continued strength, continued growth, and making sure we can restrain spending because none of the rest of it, all of the good things that the Federal Government does in so many areas such as education and health care and veterans benefits and agriculture and transportation and energy and science, I could go on and on, we all have our favorite areas where we think the government ought to invest, but none of that continues to happen, none of that will be achieved if we are not strong, if our economy does not grow, and if we cannot get our arms around the spending.

So we chose to write a budget that ensures that first and foremost our needs must be met, gives all other priorities a fair shake, that is what the

budget process does, it puts in a $50 billion what we call a place holder, recognizing that we need to fund next year's likely emergency request for the war on terror, we have to plan for that; and it continues the progress that we have made in reducing the deficit and getting our spending on a sustainable path.

□ 1515

Last year was really the first year that we have been able to move beyond the crisis mode that we have had in our budget in response to September 11, 2001. We began a path to get hold of our out-of-control spending and to reduce the deficit. We had, I think, some pretty good success. We ought to recognize that we made some progress last year and realize how it happened. Despite cries from many different quarters in the country that all we need to do is just raise some taxes, tax the wealthy is always what people say, tax all those small businesses that are creating jobs, tax those farmers, tax those families that are sending their kids to college and are trying to make ends meet around their kitchen table, just give them more taxes and we will solve the problem. We decided we were not going to raise taxes. As a result of that, the economy continued to expand, and, due in large part to those economic policies, we now have strong, sustained economic growth and job creation. We also, for the first time in a long time, managed to slow the rate of this nonsecurity spending that has been out there, for the first time below the rate of inflation. I think that is a whole lot more reasonable than what we saw in years past.

Let me just show my colleagues what we did last year. This is what happened in just one year. The President when he came in, almost a year ago right now, the budget deficit was going to look like this, $521 billion. We all said that was not what we wanted, that we did not want to do that. We wanted to see if we could get our arms around it last year. We knew it was going to be tough. We knew there were going to be all sorts of complaining, claims that we were not keeping the priorities straight, but when the President started, this is where we started, at $521 billion. In one year alone, 20 percent, $109 billion was reduced on that deficit. $109 billion or 20 percent in one year.

Why? Two reasons. Number one, the economy grew. The economy grew faster than anybody expected, because when you unleash this 10-plus-trillion-dollar economy and allow it to just chug along and create jobs and have people investing and creating those opportunities for our young people around the country and others to make money for themselves and deal with their own problems and their own challenges, our economy is a wonderful thing and when it has just a little bit more growth than we expect, that brings in a lot of revenue to our Treasury. In one year, we reduced the deficit 20 percent. In that same year, even with tax reductions, more money came into the Treasury than the year before. This is not a science experiment. It is a fact. When you reduce taxes and you cause economic growth, oftentimes, and last year was an example of this and already we are seeing it this year, more money comes into the Treasury. That combined with holding the rate of growth of spending, we were able to reduce that deficit and get back eventually to balance. We took the first steps by keeping the economy growing, creating jobs, beginning to restrain this out-of-control spending.

But while both of these items are critical alone, they are not going to get the job done. We have so many Members who understand that every year we come down to the floor on appropriation bills and we battle over a million here and a million there, and I know it all adds up, but there is a part of the budget that is not being addressed. I will get to that in just a moment.

This year in the budget, much like the President's budget, we take the necessary next step for slowing spending, at the same time ensuring that our priorities are met. This includes reducing the top line number for all the nonhomeland, nondefense spending by eight-tenths of 1 percent. What we are doing is we are saying we are going to take the President's number for defense and for homeland security, we want to keep the country strong, but in all other areas of our discretionary spending, we are going to start weeding the garden. We want to look through all of those programs and find ways to save money, find ways for us to reform programs, find places where we are wasting money, where money is not being spent appropriately, and as a result of that be able to reduce some of those increases.

Additionally, and probably more important, this budget begins to address the unsustainable growth on the other side of the budget, the 55 percent of the spending that simply operates automatically. This is the dirty secret of budgeting that most Members do not want to talk about and that is what we call mandatory spending. What is mandatory? What could possibly be mandatory about spending in Washington? When Congress sets up a law that says a check is going to be written if certain eligibility is met and regardless of any other changes in demographics or anything else, money just keeps going out, the program keeps chugging along, without any checks, without any balances, without any opportunities to take a look at whether the program is meeting the needs. That is automatic spending. That is the mandatory spending.

What we did a number of years ago in welfare reform is we said the program is not helping people, it is not helping families, it is locking people into the dependency on government, asking no personal responsibility in return. Unless we reform the program, we are not going to get our spending under control. People are just going to keep getting the checks and nothing is going to ever change. Generation upon generation was going to be locked in this spending. And so what we did just 10 years ago and what we want to do again here is tackle some of that automatic spending.

Let me show you what is happening to it. The yellow area here is the portion of the budget that back in 1995 when we tackled welfare reform was about half of the budget, this entitlement spending or automatic spending. We tackled it back then. Thank goodness we did because it was growing out of control in the welfare programs. We now need to look in other areas because look what has happened in just 10 years. In just 10 years, more than half of the budget is now done automatically, is not going to be done on the floor here, in our appropriations process, is not going to have the oversight, is not going to have the opportunity to reform because we are not paying attention to it in our budget. This year we are. This year we are going to. This year we are going to ask the committees to reform the programs and begin weeding the garden, looking for ways to deliver these programs more efficiently.

Why? Because as we see, if we do nothing, it grows unsustainably out of control, which is the word the Governors use for Medicaid, unsustainable. The Medicaid program is unsustainable. They know it is growing too fast. They know that on an average year, Medicaid grows 7.5 percent. Out of control. 7.5 percent. And so this year what we are going to do is we are going to begin to tackle this automatic spending. Our current rate of growth of spending in this mandatory area is 6.4 percent. All of it is growing at 6.4 percent. Nothing changes. 6.4 percent. Again, every year, another 6 percent, every year growing and compounding and growing and Congress is doing nothing. Our constituents are getting frustrated. And so what we need to do is we need to go in and reduce that growth just one-tenth of 1 percent. That is all we are asking for. We are saying instead of growing at 6.4 percent, it is going to keep growing at 6.3 percent. But let us get the committees and let us get the Congress and let us get the Governors into a room and let us begin talking about these programs, reforming them and getting them under control.

I will note that there is a very interesting phenomenon about this decision to slow the rate of growth which ends up being about one-tenth of 1 percent over the next 5 years. It has created a very interesting phenomenon, because what happens about this time of year is people come to the floor and they start saying things like, oh, these cuts are outrageous, these cuts are unconscionable. Why do they keep calling it cuts? Because in Washington, a cut is a decrease in an anticipated increase.

Let me explain what I am saying here. What I am saying here is that in Washington, if you do not get what you expected from one year to the next, if you do not get the increase you thought you were going to get, they run to the floor, they run to the press conferences, they run to wherever it is they can run and complain and suggest that they are being cut. It would be as if your son came to you and you have been negotiating your lawn mowing fee, his allowance maybe over the last number of years and you were able to pay him 10 bucks every time he mowed the lawn. This year he came to you and he said, ''Dad, I want 15.'' You said, ''Son, I love you. You're a great son. You do a great job. I'd like you to trim a little bit more, but you're doing a pretty good job with the lawn. I'm not going to give you 15, I'm going to give you 12.'' If he ran to the microphones with a lot of people around here, they would claim he was cut $3. My goodness, what an outrage. You should love your son. You should love what he does to your lawn, that he should get an increase to $15. My goodness, what an outrage, instead of recognizing that it was a $2 increase. That happens so often around here.

I understand that we are going to hear some of that rhetoric today, but we are slowing the rate of growth. We are just saying it needs to be slowed down. Just slow it down. Let us reform the programs. Let us get the people in a room who need to be part of the discussion to reform these programs and let us slow down the spending and make sure that the programs that we are talking about, which are so vitally important to people, take the food stamp program. That is for people who are hungry. Take the Medicaid program. That is for people who do not have health care. Take a number of these programs and suggest that they should grow out of control? Or suggest they should meet the changing needs of a population, and that is something that we have to continue to do and it requires constant weeding of the garden and constant attention if we are going to get that done.

The problems facing our mandatory spending did not happen overnight. We are not going to fix this overnight. We are not suggesting this is being fixed overnight. It is like going from 60 miles an hour to slam on the brakes to zero? No. That is not what we are doing. We are just saying, slow down, figure out a way to make these reforms.

One thing I will guarantee you is that if there is no budget, if you do not put these kinds of instructions into the budget, if there is no budget or if an entity or a Member comes to the floor with a budget today that does not have these serious kinds of instructions in the budget to reform the programs, I will guarantee you they will not get fixed. I would suggest to you doing nothing is not an option. You cannot complain about Medicaid and offer no solution. You cannot complain about the error rate in food stamps and say there is no solution. You cannot complain about these programs and say there is no solution. We do not think there is a silver bullet but we want to set up a process to begin the discussion to fix these programs. We can do this. It is going to take time. The budget recognizes that, the budget we brought to the floor today, that we need a reasonable pace to get there. We set September as a deadline so we can invite all of the interested parties in to begin this. It builds on the critical work that we have done over the past number of years to shore up and strengthen national defense and create jobs and make sure that we continue our reduction in spending. I believe it is a doable, a fair and honest budget, one that we can work with the President in order to make sure it gets put into place.

I want to end with this. We plan to enforce this budget. This is a good budget. Just like last year, we plan to enforce this budget. Whether this is by way of announcement or however you want to do it, do not worry if we do not get an agreement with the Senate, with the other body. I understand that the other body has decided to walk away from the President on the budget. They are not going to do real reform. It does not look like they are going to try and control spending. I am very frustrated with what I see over from the other body. They are watering it down every step of the way. The courage unfortunately does not appear to be there in order to make some of these big changes that I think our Nation demands at this time. But I will tell you that in the House, just like last year, we enforced the budget. There was a controversy for those Congress watchers that have been brewing on the floor this week about people who wanted to really enforce the budget. Thank goodness we do that. Last year we enforced the budget. The Speaker did. I did. We were able to hold the line on spending, keep within that budget. As a result, we got the deficit reduction that we needed. Just like last year, we will do that again this year. I do not need any special rules. I do not need any Member to tell me that that is how we ought to do it. That is my commitment. That is the Speaker's commitment. That is the majority's commitment. When we pass something, we mean it. That is what we lived under last year.

We have had terrible extra budgetary spending in an emergency basis. I understand people are frustrated with all the extra spending. I want to show it to you. Every year we have had to do extra spending. I understand that. On September 10, 2001, we had a surplus.

□ 1530

There is no question, we had a surplus on September 10 of 2001. We all know what happened the next day. And we all know and we all joined in the spending to meet the needs of our changed world. None of that was in the budget. We knew we had to do it. We knew we had to keep the economy strong. We knew we had to support our troops. We knew we had to combat terrorism. We knew we had to protect the country.

We decided we would do whatever it took. That is whatever it took. And it meant we had to run deficits. But just like last year, we made a commitment to reducing the deficit. We did it 20 percent last year. We are going to do it again this year. We will get to cutting the deficit in half by 2009. We will get that accomplished and then some, and we will get back to balance. But we have got to stick to a plan.

We will do whatever it takes, not only to protect the country, but we will do whatever it takes not to pass on that legacy to the next generation. We cannot do it all in 1 day. We cannot do it all in 1 year.

We made progress last year. This budget builds on that progress, meets the needs of our country, and it is a good budget that I hope my colleagues adopt.

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

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

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, it is hard to believe that just 5 short years ago we were sitting on a pinnacle of surpluses totaling $236 billion. And it did not come easily. It was not the fallout from some fantastic economy, some serendipitous result.

Democrats, beginning in 1992 and 1993, made the hard choices that moved the budget to surplus in unprecedented fashion. $290 billion was the deficit inherited by President Clinton when he came to office, as this chart will show. $290 billion was the largest deficit in our Nation's peacetime history.

The President, as his first legislative act, sent us a budget to cut that deficit by more than half over the next 5 fiscal years. I will never forget the day we passed it here on the House floor by one vote, and in the Senate by the Vice President's vote. I will never forget the taunts, the claims that we were cutting the economy off at the knees, buying ourselves a one-way ticket to a recession, and ballooning the deficit instead of resolving it.

Well, Mr. Chairman, every year thereafter, after adoption of the Clinton budget in 1993, every year the bottom line of the budget got better, to the point where in the year 2000 we had a surplus of $236 billion. We made the hard choices to make that happen. And that was the surplus inherited by President Bush when he came to office in the year 2001.

No President in recent times has enjoyed such an inheritance, and he squandered his inheritance. We warned against it. We warned against going for deep tax cuts and relying upon the projection of surpluses at that point in time, which was $5.6 trillion.

We told the President then that while we may seem to be sitting on an island of surpluses, we were surrounded by a sea of red ink, a sea of debt; and we needed, now that we could, to attend to our long-term needs, our obligations to Social Security in particular.

He defied and ignored all those priorities and went solely with the budget whose primary thrust and emphasis was the biggest tax cuts we have passed in the history of this Congress.

Unfortunately, the prophecies and predictions we made have come to pass. The boost to the economy imparted by those tax cuts did not replenish the revenues to the Treasury of the United States. As a consequence, today we have the largest deficits in our Nation's history. Not just this year. It is not just something episodic. Two years ago we had a deficit of $375 billion. This past year we had a deficit of $412 billion. This year, according to OMB, we can look for a deficit of $427 billion. Each of those deficits, 375, 412, 427, each of those deficits is a record deficit.

And now what do we look at for the long-term future? The President tells us he is going to cut the deficit in half. And he sends us a budget which purports roughly to do that. But he conveniently omits from his estimation of what will be incurred in the way of cost over the next 5 years major items such as the cost of the war. We have 140,000 troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. More in Afghanistan. That war cost is not going away or tapering off any time soon. And any budget that is straightforward should include some estimation of the likely cost now that we have been over there for 2 or 3 years and know what the costs should be based upon.

Secondly, there is nothing in the President's budget to account for fixing the Alternative Minimum Tax, which we all know is a political inevitability. His own Treasury Department has told us if we do not fix it, it will go from four million tax filers to 30 million tax filers by the year 2010. It will have to be fixed in the near term. There is not a thing in the President's budget that accounts for that. Even though he asks for additional tax cuts, he leaves out that $640 billion item.

And then the cost of fixing Social Security, privatizing Social Security. The President says he would like to allow workers to take 4 percentage points off their FICA payments and put it in a private account. Well, if you do that, you are taking money out of public trust funds, putting them in private trust funds; and, therefore, money will have to be borrowed to meet the obligations of Social Security; to wit, $754 billion beginning in the year 2009 and extending to the year 2015. That is not my number. The White House gave us that estimate. And yet they did not put it in their own budget.

When you add all of these things together, what you get is not a deficit that is going to be cut in half over the next 5 years, or the next 10 years, for that matter. What you get is a deficit that moves from $427 billion next year to $621 billion in the year 2015.

Let me just show you in three simple lines what this means looking backward over the immediate last 3 years.

When my Republican colleagues passed the President's budget and his tax cuts in the year 2001, his offices at OMB told us in earnest, we will not be back here hat in hand to ask to increase the debt ceiling of the United States, the legal limit on what we can borrow, again until 2008. So confident are we that these tax cuts will be replenished, we do not think we will be back here until 2008.

They were back here in the year 2002, asking for an increase in the debt ceiling of $450 billion.

The next year, 2003, they came and asked for a debt ceiling increase of $984 billion. Let me tell my colleagues for reference purposes how big that is. The entire debt of the United States when Ronald Reagan came to office was less than $984 billion. In one year, in one year, the Bush administration asked and the Republicans in the Congress, both Houses, acceded to a debt ceiling increase of $984 billion. That was May 26, 2003. Within 15 months, Secretary Snow from the Department of Treasury was back and said, we need more; we need more. And consequently, before we adjourned last November, the Congress again, with Republican votes, increased the debt ceiling by $800 billion.

That means in 3 fiscal years, 3 of the 4 fiscal years represented by the Bush administration's first term, the debt ceiling of the United States had to be raised by $2.234 trillion in order to accommodate the budgets of the Bush administration.

Today, we have before us a budget resolution which was crafted by the Republicans and by the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE). Very little collaboration. A lot of civility. We have a great relationship, but little collaboration. They did their thing; we did our thing. Basically, what they have done is a take-off on the President's budget. It is very similar to the President's budget.

So instead of taking my word for what the consequences of this budget are, let me show something that every Member has in his or her office right now. It came yesterday, March 15: an analysis of the President's budgetary proposals for the fiscal year 2006, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, which, as everybody knows, is neutral and nonpartisan. Members do not have to read the whole thing, although I would commit it to their reading. They just have to read to the second page. Table 1.1 on the second page, if they read there, they will see the implications of what they will be putting in train if they vote for this budget resolution, which is basically the President's budget request.

And that is, according to CBO, we will add to the debt of the United States $5.135 trillion over the next 10 years. Another $5 trillion on top of the $2.2 trillion that I have just shown will be added over the next 10 years as a consequence of passing this budget. That is not cutting the deficit in half. That is letting the deficit soar and soar and soar.

To mitigate the problem, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and his colleagues on the Committee on the Budget have prepared some cuts in domestic discretionary spending. The irony here is they and the President both go to one sector in the budget that has not been growing over the last 3 to 4 years, and they take their cuts almost exclusively out of these domestic programs, programs like education and veterans health care and the environment.

Yet where the real cost increases, spending increases, are coming is not in those accounts, which constitute about $350 billion and have basically been flat for the last 3 years. As this chart shows, over the last 4 years, 90 to 95 percent of the spending increases have come from defense, understandably, the reaction to 9/11, post-9/11, and to an account in the budget that did not exist 3 years ago, Homeland Security. That is where the growth is coming.

But in instead of going to this growth, instead of going to these items in the budget, they are concentrating on domestic discretionary spending, and I tell my colleagues while we can take a hit this year, $150 billion over 5 years, a significant reduction, and maybe some more next year, pretty soon we are going to reach the tolerable limits of what we can do in the way of cutting education, law enforcement, infrastructure improvements, and things like that in the United States.

So there are limits to where we can go and the methods they are choosing, and that is why I say this is the path we are taking. Here it is when CBO sends us their report: $5 trillion. And, by the way, that does not include anything for the additional cost of the war past the year 2006, and that is because the President does not have it in his budget. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) to his credit said we know we are going to be there in 2006. We know basically what it costs, we should put something in our budget to reflect that cost. And he put $50 billion in his budget. The President did not. If we adjust his budget, as represented here in CBO, for the likely cost of being in Iraq and Afghanistan for some years to come, it adds another 300 to $400 billion to the tally. It pushes it on up even more.

So that is what we have before us, a very tough, almost intractable problem. And I wish I could say that for all of this arduous effort I thought that we were beginning to get our hands around the problem. I do not think so.

We have offered a substitute that we think is better fiscally and better in terms of our core values, the values

that we support and we think the American people share: the education of our children, for which we do more; the health care of our veterans, for which we are committed and do more; the development of our communities; and the quality of our environment. We do that simply by bringing spending in the domestic discretionary accounts back to baseline, that is, to current services, enough to prevent them from being eroded away by inflation, but not by any significant increase.

Those changes plus the plan we lay out will bring our budget to balance by the year 2012. We think that ought to be the effort and aim of every budget that is presented here in the well of the House, getting back to balance as soon as possible and will incur less debt than the budget resolutions being offered to us.

So we have got plenty to debate here today, but we have got an alternative on our side that protects our core values and priorities, the education of our children, the health care of our veterans, the development of our communities, the quality of our environment, and one also that is fiscally responsible. One also that will move us to balance sooner in time more assuredly than the Republican resolution.

We look forward to the debate. We believe that we have the better choice, the better resolution; and we will be presenting in the course of the day the reasons why.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to have our Members talk a little bit about our continued strength as a Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), a member of our committee, to talk about national defense.

□ 1545

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me time, and want to commend him for his hard work in crafting this fiscally responsible budget which fulfills Congress's commitment to protecting American citizens.

As the chairman just stated, the driving force of this budget is to make sure, first and foremost, that our most critical priorities are met, and there is no greater priority in this budget than making sure that America's continued strength and security are intact. Our number one commitment to the American people continues to be the protection of their security.

Five years ago when I decided to run for Congress, I decided because I looked at our military, I saw that it was underfunded, I saw that it was overdeployed. In fact, in the late 1990s, the service chiefs had warned Congress that our Nation was on the brink of a hollow military, with inadequate funding for troop training and maintenance of equipment.

This became painfully clear when we were attacked on September 11. Our Nation had severe defense and homeland security deficits that had to be addressed immediately. Since that day, Congress has shown that we are more than willing to spend whatever is necessary to protect and defend our Nation and support our troops.

Since September 11, we have spent $1.9 trillion, almost $2 trillion, to provide for the defense and homeland security of this Nation, and that does not include the supplementals that we have already passed, which add up to $248 billion. So we have done a whole lot of very necessary and very costly building, rebuilding and across-the-board updating to correct those deficits, and we acted quickly, deliberately, and in a bipartisan way to address those needs. I am glad to say that this year's defense and homeland security budget builds on the substantial progress we have already made.

Our national defense base budget continues the multiyear plan to enable the military not only to fight the war against terrorism today, but to transform our military to counter some of the unconventional threats that will come in the future, and Congress has shown that we are more than willing to do whatever it takes.

I am going to show you a chart, and this shows that since 2000 we have increased spending for the military by 66 percent. You can see it goes from $287 billion to $476 billion these last 5 years. So that is quite a commitment.

Now, this budget accommodates the President's request for the Department of Defense and increases our spending this year up to $419.5 billion, almost $420 billion. That is an increase over last year of 4.8 percent. It also proposes a sustained average increase of 3 percent over the next 5 years.

I think we all know that the most important part of our defense funding is for the people, the men and women who serve our country, the finest military personnel in the world. To support them and to allow the Department of Defense to continue to recruit and train first-rate forces, this budget builds on the critically needed funding increases of the past few years for military personnel.

Since President Bush took office, we have increased spending in military personnel accounts by approximately 40 percent, providing such quality of life advancements as, number one, an increase in military pay of 21 percent. We have reduced the average out-of-pocket housing expenses for military people from 18 percent down to zero. They do not have to pay on average any out-of-pocket expenses for their military housing. And we fully funded the health benefits for active duty members, for retirees and their dependents as well.

We spend money in operations and maintenance. That is the core of our readiness to fight this global war on terrorism. This budget provides for increases in training and education, operations and support for the military forces, maintenance of field weapons systems and equipment, and operation and maintenance of facilities. In total, operations and maintenance has gone up by 20 percent over the last 4 years.

To continue our effort to replace worn out or obsolete equipment, we provide for procurement of new ships, aircraft and vehicles, as well as the purchase and initial fielding of weapons systems, ammunition and other combat-related systems. Over the past 4 years, funding for procurement has increased 25 percent.

Also, as the chairman noted in his opening statement, we have included in our budget $50 billion to fight the ongoing War on Terror.

Mr. Chairman, the number one responsibility of the Federal Government is to protect American lives, and I am proud to say that this budget does just that. I urge its adoption.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) to talk about homeland security.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I want to compliment the gentleman and the staff for putting together what I consider an excellent budget. Your work will be recognized as we move this.

Continuing our progress in providing for homeland security, this budget provides for a total homeland security spending of $49.9 billion, an increase of 8.6 percent. About 55 percent of that would go to the Department of Homeland Security or other homeland security-related funding spread through the government, including the Department of Defense, Health and Human Services and Justice as well.

These funds will work to meet the needs in three key strategic areas of homeland security, including, first of all, preventing attacks. We provide for increases in funding for homeland security programs and agencies specifically designed to help prevent attacks from occurring, including border security, counterterrorism and counterintelligence.

Secondly, we reduce other vulnerabilities. Our budget works to reduce and eliminate the risk of attacks at our ports, rails, in the skies, our food supply and roads by allowing for increases in many of the programs and agencies to help protect these important areas of commerce and travel.

Thirdly, ensuring preparedness. This budget also helps to ensure that our first responders have the necessary material and equipment to handle emergencies as well as adequate disaster preparedness through FEMA.

Key initiatives of the President's proposal supported by this include: $40.4 billion for total homeland security spending, excluding the Department of Defense homeland security spending; $38.3 billion for the Department of Homeland Security, a 177.5 percent increase for agencies moving into the department from fiscal year 2001;

and the increase in this year's budget follows on the heels of truly substantial increases over the past few years.

As you will see from the chart we are going to put up now, this chart shows only the non-defense discretionary spending and illustrates what we have done in the past years in the area of homeland security since 2001.

In 2000, spending in this category, as you can see from the bottom over here, was $9 billion, so over the past years we have increased that by 28 percent, where we are now up to an estimated $32 billion. So the increase has been there and we are doing what is right.

We have invested more than $50 billion to create the Department of Homeland Security, reorganizing 22 agencies consisting of 180,000 employees and their missions and invested heavily to protect the homeland against threats such as bioterrorism.

As I said a moment ago, there is no higher priority in our budget, or certainly in the budgets of the past few years, than providing for what is needed for the protection and security of our country and support of our troops. That said, we want to ensure that the money we are spending is being spent wisely and with proper planning and oversight. As the chairman has often said, and we are working on here, many times too often around here we judge our progress simply on how much we are spending, instead of how well we are spending it.

Aside from the increases the President has proposed for both homeland security and defense, his budget recommends reducing total funding for non-security discretionary programs by about 1 percent from the current year's level. Particularly under these circumstances, we want to make sure that every dollar we spend is spent wisely and with proper planning and oversight. The homeland security defense spending is certainly no exception.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purposes of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend the gentleman from South Carolina for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscally responsible Democratic alternative budget offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and in opposition to the Republican leadership's unbalanced budget.

Mr. Chairman, the annual budget resolution is not a legally binding document, but a guide, a blueprint for our Nation's budget. While the House regretfully—and irresponsibly—failed to pass a budget resolution last year, we should not by our inaction diminish its importance. The budget resolution should reflect this body's values and priorities and those of the American people. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the majority's 2006 budget resolution does not reflect the American people values, priorities and needs, let alone their children's needs. This budget will, in fact, hurt the vast majority of Americans for years to come.

This budget resolution makes tax cuts for the wealthiest in our society its top priority. By contrast, it puts little or no priority on programs to serve veterans. It slashes funding to protect the environment and eliminates numerous education programs. Low-income households and underserved communities take the worst hit through excessive cuts to health care programs, education, critical infrastructure and housing.

These funding cuts include the elimination or substantial reduction of 150 programs. For example, the Department of Education eliminates 48 programs, costing a total of $4.3 billion, and the Department of Health and Human Services eliminates 33 health and social services programs costing $2.0 billion. Some cuts are implemented over a 10-year budget window, but many are eliminated entirely in fiscal 2006. For example, all vocational education programs are eliminated immediately. The budget slashes $522 million for all technology education programs and $437 million for State grants for safe and drug free school and community programs. The Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, budget is cut by nearly one half billion dollars, jeopardizing EPA's ability to enforce environmental regulations and coordinate mitigation programs with State and local governments.

The Republican budget cuts veterans' health care by $14 billion below current services over the next 5 years. These cuts come at a time of unprecedented growth in demand for services. The Veterans Health Administration, VHA, is struggling to provide adequate health care services for our aging Vietnam, Korean, and World War II veterans, in addition to serving the needs of the countless and increasing Iraq war veterans.

The Congressional Budget Office predicts that the administration's policies expressed through this budget will result in deficits of $250 billion or more each year over the next 10 years. The programs I just cited represent a small portion of the discretionary budget. Targeting environmental, veterans, health care, education, basic scientific research and housing programs for cuts, while advocating permanent tax cuts that benefit the highest income tier, is not the way to balance the budget.

These discretionary programs represent only 16 percent of the deficit but are charged with nearly 100 percent of budget cuts. While the tax cuts represent the cause of the majority of our deficit, they will not be pared back but instead are made permanent.

The Bush administration and its House leadership proposes to make tax cuts permanent even though this policy would cost $1.5 trillion over the next 10 years. Mounting debt and enormous interest obligations will be borne by current and future generation. Equally troubling, most of our new debt is being purchased by foreign nations. Japan and China, for example, hold nearly $1 trillion in American debt. A decline in the dollar's value against the Euro during the last year has not gone unnoticed by foreign governments that finance U.S. deficit spending. Financial ministers have expressed increasing concerns about America's unwillingness to reduce deficits. Asian nations, including South Korea, are now balancing their currency portfolio with Euro purchases. Without a historical comparison it is difficult to adequately predict what impact these trends will have on American economic and national security. Some of us are growing increasingly concerned by the administration's lack of a comprehensive strategy for reducing our reliance on foreign financing. even acknowledgment of the problem would be helpful.

The President has insisted on cutting taxes during a time of war. You don't finance two wars with five tax cuts. President Bush is the only president ever to do so, and his stubborn pursuit of additional costly "reforms" (such as the multi-trillion dollar Social Security privatization plan) seriously imperils America's ability to compete in the future against emerging economies in Asia and the European Union. Our economy, particularly in my home district on Northern Virginia, is currently in pretty good shape. But our standard of living and growth cannot be sustained if we insist on deferring enormous debt and interest obligations to future generations. The House leadership's blind acquiescence to the President's policies is regretful and irresponsible.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Republican leadership's budget, which basically rubber stamps the President's budget. I strongly support the Spratt alternative Democratic budget, a much more responsible and morally defensible budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, who is one of the most able and honorable Members of this body. I also want to congratulate the gentleman for having put together a budget that reaches balance.

The other side talks a good game. They do not produce. Every year the ranking member's budget has a lower deficit than the Republican budget.

My point today is simple: On the floor of this House, there are two pictures and two pictures only: One is George Washington, to my right, and the other one is a gentleman people in the galleries have trouble identifying. Who is he? He is a Frenchman, the Marquis de Lafayette. Why is he here? Because during the American Revolution, they loaned us money to help us beat the British.

There is always a race between the creditors and the citizens. Well, under the Republican budget, the creditors start winning in the year 2009. This is it, the tipping point. In the year 2009, we will be spending more money to service our debts, increasingly to foreigners, than we will be spending on our own citizens on domestic non-defense discretionary spending. That is an outrage. It will be better starting in the year 2009 in terms of domestic government in this country to be a creditor and not a citizen.

And the trend that is being set by the Republican budget just gets worse. Do not take my word for it, listen to the Government Accountability Office. By the year 2040, under present trends, it will take all the revenues of the Federal Government just to pay interest

on our debts. There will be no national defense, there will be no Social Security, there will be no Medicare, there will be no government left. The Republicans have put us on a road to ruin.

One of the speakers recently just said, well, we have a strong defense. That is good. We are borrowing more and more of the money from the Chinese. Who do you want pictured on the wall of the House of Representatives in future years? Do you want the Marquis de Lafayette, or do you want Hu Jintao of China, or Prime Minister Koizumi of Japan, or do you want Tony Blair of Great Britain? Because these creditors have more and more power over this country because we are borrowing more and more of their money.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I am very happy that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER), my predecessor speaker, spoke of what happens next. Because I think as I look at this budget and I ask myself what is really wrong with this budget, of course, we are going to hear a lot of detail this afternoon and it is easy to get lost in the detail, and frankly it is easy for detail to obscure the underlying principles and rationale for a budget.

But let us get beyond the detail and ask ourselves a basic question, how long out does this budget go? Can you believe that this budget only goes 5 years? It only goes out 5 years.

Now, what if I came home and I told my wife, I have got a great family budget, it goes one year, knowing that I have a balloon payment on my home mortgage the following year?

What if my accountant gave me a 3-year budget for my family, knowing that I would retire in the fourth year?

What if my business ran a 5-year budget, and I knew that I had to replace my entire plant inventory in the sixth through the tenth year? I think I would be told to get out of budgeting.

And what if I told you that this budget goes 5 years, because the consequences of the budgetary policies that are inherent in this budget come home to roost after that 5 years. And what if I told you that for that exact reason in prior years we have run 10-year budgets, but we did not do it in the last couple of years. And why would we do this? Because the consequences are obscured beyond that 5 years.

I know what I think about that, and I know what the Democrats think about budgeting only until it hits the fan, and that is wrong.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA).

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my disappointment with the lack of attention to our Nation's fiscal crisis. We have a budgeting process that simply defies logic. The system is broken, plain and simple. We need to focus our efforts on finding a cure for our addiction to budget deficit spending.

This dog of a budget does not hunt, but the Blue Dog Coalition has introduced a 12-step reform plan that is a good place to start with reforms. It requires a balanced budget, stops Congress from buying on credit and puts a limit on spending. It requires an accurate account, cost estimates and allows sunshine to purify the process. It is no secret that our national debt is out of control. We are expected to run a $427 billion deficit in 2005, with more deficits projected as far as the eye can see.

We do not even have a firm grip on where our money is going. Within the Department of Defense, only six of 63 departments are able to produce a clean audit. That is less than 10 percent.

□ 1600

This budget omits so many major expenses that it is a sham. The administration has essentially cooked the books using Enron-style accounting and Congress is just blindly going along with the program.

We find ourselves trying to pass a budget that hides half of our problems. We know that foreign holding of U.S. debt is on the rise. Interest on the national debt is the fastest growing area of the Federal budget, and the trade deficit is totally out of control.

What are we doing about it? Not a darn thing.

I hope that this Congress will wake up and restore fiscal responsibility and accountability. It is time to stop digging this hole deeper.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, we have in this country a $7.7 trillion national debt. We have deficit for the past 4 years of over $400 billion a year. We have interest between a half a billion dollars and three-quarters of a billion dollars a day, interest a day on our national debt.

We have got to change the way we are doing business in this country, or our children and grandchildren and future generations will not have a chance. The first rule of holes is when you are in a hole and you do not want to go deeper, stop digging. We just keep digging this hole deeper and deeper and deeper.

This should not be about Republicans and Democrats. This should not be partisan at all. We are all in this together. We ought to be working together to return to fiscal responsibility. Some people talk fiscal responsibility, but they are not willing to practice it.

I proposed a couple of years ago that we reinstate what is called PAYGO, pay-as-you-go rule. That would require if you have a new spending proposal or a new tax cut proposal, you have to say how it will be paid for. Pretty simple, pretty commonsense.

Chairman Alan Greenspan has recommended that to the Committee on the Budget, to the House of Representatives that we should return to the PAYGO rule and we should do that. That would keep us from putting our country deeper and deeper in debt. But we are not doing that, and we have got to change the way we are doing business here.

We are putting our kids and grandchildren in a hole so deep I am concerned that they will never be able to climb out if we do not turn things around here.

We should all come together, Republicans and Democrats, and say we are going to restore fiscal responsible; we will take care of business. But we cannot have just unlimited tax cuts. It is like a kid going into a candy store saying, I got a dollar, when what he wants to buy is a $1.50 worth. They say, You do not have enough money. But I want it. Well, we cannot have everything we want. We can have selected tax cuts, we can have selected spending; but we cannot have everything across the board and keep our country in the black.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the American people realize how bad the situation here is in Washington and how financially mismanaged our government has been over the last 4 years.

Since 2001, this country has borrowed in hard dollars $1.12 trillion. What that means to every citizen is simply this: at 5 percent interest, that is over $50 billion a year that has been transferred away from addressing the problems of health care and veterans and education and the things that will keep our country competitive into interest. What is worse than that though is since that time 84 percent of the budget deficit that we have run, the money we have borrowed has come from foreign interest.

We are now sending $80 billion a year overseas in interest checks. We are bankrupting America while this country, this Congress fiddles. And this situation is not only dire and getting worse by the second. We are borrowing $13,000 a second, paying interest at about $5,000 a second.

If you took 1,000 dollar bills and stacked them on top of one another, one million dollars would be about a foot high. A billion dollars would be about as high as the Empire State Building, and a trillion dollars would be a thousand times as high as the Empire State Building. This government has borrowed over $1 trillion in the last 48 months, and we are doing nothing in this budget to address that problem.

We are lording over the largest budget deficits in the history of the United States. That is the record. I mean, people are entitled to their opinion. They are not entitled to their own set of facts. This is not something that is going to happen in the future. This has happened and is happening now.

The director of GAO was before the Committee on Ways and Means last week. Do you know what he said? He said if we continue on this course, if we do what the administration and this Congress recommends, and that is make the tax cuts permanent, and spending only grows at the rate of growth of the economy, in the year 2040 every dime that comes into Washington, D.C. will be going to pay interest. There will be nothing left, 35 years from now.

I do not know if I can impress on the American people enough to demand that something be done about this horrible mismanagement of their country and their country's finances.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I say they have demanded and we are responding; but I do not hear any of them saying we want a tax increase like the Blue Dog budget is going to offer. That is not what they are saying.

We do not need more taxes to come into Washington from this oversized government. We do not need that from the Democratic substitute. We do not need it from the Blue Dog budget. We do not need a tax increase. There is not anybody balancing their checkbook around their kitchen table in Iowa saying, gee, Mom and Dad, let us figure out a way to pay more in taxes.

They want us to control spending. So we will talk about controlled spending.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) to talk about the discretionary part of the budget.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's leadership in this effort. As he noted in his opening statement, we have spent a great deal in these past few years to secure our Nation in the wake of the September 11 attacks. But at the same time we were directing a huge new share of resources to those urgent needs, we were also continuing to keep pace in our domestic nonsecurity programs like education, health care, veterans, agriculture, a whole host of other issues outside of defense and homeland security that people associate with their government.

On 9/11, our priorities shifted as a Nation, but our fiscal priorities remained the same. We kept growing our domestic programs by the same levels we had been, the rate of which would have been unsustainable even without a September 11. Over the past decade, we have increased programs almost across the board, and in many cases doubled, tripled or even quadrupled the rate of inflation.

I say that because out of one side of the mouth of the opposition comes a plea for fiscal restraint and out of the other side comes a hue and cry at the devastating terrible cuts that are being beset upon the American people.

Let us look at what the impact of domestic spending has been over the past decade. A Mount Everest of increases in discretionary spending. As we can see, overall discretionary spending grows since 1994, a very steep line. With the exception of last year which was the first time in a long time that we began the process of slowing growth, on average we have increased discretion spending by 6.1 percent per year for over a decade.

Let us look at some of the key areas that make up that portion of the spending. In the last 5 years, the Republican Congress has increased education funding by an average of almost 12 percent per year. Over that same period of time, spending for the Department of Education has increased by 75 percent, almost doubling our commitment. In fact, aside from the newly created Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Education has grown faster than any other Federal agency or Department during this period.

Let us look at some of the key programs that make up two-thirds of the Department of Education's budget. Title I, since 2000 title I funding for low-income schools has increased by 55 percent. Pell grants which help provide lower-income students with funding for college has increased by 57 percent over 5 years. And while this decision will be left up to the authorizing committee, the President's budget request called for increasing that amount that students are eligible to receive under this program.

Let us look at funding for our special needs students. IDEA, the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA, provides for those needs of our most important and sensitive children in the school system; funding has increased by 87 percent in the past 5 years.

In addition to increased funding, Congress also passed the No Child Left Behind Act which demands results in exchange for dollars. It works to forge a real link between education spending and classroom achievement while focusing resources on underperforming schools.

Now let us look at veterans, those men and women who have done so much to secure the freedoms and liberties that we enjoy and take for granted on a regular basis. I think that everyone should be proud of the commitment that we have made and continue to make in the area of veterans benefits.

Since Republicans took control of the Congress in 1995, tremendous strides have been made in improving benefits for our Nation's veterans through hefty increases. Budget authority since 1995 has increased 77 percent, beginning at $38 billion, ending up at $67.6 billion. A tremendous increase. In fact, that 77 percent increase compares to only a 40 percent increase over the previous 10 years.

Spending per veteran. Let us get right down to the veteran in your district. Spending per veteran since 1995, increased payments per veteran have gone up 103 percent compared with 43 percent during the previous 10 years. You could walk into any Legion Hall or VFW complex in America and be proud of that number.

Since 1995, we have increased VA medical care funding from $16.2 billion to almost $30 billion. And in 1996 and 1999, Congress expanded eligibility for medical care and as a result the number of veterans utilizing VA care has nearly doubled.

The Montgomery GI bill. Those veterans who return home and seek to improve their lot and develop their education skills, since 1995 Montgomery GI education benefits have gone from $405 to $1,004, an increase of 147 percent. And I will also note that prior to the Republican take over in 1995, under 40 years of Democrat control, there was no progress whatsoever on concurrent receipts. Now military retirees injured in combat or while training for combat who are 50 percent or more service disabled, are able for the first time in over 100 years to receive retirement benefits at the same time as their veterans disability compensation.

About a month ago, the Charleston Gazette ran this quote, and I will share it: ''Bush increased VA spending by 27 percent in his first term. As factcheck.org pointed out, funding for veterans is going up twice as fast under Bush as it did under Clinton. And the number of veterans getting health benefits is going up 25 percent.''

The bottom line is that domestic discretionary needs have been met and continue to be met under this blueprint that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) presents today.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) to talk about automatic spending or mandatory spending. We do not need a tax increase. We need to control spending.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I thank him for saying what he did earlier about tax increases.

I have been watching these budget debates for 11 years now as a Member of Congress, 3 years as a member of the Committee on the Budget; and year after year the argument is the same.

Our colleagues from the other side of the aisle criticize our budgets in two respects. They say Republican budgets do not spend enough, and they say taxes should be higher. That is pretty much the gist of their complaints against our budgets. So I am glad to see the chairman pointing out his opposition and join him in adding my opposition to tax increases.

Now, I do want to talk as the chairman has asked me about mandatory spending. And I appreciate this opportunity as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, as well as a member of the Committee on the Budget.

As the chairman has noted, Congress spends a lot of time talking about discretionary spending, that part of the budget that makes up only one-third of total spending. The last time we made

any real effort to restrain the bulk of our spending, that part on auto-pilot, was back in 1997 and before that 1990.

Now if we look at this pie chart, we can see how much of our total spending has come to be mandatory spending: 48.7 percent in 1995, 54.3 percent today. And if we do not get a rein on it, by the year 2015, the portion of the budget over which we have little control or have chosen to have little control will grow to 62.1 percent.

□ 1615

Eventually this spending will crowd out other priorities which we also need to address.

Let us look at the other chart if we might. This one deals with student loans. We address much of our student spending with discretionary money, but student loans are mandatory programs. Since 2000, student loan volume has increased by 64 percent, with loans increasing by $31.4 billion to $80.7 billion today. This represents an annual growth rate of 10.5 percent at a time when our economy has grown by approximately 4 percent per year.

The next chart deals with Medicare spending. Medicare, of course, as we all know, is the Federal Government's nationwide health care system for 41 million senior citizens and disabled persons. That is 14 percent of the population. Since 1995, Medicare spending has grown 88 percent. This year alone we will spend $293 billion on Medicare. Over the next 5 years, CBO estimates that Federal outlays will amount to $2 trillion, and as my friend from Tennessee pointed out, $1 trillion is an awful lot of money.

Our next chart deals with Medicaid. Medicaid provides medical and long-term expenses to more than 40 million low-income families, elderly and disabled individuals. This is one out of seven Americans who benefit from this program. It serves as the cornerstone of America's health care safety net. Since 1995, Medicaid spending has grown an astonishing 211 percent. Let me repeat that. Since 1995, Medicare spending has grown 211 percent. According to CBO, this year the Federal Government will spend $183.2 billion on this important program, and over the next 5 years that spending will grow by over $1.1 trillion, an enormous rate of increase in this mandatory program.

So why have we allowed it to get to this point? And why are there still so few people who are willing to admit there is a problem, let alone trying to tackle the problem?

The first reason, mandatory spending is difficult to control. This spending is tied to a variety of factors outside Congress's control, demographics, economic conditions, medical prices and so on. In addition, we have an aging population, with longer life expectancy—that is a good thing—increasing benefits and ever increasing medical expenses. In addition, the baby boom generation, my generation, is about to retire, adding huge strains to the resources of these programs.

Secondly, these programs address critical needs that must be met, Medicare payments, Social Security payments, commitments to our veterans.

Almost everyone is affected by one or more of these programs, either ourselves, our children, our parents, our grandparents. In many cases, people associate these programs with the one check that they receive with their name on it.

Now, all of these factors make it especially difficult not only to control entitlement spending but even to discuss getting it back under control without causing concern to good, deserving people who worry that their benefits will be changed. So we have a big problem to deal with, not only to get our hands around the problem, but to do it in a way that is fair for today's recipients and tomorrow's recipients.

The President's budget addressed this problem by including savings in mandatory programs, just slowing that rate of growth, as part of our effort to get the growth rate under control and to help reduce the current deficit. Our budget, while not an exact duplicate of the President's proposals, begins the process.

It is important to remind everyone that this is not happening in a vacuum. As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) pointed out, we have already taken the first steps toward getting a grip on discretionary spending.

Specifically, what does this budget do? It provides, for the first time since 1997, reconciliation instructions to the authorizing committees. It directs each of them to find a specified amount of savings. What it does not tell them to do is where to find those savings. That will be left up to the committees. The budget has a number that is given to each committee, and it directs the committee of jurisdiction to find that amount of savings. This is a critical step to begin the process of getting our mandatory spending back to a sustainable level, simply slowing the rate of growth of programs such as the one demonstrated on this poster.

It is a critical step, and I ask all of my colleagues to support this effort by supporting the budget, and I thank my chairman again for putting together a resolution that addresses the very needed mandatory spending restraint that is going to be necessary for our future economic prosperity.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time.

It has to be tough. I am a good friend of the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and a friend of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM). It has got to be tough for them and the chairman.

Back when they were on the committee a few years ago when this President first started in office, we had surpluses, and it was easy to go before the committee and debate how we would spend money we actually have or actually had and projected we would have. But today we are out of it, so much out of it that we have to come to the floor and almost pretend that we are doing something that we are not.

As much as I respect the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), and I know he has left the floor, he should call his own Governor, Governor Barbour, and ask him his feelings about the Medicare increases he bragged about here on the floor.

My Governor Bredesen in Tennessee was faced with an enormous shortfall, as most Governors are. I might add that the Governors were here not long ago, Democrats and Republican, and expressed their outright opposition to President Bush's budget as it related to Medicaid and even this budget as it relates to it.

The thing that is clear today, Mr. Speaker, is that our priorities are just very different than theirs. They accuse us of wanting to spend more. Yet the two most previous speakers bragged about how much spending they have done over the last several years. I would, too, if I was actually cutting budgets.

The VFW Hall that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) said I should be proud to go into and explain what we have done over the last few years, it is funny. They were here passing out ribbons and arm bands, urging us to do more because this budget here actually cuts the budget for the Veterans Affairs Department by $740 million when we consider keeping up with inflation.

We ask those returning from Iraq to pay higher copayments for their drugs, and we even ask them to pay a $250 dollar entry fee.

All of these numbers we use here could be confusing to people back home, but here is the short of it. We are going to do less for those who need it most, and we are going to do more for those who need the least in this budget.

I would be embarrassed if I had to vote for this budget. Thankfully I do not, and frankly I do not even know if I am going to vote for all the things we are going to present on our side, for one reason. It is not balanced. Ours is more balanced than my colleagues, and as much as my colleagues may want to pretend that they are doing something for education when they talk about the increases, ask any State education commissioner how far off we are with our numbers for the No Child Left Behind Act, how far we are off for the poor children in this country. If my colleagues are proud of making those kind of cuts, go for it; vote for that budget.

The last point I would make is on Medicaid and Medicare. We want to say to poor people in this country that we are taking care of them and doing all that we can. Yet we will not say to drug companies in the country that we want them to negotiate directly with Medicare so we can ensure we get the

best price for seniors, for the disabled and for the poor working people across this country.

Vote no if my colleagues care about America and care about our future.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me time, and I, more importantly, thank him for his tremendous leadership, for his leadership on the Committee on the Budget. He has presented budgets that are statements of our national values, that are balanced in terms of their priority and balanced in terms of their fiscal soundness. He has been a great teacher to the country and the Congress on this issue. We are indeed blessed by his exceptional leadership.

Mr. Chairman, with today's vote on the previous question, Republicans told their constituents exactly where they stood on Social Security. They want to privatize it. Defeating the previous question would have ensured that payroll contributions of millions of Americans are protected and are not diverted away from Social Security to fund private accounts, but Republicans voted unanimously to undermine Social Security with private accounts.

Even though Social Security privatization is the President's number one priority, the Republican budget hides the cost in and the harmful effects of Social Security privatization by refusing to include any details on the plan in the budget.

The Republican budget also continues the Republican raid on the Social Security Trust Fund by spending every penny of the Social Security Trust Fund over the next 10 years, totaling $2.6 trillion.

The previous speaker or colleague the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD) referenced that when President Bush came into office he came in at a time of surplus. Indeed, for the last 3 years of the Clinton administration, there was zero deficit. In fact, there were surpluses, and that tightening of the government's budget under President Clinton enabled the Clinton administration to pay back over $350 billion of our indebtedness, reducing the national debt. We were on a course of action in the budget of being debt free by the year 2008, debt free for our country, and what that means in terms of the budget and the debt service is remarkable.

Yet, President Bush came into office with his reckless tax cuts for the superwealthy. Not all of them were for superwealthy. We supported those for the middle class, but because of the size of the tax cuts for the superwealthy has driven us deeply into debt to the tune this year, if we include the supplemental, of about a half a trillion dollars in debt for 1 year, this is unconscionable.

The course of action that the Republican administration is on makes it nearly impossible for them to pay back the Social Security Trust Fund, the money they have taken from it to date.

Secondly, the private accounts and the transition costs of around $2 trillion for the transition over the next 10 years, is huge and, again, undermines Social Security.

So the deficit in the budget is directly related to undermining Social Security. It is essential that the President be stopped in creating these private accounts which drain money out of the Social Security Trust Fund, thereby weakening Social Security. It is essential that the President and the Republicans be stopped from their reckless deficit spending, their raid on the Social Security Trust Fund and their further deficit spending with their tax cuts for the superrich that will make it impossible for them to pay back the money to the trust fund.

This is money that the American workers have placed into the trust fund, that American businesses have matched by placing into the trust fund for retirement insurance. This money belongs to the American people. It is not a slush fund for President Bush to give tax cuts to the superwealthy at the expense of working families in America.

Democrats are committed to addressing the challenge which faces Social Security down the road. The first step towards strengthening Social Security is ensuring that Social Security contributions are used only to pay for the guaranteed benefit that American workers have earned through a lifetime of work, for retirement; for disabilities if, God forbid, that happens, a tragedy befalls their family; and again, for survivors and families who have lost a loved one.

Privatization makes the challenge facing Social Security worse by slashing benefits by more than 40 percent for future retirees survivors, the people with disabilities, if what we know of the President's plan, indexing to prices rather than wage, is proceeded upon, saddling our children and grandchildren with massive debt and jeopardizing the retirement lifeline provided by Social Security's guaranteed benefit.

Rather than diverting trillions with a T-R, trillions of dollars from the trust fund to fund risky private accounts, Democrats are committed to strengthening Social Security. Once privatization is off the table, Democrats want to work with Republicans in a bipartisan way to make any adjustments to keep Social Security solvent.

□ 1630

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the issue is what we do about Social Security from the year 2050 to the year 2100. Contrary to what the President has put out there, there is no crisis facing Social Security. There is a problem down the road. We have time to deal with it in the right way, in a way that does not slash benefits, that does not increase the deficit, does not rob our trust fund of its funds and does not burden our children with all of that debt.

So we will go to the table and say, with the amount of money that should be in the trust fund, and if the administration honors its moral and legal obligation to pay the trust fund back the money it has taken out, then the trust fund and interest on it should take us well into 2050. And after that, the benefits would be at 80 percent, and that is what we have to deal with. We can deal with it soon. We can deal with it in a bipartisan way. Just as President Reagan did working with Speaker Tip O'Neill in 1983, we can work it out in a bipartisan way to strengthen Social Security.

Some say that the private accounts are an end in themselves. There are people who believe in private accounts. Others believe that the private accounts are just a decoy, just a Trojan horse that looks appealing to people because it is a new idea, that once they get it past the gates of the city that rotten underbelly of huge deficits will destroy Social Security.

Either way, private accounts have got to go. They take money out of the trust fund, and this administration has no visible means of paying that money back.

Today, again, the Republicans said with their vote that they want to undermine Social Security by privatizing it, while Democrats voted unanimously to strengthen Social Security for future generations. Let us honor our responsibility to future generations, to our children, also to America's workers. Morally and legally we are bound to give them the promise of America to pay their insurance; their retirement insurance; and, if in time of tragedy, their disability and survivor insurance as well.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, we do not need a Democratic tax increase. We need to keep the economy growing.

Mr. Chairman, to speak about that issue, I yield 10 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), vice chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for yielding me this time, and I am delighted to have the opportunity to talk about the importance of keeping the economy growing. And this budget certainly does that.

But let me take a moment, if I could, and respond to some of the comments by the minority leader with regard to the Social Security system. First, to say the criticism that your budget, Mr. Chairman, does not include Social Security, is kind of an unusual one, given that as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) knows, under the Budget Act of 1974, Social Security is off budget. And even if the Budget Committee, in all of its wisdom, decided we were going to reform Social Security, we would not have the ability to. You cannot do it in the budget.

And, secondly, although we heard a lot of criticism about some of the President's ideas and some of the other ideas to indeed modernize and save Social Security, we did not hear even outlines of a plan on the other side. So it is kind of hard to put a budget together, even if you could under the Budget Act, when there is no plan.

There is lot of denial about the problem we just heard. And there is a lot of criticism about those who would like to address the problem. I commend the President for addressing it. There can be no greater sense of leadership around this place, Washington, D.C., than someone who is willing to take on the third rail in American politics, Social Security.

Traditionally, it has been one that politically is very tough, hard to take on, referring to that third electrified rail in the New York subway system. You grab it and you are electrified. The President is taking it on, as are Republicans, because it is the right thing to do. It is the right thing to do for our seniors, to be sure they have strong Social Security. And as the President said repeatedly, anybody who is age 55 or older will not have their benefits changed one bit.

But more importantly, it is important for those succeeding generations. I have my 14-year-old son with me today. We want to be sure that his generation has an opportunity to have the same kind of peace of mind in retirement and the retirement security that we have all enjoyed.

And quite frankly, the math does not lie. The Social Security system was funded in a way that does not permit us to continue to provide those benefits to future generations because of the fact that we have people living longer, because we have more people who are about to retire, my generation, the baby boom generation, and because therefore we will have fewer people working to pay in those benefits.

We need to do something. We need to do it on a bipartisan basis. We need to put aside this notion that everything is off the table and criticism and denial and, instead, address the very real problem we have. And the very obvious solution is to do something sooner rather than later because the sooner we do it, the less impact it will be on our economy, on our budget, and on our young people.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) talked about the reckless tax cuts that have driven us into debt. Well, what have we seen over the last 4 years? It is not tax relief that drove us into debt. Over the last 4 years we have seen remarkable changes in our Nation's economic picture after having endured the bursting of the stock market bubble, the corporate scandals, a recession, the terrorist attacks and their aftermath and, of course, the uncertainties of an international war against terrorism, including our conflicts in Afghanistan and now in Iraq.

These things have resulted in two things. Number one, because of the recession, less revenue. And of course that is the number one reason we find ourselves with a growing deficit over the last few years. And all the data supports that, from CBO, from OMB, all the nonpartisan actuaries looking at this issue. All those who analyze it say the same thing. When you have less revenue coming in, lower capital gains, lower corporate income tax, lower individual income tax because of recession, that is the number one reason.

The second reason is increased spending. And, yes, this Congress has increased spending, and in a few areas as has been talked about earlier today, it was necessary. One, of course, is Homeland Security. Once again, this budget provides for substantial increases in our Homeland Security budget because we need it to protect our country against the terrorist threat.

Second is with regard to defense. We inherited not only a recession over the last 4 years, but also a deficit in terms of our defense. We needed to rebuild defense. And again today we will vote on a budget, or this week on a budget, that will increase substantially our commitment to the defense of our country. So some spending has been increased, and some other areas as well.

Tax relief is specifically focused on growing that economy, getting us out of that recession, moving us to a point where we have increased revenues coming in. And you know what? The strength and resilience with which our Nation has responded to the challenges I talked about earlier, the recession, the terrorist attack, the stock market bubble, the corporate scandals, has been incredible. And it has been because of the tax relief. The tax relief, as opposed to the less revenue from the recession, as opposed to the increased spending, the tax relief has actually enabled us to move out of a recession into economic times where we see good economic growth.

We have acted together to address those deficits in our Homeland Security, our national security, and also put in place through tax relief the necessary incentives to grow our economy. Because of that, we are in a very different position today than we were 4 years ago.

In fact, the general consensus of both public and private forecasters is that the US economy is in a sustained expansion growth period, with real solid GDP growth over the last year and going forward, real growth and payroll jobs, low unemployment and very low historical inflation.

This chart shows the GDP growth. Starting in 2003 going up, real GDP growth has increased for 13 consecutive quarters. In 2004, our real growth was 4.4 percent. That makes us the envy of the developed world. It is the strongest growth we have had in 5 years and one of the strongest in 20 years.

The Budget Committee recently heard from Chairman Alan Greenspan from the Federal Reserve who said the U.S. economy delivered a solid performance in 2004 and thus far activity appears to be expanding at a reasonably good pace. The Fed projects we will have real GDP growth this year of between 3½ and 4 percent, and again good growth in the proceeding year.

This growth is because, again, the tax relief is beginning to work. This includes real business investment, increasing at a rate of 15 percent over the last year and a half. The best performance in real business investment and equipment over the past 7 years, shipments of nondefense capital goods, which is a key measure of private business investment, has rebounded very strongly.

Homeownership has also increased dramatically. We are now seeing the best homeownership rates that we have seen in our country's history. Housing construction is at its best in 20 years. This shows a record high in homeownership, including among minorities.

Unemployment is also a good story. If we look at what has happened since the tax relief was put in place, payroll employment has increased by 3 million jobs over the past 21 months. Just last week we saw job gains of 262,000 new jobs, more than a quarter million new jobs in February. Again, that is something that we should be proud of as a Congress, something we should be very pleased about. Significant improvement in jobs and labor markets has occurred and is expected to continue as new claims for unemployment insurance are at their lowest level in over 4 years.

Even the stock market is rebounding. Despite all the problems we have gone through with the markets we talked about earlier, the Dow-Jones Industrial Average has been at its highest level in 4 years. The Dow has nearly tripled in value over the last 4 years. These are not just figures or abstractions; these mean real jobs for real people we represent. It means we have higher investment in plants, in business, and equipment. We have higher business income; we have higher wages, higher take-home salary. This is happening in America right now. We need to be sure that continues.

Expanding job opportunities and solid income growth is what this budget is all about so every American who wants to work can work and find a job. That is what makes this a Nation of opportunity and prosperity. Today, because we have an improved economic picture, things are better; but we are not finished. We need this momentum to continue. We need to be sure we continue to see the kind of economic growth we have seen, and that means we need to continue the tax relief we passed in 2001, 2002, and 2003.

The minority leader earlier talked about the reckless tax cuts that caused the deficit. We talked about what caused the deficit. Here is what has resulted from those reckless tax cuts: 3 million jobs in the last 21 months. There are a lot of factors in the economy; but the one we can control is the

fiscal side, and that is our spending and our tax relief.

What this budget does is it says we need to continue that tax relief. We are not going to increase taxes just now as our economy has finally gotten back on track, as the people we represent have finally seen the kind of opportunity we all want them to have. We are not talking about new taxes; we are talking about keeping the tax relief that was in place in 2001, 2002, and 2003 by this Congress, put in place by this Congress, so we can continue to have good economic growth.

The speed and the strength of the economic recovery of the past several years has been due in large part to this tax relief. We cannot forget that as we look at this budget. We also need to keep spending under control.

Earlier this month, Alan Greenspan told us that the notion of raising taxes in response to deficits ''posed significant risk to economic growth and the revenue base'' and that in his judgment we should aim to ''close the fiscal gap primarily, if not wholly, on the outlay side.'' That is what this budget does. It makes some tough choices in nondefense discretionary spending, some tough choices in terms of our entitlement growth. Our entitlement programs are growing well beyond inflation.

As the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) has laid out today, this budget calls for a lot of responsible ways for Congress to help itself to control spending, controlling discretionary growth, allocating discretionary spending to defense and homeland security priorities, as we talked about earlier, and calling for reconciled reductions in the amount of growth on the mandatory spending side. None of it is going to be easy.

A lot of us here in Congress have gotten pretty comfortable in signing off on big spending increases and free-flowing new spending. But success at keeping taxes and spending down is critical to a strong economy and with it higher standards of living for our Nation's workers and our families.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) talked about the good old days in the 1990s when we did have an opportunity to get the deficits down and get some surpluses. We did it very simply by keeping taxes under control and keeping spending under control. That is what this budget provides for, so we can reduce the deficit in half in 5 years and see that opportunity continue.

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

To respond to the gentleman, I would say that Mr. Greenspan has told our committee three times that we should borrow from the experience of the 1990s, reinstate the so-called pay-as-you-go rule, and apply it both to entitlement spending increases and additional tax cuts, including renewal of expiring tax cuts as a means of diminishing the deficit and improving the bottom line.

In the interest of full disclosure, we ought to acknowledge that advice was given to us three times, and it is in our budget resolution. We recommend it in two places in our budget resolution. The one discipline proven to work that we ought to institute at the very least is PAYGO and apply it both to entitlement spending increases and to additional tax cuts, per the recommendation of Chairman Greenspan.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, while the majority cynically tells America that they will cut the deficit in half by 2009, here we go begin. A simple review shows that the budget will add $127 billion 5 years from now and make the situation even worse.

□ 1645

This is the legacy we are giving to our kids. We are telling them, ''We've got a deal for you. We're going to privatize part of Social Security.'' They are going to need the money to pay the interest on the debt. They better save their money.

My friend from Ohio has presented probably the best defense of deficit spending that I have ever heard. Along with the false claims and the budgetary sleights of hand, remember, these are the same folks who since 2001 have converted a $5.6 trillion surplus into a deficit of $4 trillion, a $9 trillion turnaround. Defend that.

It really takes a special talent to underfund education, to underfund veterans' programs, to cut Medicaid, to fail to protect Social Security and still raise the deficit. Over and over again it is clear, Mr. Chairman, the leadership in Washington has no credibility when it comes to handling the people's money. We are good at giving tax cuts to Sammy Sosa and we forgot the very people who are fighting on the front lines.

It is not just doing the congressional budget process where this is apparent. A lack of credibility with America's money seems to be the order of the day throughout government. Just this morning, we completed another $81 billion supplemental for a war the administration told us would cost $100 billion in its entirety. We were told that the war would be paid for by oil revenue. Just this week, we found out that Halliburton has overcharged the Pentagon more than $108 million in excess billing, a sum that would pay for 592 up-armored Humvees which we disgracefully did not provide for our troops at the beginning of this war, or 2,250 explosive device jammers for our troops in the field. We are going to hear these conversions of costs over and over and over again. Mr. Chairman, get used to it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Nussle budget. This budget cuts $20 billion from Medicaid. Our friends on the other side of the aisle claim that this is not a cut, just a reduction in growth.

But it is a cut. When prices increase, and they surely have in health care, and spending does not match that increase, you are reducing the program's purchasing power. You are cutting the program. This budget is going to deny States, health care providers and low-income working families $20 billion for the health care services that they would have had. And there is no evidence that closing loopholes or fighting waste, fraud and abuse would save anywhere near this amount.

Medicaid provides health care, irreplaceable health care, to 52 million of our poorest children, poor pregnant women, parents and the elderly. It is a critical source of acute and long-term care for 13 million elderly people and disabled people. These are real people who would be affected by cutting $20 billion out of Medicaid.

Mr. Chairman, since the President took office, the number of uninsured has increased by 5.2 million. Without Medicaid, this number would surely have grown much higher. Medicaid enrollment grew by 6 million over the same period, covering many people who would otherwise have been uninsured. Even so, Medicaid costs have grown about half as fast as private health insurance premiums have grown. Between 2000 and 2003, Medicaid per capita spending went up 6.9 percent while private insurance premiums shot up over 12.5 percent. The growth we have seen is a result of the skyrocketing health costs that the President has allowed, not Medicaid itself.

If these cuts in Medicaid are made, the ranks of the uninsured will surely increase, the economy will become weaker, and health care costs would skyrocket even more because fewer people would be unable to afford regular checkups and preventive measures but would be stuck by going to the emergency room as a last resort. That is why the National Governors' Association opposes these cuts. It is why faith-based organizations oppose these cuts. And it is certainly why organizations, which I have a list of here, like the March of Dimes, the National Association of Children's Hospitals, the American Academy of Pediatrics and the AARP, all of these groups and many more oppose the cuts that this budget puts into Medicaid.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this budget and these draconian cuts in Medicaid.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PORTMAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H.

Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO OFFER AMENDMENT OUT OF SPECIFIED ORDER DURING CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration in the Committee of the Whole of H. Con. Res. 95 pursuant to House Resolution 154, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), or his designee, be permitted to offer amendment numbered 2 in House Report 109–19 out of the specified order.

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

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 154 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 95.

□ 1652

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 further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) had 1 hour and 7 minutes remaining and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) had 1 hour and 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

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

Mr. Chairman, the budget is a reflection of our values and priorities as a Nation. Congress should support a Federal budget that will make us more competitive in the global economy, spread prosperity to more Americans and reestablish fiscal discipline to ensure a better future for our children. This budget resolution takes us in the wrong direction. In order to cover up the President's mismanagement of the economy and the resulting mountains of debt, the Republican budget sacrifices important domestic priorities like Medicaid. This budget resolution cuts Medicaid more deeply than the President's proposal, as much as $20 billion over 5 years. Slashing Medicaid will have a devastating impact on the most vulnerable in our society. Medicaid is the health care safety net for impoverished children, elderly and the disabled. Reductions to Medicaid will cause lasting harm to current Medicaid beneficiaries and make the system less viable for health care providers.

Exactly who will be affected by cuts to Medicaid? Thirty-nine million low-income children and parents, including one in every five American children; 13 million elderly and disabled individuals who are receiving acute and long-term care coverage.

This budget would set back the quality of nursing home care. With Medicaid funding half of the Nation's nursing home care, cutting or block granting the program would set back efforts at improving the quality of care provided to seniors and people with disabilities in the Nation's nursing homes. This budget would unravel an already fraying health safety net, jeopardizing support for providers like hospitals, clinics, doctors and health plans that serve low-income people.

This budget would increase the number of uninsured which has already risen to 45 million people under the President's watch. Sick people cost more when they are uninsured and receiving care in emergency rooms than when they are covered by Medicaid.

This budget would put children at risk. If children have less health coverage, they are more likely to compromise their ability to learn in school and to grow into healthy, contributing members of society.

Cuts to Medicaid will shift costs to States, increasing their already significant fiscal burdens. Cuts in block grants do not address the real challenges States are facing, Medicaid enrollment increases which have occurred as a result of more people losing their health care coverage. Shifting additional costs to the States will likely drive them to cut Medicaid coverage and services.

This administration has provided huge tax cuts to the highest earning households in the Nation over the last few years. Now we see the rest of the plan. To reduce or eliminate health care coverage for poor, elderly and disabled people in order to finance tax cuts for the wealthy is inequitable and not in line with our Nation's values.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from South Carolina for yielding me this time, and I also want to thank him and commend him for the leadership that he has shown during the course of the Budget Committee work and for the alternative Democratic substitute which we will talk about a little bit later today.

Mr. Chairman, there are few moments during the legislative year here in Congress which really defines who we are as a Congress, who we are as a Nation and where we are going with our priorities. It is one of these moments today when we have a discussion about our budgets and the priorities that we place in the budget.

For some reason, the Republican budget that we have before us only is budgeted for 5 years rather than the typical 10 years. I submit that one of the reasons I think they are doing a 5-year budget instead of a 10-year budget is because of the complete breakdown in fiscal responsibility and what the costs of their budget will entail and the explosion of budget deficits in the second 5 years that they do not want to talk about during the course of these next couple of days during the budget. We, on the other hand, will be presenting a Democratic alternative, one that does, I believe, reflect the values and the priorities that we share as Americans in this Nation.

Our budget will reinstate the pay-as-you-go rules to instill budget discipline again in the decisions that we are making in these budgets. We achieve a balanced budget under our plan by 2012, just when the massive baby boom retirement wave really starts to hit, and we protect important investments, in defense, in veterans' programs, education and health care to keep America strong and to help us grow the economy and create jobs. By reinstating the pay-as-you-go rules, we will be in a better fiscal position to better preserve and protect the long-term solvency of the Social Security program.

What this chart demonstrates next to me is the result of budget decisions over the last 14 to 15 years. This green line which shows an upward trend that resulted in 4 consecutive years of budget surpluses is Congress operating under pay-as-you-go rules. The red lines that show the plummeting of the surpluses into historically large budget deficits shows Congress without pay-as-you-go rules. What is hard to understand about reinstituting pay-as-you-go rules as part of budget discipline and decisions that we have to make to right the fiscal ship again?

With pay-as-you-go rules, it gave us 4 years of budget surpluses, 2 in which the Congress was not raiding the Social Security Trust Fund and using that money for large tax cuts or other spending priorities and enabled us to start reducing the national debt which was an incredible economic dynamic at the end of the 1990s.

This chart demonstrates the current raid on the Social Security Trust Fund under the Bush administration. Every dime in surplus that is being run in the Social Security account right now is

being diverted, to help finance large cuts for the most wealthy or to help finance large new spending programs, a 30 percent increase in Federal spending over the last few years alone. That will continue throughout the duration when we are running surpluses in the Social Security Trust Fund under their budget proposal. What this has meant was increased borrowing cost, year after year after year having to raise the debt ceiling in order to finance the breakdown in fiscal discipline in this place.

Why is this important today? It is important because we do not owe this debt to ourselves anymore. Ninety percent of the new debt that was purchased this last year alone is being purchased by foreign countries, Japan, the number one purchaser, soon to be surpassed by China as the number one holder of our debt.

□ 1700

I do not believe, and Democrats do not believe, it is in our best long-term economic interest to be so dependent on foreign interests to be financing these deficits.

The President has been out campaigning on a new Social Security plan lately. It is kind of tough to engage in a meaningful discussion since he has not offered a detailed proposal; but from what we understand, he is calling for massive new borrowing in order to set up these privatized accounts that he is fond of. In fact, Social Security runs a deficit of $3.7 trillion over the next 75 years. What the President is proposing to do is to borrow $5 trillion for these transition costs to set up private accounts over the first 20 years alone in order to fix a $3.7 trillion problem. And that is probably one of the reasons why he is having such a hard time selling his plan out in Middle America. People know intuitively with this massive new borrowing that it is going to hurt economic growth prospects for our Nation; it is going to jeopardize our children and grandchildren's future by leaving a large legacy of debt for them. That is why, once we can get past the whole idea of privatizing the Social Security system, we can try to get together as Americans and work on a bipartisan solution that will be fiscally responsible and that will keep the promise to future generations.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, the budget declares our Nation's priorities in black and white, and this budget makes America black and blue.

Republicans have squandered the surplus, forcing America to go country to country in search of money to prop up what cannot stand on its own fiscal integrity. They present charts and graphs. They talk about acting in America's best interest when, in fact, we have before us a budget that rewards America's special interests. We are deep in debt and growing deeper because Republicans have so many special interests to thank with your money.

The price tag is mind-boggling, but that is outdone by the people Republicans have targeted to bear the burden of their fiscal recklessness. The rich get the gain; America's most vulnerable get the pain.

As ranking Democrat on the Human Resources Subcommittee, I asked my staff to examine where past Republican practices might be in this politically engineered budget crisis. $18.7 billion is coming out of the Committee on Ways and Means. None of it out of Social Security. None out of Medicare. What is left? Poor people and children.

Two million of our Nation's poorest families will see Draconian cuts in Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. Child care assistance for low-income working families could be eliminated. Social service block grants could be cut 60 percent, and Federal assistance for foster care could be slashed by 80 percent. And if that is not enough, let us take $5 billion worth of food stamps out of children's mouths. It is America's most vulnerable who will pay for the Republican intention to extend tax breaks for capital gains, with 75 percent of the benefit going to people earning over $200,000 a year.

What in the world is going on? Do Republicans intend to starve the poor so they can feed the rich?

Budgets reflect values. We heard a lot about values, family values, all this stuff. I guess feeding kids is not a value. And I suppose this budget reflects the Republican majority. Those values can be summed up in one word, bankrupt, just like this budget.

I urge a ''no'' on this resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank our ranking member for yielding me this time.

This is a bad budget. The very safety net that we hoped to help American families is being shredded. The Republican budget is wrong; and the prescription is wrong for Medicaid, over 52 million children, women, elderly, seniors, disabled individuals, 52 million in America. The largest health care program and the only health care program for many.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce has been instructed to cut $20 billion from the Medicaid health care program for so many vulnerable citizens. Medicaid pays for 70 percent of nursing home care in Michigan. Sixty-four percent of the costs are spent on the elderly and disabled. Do we really want to hurt the least of these who have built this country?

This Republican budget cuts Medicaid even more than what the President sent to Congress. We can do better.

I just left a meeting with my Governor in our Michigan delegation, both Democrats and Republicans. Unfortunately, the Republicans wanted to blame our Governor for Medicaid, and they said cut Medicaid back. When one is unemployed, when they have no health care, when jobs are being lost, unfortunately they need Medicaid. And it is unfortunate that this budget does not restore Medicaid, help the most vulnerable, and not ask for $20 billion cut for the elderly, for seniors, for the disabled.

The budget is bad. It kills Medicaid. We can do better.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, to talk about the importance of our communities and our cities, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

As a member of the Save Our Cities Caucus, which is chaired by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), I rise in strong support of full funding of the Community Development Block Grant and Community Services Block Grant.

Our cities are hardest hit by the tough social problems of this age: poverty, drug abuse, underachievement. And I am proud that Republicans have long understood that the Federal Government has a responsibility to support our cities. They are the life blood of our commerce, but locally controlled Federal dollars are far more powerful than arbitrary Federal programs.

It is extremely important that we fully fund these critical programs because they preserve the local power of local governments to fix holes in the safety net, to assure the services that people need. In New Britain, my hometown; in Meridien or Danbury, Connecticut; or in Waterbury, the largest city in my district, Community Development Block Grant funds and Community Service Block Grant funds leverage several times their value to provide child care, elder care, literacy programs, substance abuse treatment programs, after-school programs. They help those cities demolish buildings that are a blight or that harbor drug dealers. They help clean up brownfields. They improve fire stations. They improve parks. They rebuild sidewalks. They reconstruct streets. They work to make our cities able to attract the economic development that provides jobs and a healthy urban environment.

So between the Community Development Block Grant and the Community Services Block Grant, the Federal Government has traditionally contributed, and under Republican leadership, generously, to assure the safety net in the cities and the economic strength of our urban communities.

So I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for recognizing, as the majority of Republicans do, the importance of these flexible block grant programs to our urban communities.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), the chairman of that coalition, to talk about the same subject, the importance of our communities and the Community Development Block Grant.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman indicated, I chair a working group appointed by the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) called Save America's Cities. This working group has 24 members of the Republican conference who have backgrounds in urban issues, either having served as mayors or members of city councils or otherwise in local government, or who by their districts have a natural affinity for urban issues by working closely with their communities and seeing the difficulty of urban revitalization and redevelopment and the commitment to bringing jobs back to our cities.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Committee on the Budget in adding $1.140 billion to the administration's request for programs under the community and regional development function in the budget, which includes the Community Development Block Grant. The budget document itself specifically lays out that the funds are being restored with the clear intention of supporting the Community Development Block Grant program, or CDBG.

It goes on to state that the resolution makes no assumption regarding implementation of the President's proposed Strengthening America's Communities Block Grant or transferring the Community Development Block Grant program from the Department of HUD to the Department of Commerce. This is an important notation because it is very important for national associations that support urban issues, like the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, that have had a great deal of concern about the consolidation of 18 programs, some of which are currently located in HUD, to Commerce and the reduction in overall spending, which was proposed of 30 percent.

This House, in taking the action of supporting the Committee on the Budget's resolution, does not accept the President's level of funding and looks to restore functions for CDBG that go to important issues in our community such as taking abandoned houses and refurbishing them, demolishing abandoned buildings where they cannot be rehabilitated, taking abandoned lots that might have been strewn with broken grass or be places where criminals congregate and turning them into community parking lots that can help support areas of local community business districts.

Looking, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) was saying, to the area of brownfields, we have abandoned factory sites throughout our urban core which make it more difficult for us to bring jobs to those areas of our cities, to find ways to environmentally clean up those sites, and to demolish the buildings, bringing jobs back into them. The Community Development Block Grant program supports those functions.

I also serve as chairman of the Federalism and the Census Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Reform, and we recently held a subcommittee hearing on the administration's proposal to consolidate existing direct grant economic and community development programs within the Department of Commerce. We heard information from the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities where they told of the success of these programs.

I want to thank the chairman for listening to the great degree of success that they have had in the past and looking to ways that we can continue to support this program.

So I appreciate the addition of the $1.140 billion and the notation of the support for the Community Development Block Grant program.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Just to punctuate what the gentleman from Ohio and the gentlewoman from Connecticut said, we believe in local control; and we want to be partners with these communities in solving problems. We disagreed with the President in his budget with the changes that were made to the Community Development Block Grant; so we made that value judgment and change in this budget. We are supporting our mayors. We are supporting our communities. We want to be good partners, and we believe in local control in solving those problems. The big Federal Government cannot solve all these problems that these local folks are dealing with. We want to give them the opportunity to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Before us today is an excellent budget, the result of an excellent process, and the product of an excellent chairman, the gentleman from Iowa.

Despite some occasional overheated rhetoric, the fiscal year 2006 budget resolution is, in fact, a modest attempt by a reasonable majority to hold down the growth of government spending. This is one of the strongest budgets I have seen since coming to Congress.

True, it makes tough choices. Imagine, it prioritizes spending, and it starts the long process of modernizing the Federal Government while rooting out waste, fraud, and inefficiency. But, Mr. Chairman, American taxpayers deserve no less, especially today. We are at war with an enemy who threatens us here at home and on the other side of the world.

□ 1715

Our security spending must therefore take priority, and in turn we must make difficult but necessary choices about non-security spending.

That is exactly what this budget does. It meets our needs at home and abroad without raising taxes, which would stifle our economy, or wasting money, which undermines the hard work the American people did to earn those tax dollars in the first place.

Of course, for some people, regardless of the fiscal and international circumstances, taxes and spending are never high enough. This year, as every year, they have warned us about the dire consequences of trusting the American people with their own money.

Last year, the same critics made the same criticism of our efforts, which we now know ultimately slowed the growth of non-security discretionary spending to about 1 percent. These critics assured us that our budget would bust a hole in the deficit. And yet last year, the deficit came in $109 billion smaller than experts originally thought it would, specifically because of the increased economic growth directly attributed to Republican tax relief passed since 2001.

Millions of jobs were created last year. Indeed, more than 3 million of them have been created since the House took up President Bush's similarly criticized Jobs and Growth tax relief package 21 months ago.

So, in short, Mr. Chairman, the economic data coming in every month speaks to the wisdom of the fiscal policies of the Republican majority. The critics were just wrong, and they are wrong again this year.

The principal mantra against this budget is that it will explode the deficit, despite the evidence of last year's shrinking deficit projections. What, one wonders, do they think that the $67.1 billion in additional spending that they propose at the Committee on the Budget markup would do?

The balanced budgets of the late 1990s should serve as our model, they say. Well, I agree. And I would remind them that the balanced budgets of the late 1990s were passed by Republican Congresses, without much help from our friends on the other side of the aisle. Hardly any of them voted for it.

How anyone takes credit for policies they opposed is beyond me, but I guess that is politics. But, again, so is the idea that raising $392.4 billion in new taxes, as Committee on the Budget Democrats proposed just last week, would somehow help the economy to create jobs.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the facts are indisputable: Democracy is on the march around the world; the war on terror is being won; the economy is growing; jobs are being created; deficit projections are shrinking; and the looming demographic crises facing Social Security and Medicare are being addressed, all thanks to the courage, the policies and the leadership of President Bush and this Republican Congress.

That the same people who have criticized us all along are criticizing our

budget today, Mr. Chairman, only suggests we must be doing something right.

So I urge all my colleagues to give more momentum to our success and support the budget resolution before us.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman.

I would point out that when the Bush budget summit agreement came to the floor of this House in the fall of 1990, after many arduous months of negotiation with the Bush administration and the Democratic leadership and the Republican leadership in the House, only 88 Republicans supported the passage of that bill, which had the President's support behind it.

In 1993, when we passed the Clinton Budget Act and began the unprecedented march towards lower and lower deficits, eventuating in a surplus of $236 billion in the year 2000, not a single Republican in either House voted for that deficit reduction effort.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from South Carolina, our ranking member on the Committee on the Budget for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I had enough time to respond to the Majority Leader's problems with this budget, but, in all honesty, the War on Terror, we just passed the supplemental that was not part of this budget, and most of us, in fact I voted for that supplemental because it was the War on Terror.

But I rise to oppose the drastic cuts in Medicaid in this budget resolution. Medicaid is not the problem child of our health care system and should not take the fall for this administration's inability to balance the budget.

Medicaid's cost per capita growth is lower than Medicare or even private insurance, despite the fact that Medicaid has absorbed an increased beneficiary population due to gaps in Medicare coverage, an economic downturn and the decline of employer-sponsored health insurance. Medicaid is a success story in this country, not a program that belongs on the Federal chopping block.

As a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I cannot support this budget resolution instruction to my committee to cut $20 billion outs of Medicaid.

The robust Medicaid program is critical for the health care delivery in my home State of Texas. Forty-five percent of all infants born in Texas are covered by Medicaid, 45 percent. Nearly 50 percent of all children receiving care in our children's hospitals are Medicaid beneficiaries. Medicaid is the single-largest health insurer for our Nation's children. How can we cut the most vulnerable in our society, our children, and still consider ourselves looking out for the least of this society?

To paraphrase the Bible, let us not suffer the little children. That is not our job here in this Congress. If Congress goes forward with these ill-advised Medicaid cuts, the States will be left holding the bag and their only option is to further cut the benefits.

Mr. Chairman, 45 million Americans currently are uninsured. It makes no sense to slash Medicaid spending, which will virtually guarantee an increase in the number of uninsured in our country. Medicaid cuts will not better our bottom line. It will only make our problems worse.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak very briefly about an aspect of fiscal responsibility, the rule called pay-as-you-go, because there is a connection between our lack of fiscal responsibility and these draconian cuts we are seeing in vital services, like the $20 billion that people who are poor and dependent on Medicaid will be forced to endure.

Our colleagues in the majority have consistently opposed Democratic efforts to reinstall pay-as-you-go rules for both entitlement spending and new tax cuts. In fact, they just denied the House the ability to vote on such a proposal offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) and the Blue Dogs.

These PAYGO reforms were put in place in the 1990s and were essential to the successful effort achieved then to balance the budget. PAYGO reforms have been endorsed in their entirety by Alan Greenspan, but the Republicans do not want them applied to tax cuts. Why? Because doing so would require that they identify specific revenue measures, most likely spending cuts, which would provide the offsets, vital spend services being cut, such as Medicaid.

So we should reinstate PAYGO. We should not support this budget, that destroys so much which is a part of our health care delivery, Medicaid.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the alternative budget resolution that will soon be offered by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). I do so in light of the fact that the Republican budget resolution mirrors the President's request for defense and the Spratt alternative matches this funding dollar-for-dollar, but the Spratt budget is better because section 401 of his resolution calls on the Congress to address serious shortcomings in both the President's budget and the House Republican budget resolution.

Let me explain why I favor the Spratt alternative budget. The Republican budget only temporarily increases the death gratuity and the Service Members Group Life Insurance coverage. The Spratt budget would make these increases permanent. That is important.

The Republican budget omits targeted pay raises and reenlistment bonuses for enlisted personnel. We know right now we are having a great deal of trouble in enlisting young people, reenlisting some of the troops. As you know, you enlist a soldier, but you retain families. These issues are critical to retaining experienced troops and maintaining readiness. The Spratt budget makes it a priority.

The Republican budget fails to increase funds for Family Service Centers to support the families of deploying troops. The Spratt budget takes care of that, and takes care of our military families.

The Republican budget shortchanges community-based health care organizations that care for the injured servicemen and women. The Spratt budget takes care of that. It pluses up the program.

The Republican budget does not aggressively fund nuclear nonproliferation programs. Both sides of the aisle, and as a matter of fact during the last campaign both the candidates for President, said that stopping a nuclear weapon from getting in the hands of terrorists is our top national security priority. The Spratt budget backs that up with dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the budget to be offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, a budget says a lot about our values. What this budget says to America's veterans is that Congress does not value your service to country. It makes a mockery of the American value of shared sacrifice in time of war. How does it do that? Let me explain.

This budget says to the person sitting here safely at home who makes $1 million in dividend income this year that you can keep every penny of your $220,000 tax break that the House Republican leadership has given you recently, every penny of that tax break. But, on the other hand, it says to millions of America's veterans that we are going to direct a $14 billion cut in veterans' programs over the next 5 years.

This budget even goes so far as to say they have to cut $798 billion out of disabled veterans' monthly pensions, low-income veterans compensation checks and veterans GI benefits, their education benefits, unless of course they want to go raise fees or, perhaps most likely, do all of those things.

Where is the American value, the American family value, in those priorities? To a millionaire, making every

dime on dividend income, you can keep your $220,000 tax cut; but to a veteran who may be coming back from Iraq, in fact a soldier today who may be tomorrow's veteran or next year's veteran, we are going to make you wait longer for health care in our VA hospitals; you are not going to get the care you deserve and you earned by risking your life for your country.

I hear a lot from my Republican colleagues about family values. This budget does not reflect the family values of the American family, because the American family respects the service and sacrifice of our veterans, not just with speeches on Veterans Day. We are awfully good about that. But they expect us to respect veterans every day, and this bill does not even come close to maintaining present services for health care for our veterans.

They can show their charts, how they have increased veterans funding, but the reality is it does not keep up with present services. So, in effect, every Member of this House who votes for this bill is voting for a real cut in health care services, education services and monthly disability pension checks for America's veterans.

I think the American people, and I know America's veterans, are going to be offended by the values and priorities of this bill. Let us not just say yes to veterans on Veterans Day and turn our backs on them on budget day. Sadly that is what this budget does.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject the values of this budget; reject the slap in the face of millions of American veterans while coddling the wealthiest in our society, who are going to enjoy that $220,000 tax break they are making by their riskless dividend income of $1 million this year.

Let us stand up for America's veterans today when it counts. They may appreciate our speeches on Veterans Day, but today they need our vote. That is the value that counts. Vote no on this unfair slap in the face to America's veterans.

□ 1730

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), a veteran and the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate you on this budget. I think the American people are smart enough to recognize truth and demagoguery. That is what you hear on this House floor is demagoguery, and that is completely unfortunate.

I believe that ensuring that the disabled, the injured, the low-income and special needs veterans are given the highest attention. That is the priority of our Nation.

In establishing priorities of care for veterans health care, this Congress also believes that the same military values that guided servicemembers on active duty should define how services and assistance are provided to them as veterans. It is why we established the priorities of care, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight.

This budget takes into consideration the present budgetary constraints, the aging veteran population, as well as the influx of veterans into the system as the Nation continues to fight the war on terror throughout the world.

As chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I seek an increase in $12.6 million for the medical and prosthetic research projects above the President's budget request. We also increased by $293 million for State nursing home partnership. We increase about $300 million discretionary funding for veterans health care, despite the demagoguery you will hear from some Members on this floor.

To ensure that our national cemeteries are maintained as the shrines that they are, my subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), and I recommended an additional $45.6 million in construction to begin a 5-year $300 million national shrine commitment project to repair and restore the existing national cemeteries. But while our greatest attention should be focused on those who have served us and can no longer fend for themselves, there is another group of veterans that needs our help: our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines who need assistance in returning to the workforce or entering the workforce for the first time after serving their country.

This budget will also ensure that the VA benefits take care of the young solder coming home, as well as the older soldier who may already have a family. We need to make sure that the VA is flexible and personal in its delivery of health care and benefits, such as training and education.

This is a wise investment, harnessing the same spirit and drive that has won our Nation's battles, to contribute to our Nation's workforce and to sustain our national competitive edge. To facilitate this investment, I created a new subcommittee solely devoted to this effort chaired by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), as chairman of the Committee on the Budget, has done an outstanding job. He has led Congress through some challenging budgetary times as chairman. Some may forget the meaning of the attacks upon our country on September 11. It was an attack upon our freedom, upon our way of life. It was devastating to our economy. That economic growth has returned, but we also now need to manage that economic growth smartly.

There is a lot of rhetoric, but let me return to some facts. Under this President, spending for veterans has increased by 47 percent in 5 years versus 32 percent in the 8 years under the Clinton administration.

If I turn to the chart to my left, as the chart shows, over the last 7 years discretionary spending has grown 39.5 percent under the VA–HUD appropriations bill. That is a 4.9 percent average increase for every year from 1998 all the way to present. So despite all the rhetoric that America and my colleagues will hear, the reality is this chart. The spending on veterans continues to increase, maintaining our commitment to veterans in America.

I also would like to turn to a second chart I think is very interesting. On this chart it shows what happened under the Democrat control of Congress. Congressional spending per veteran was flat. For 10 years a meager $400 increase for 10 years from 1984 to 1994.

Can everybody see this? It was flat. To my colleagues on this side of the aisle, do you see this? It was flat for 10 years. You did not hear demagoguery on the House floor. What you had at the time were individuals on both sides of the aisle working together in a bipartisan fashion with regard to how we deal with veterans.

So what we have under the Republican control the last 10 years is from 1995 to 2005 Congress increased spending by $1,400 per veteran, that is from $1,368 to $2,773 per veteran. I think this chart is very clear.

What has occurred under Democrat control is flat-lined budget for veterans. I am not going to demagogue. It is just a reality.

Now with regard to what has happened under Republican control, the increase and the maintaining of our commitment to veterans programs and causes across the board. This is the reality.

I want to say to the budget chairman, I want to thank him. He has given me a task, and the task is that with regard to all of these programs in discretionary and mandatory, are there savings out there? Are these systems being run smartly and effectively and efficiently?

He has challenged those of us who serve on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. And you know what? We will accept the challenge, and we will go and work together in a bipartisan fashion and see if we can find those savings. He has not dictated to us. He has challenged us and we accept the challenge.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY), a member of the committee.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's budget allows our country to meet our most important values, a strong defense, a strong economy, while reducing our Nation's deficit.

Let me, if I might, focus on another area of concern that the prior speaker just talked about and that is commitment to our Nation's veterans. We do value our veterans' service. And if you look at this chart that I have here that talks about overall spending in the VA, Mr. Chairman, you will see a strong

commitment to honoring the commitment of our Nation's veterans.

The second chart that I have specifically talks to veterans medical care which has increased from 1995 to 2005, over a 10-year period, nearly 85 percent. And in the last 5 years, medical spending has increased by 68 percent. That is a commitment to our Nation's veterans.

Let me talk about some other specific areas of improvement that we have made. We have allowed Guard and Reserve units to enroll in medical benefits. We have increased the GI benefit. We have funded finally for the first time concurrent receipts so that the practice of disallowing veterans who had disabilities as a result of their service from collecting both their retirement pay and disability pay is finally being addressed with a $22 billion commitment over the next 10 years.

We have reduced the wait times at our VA hospitals, and the VA continues to give our Nation's veterans excellent care.

Let me touch on, Mr. Chairman, what we have done under the gentleman's leadership this year in the veterans line items of the budget. The discretionary baseline under the President's submission was $30.8 billion. Under the gentleman's mark and allowing me to work together with him and propose an amendment, we increase that by $877 million, which means in these tough fiscal times that our Nation is experiencing a 2.8 percent increase for veterans health care numbers.

Yes, there is a reconciliation number; but when we started with the President's submission, it was $424 million. The reconciliation, Mr. Chairman, under the gentleman's mark is $155 million. I believe that we can find that reconciliation number without enrollment fees, without drug co-pays because we will have the flexibility to look for waste, fraud, and abuse in the veterans numbers and be able to reduce and meet a goal in that fashion.

Let me repeat: we do not have to establish either drug co-pays or enrollment fees. We can achieve this reconciliation in other ways.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, I congratulate the gentleman again for a fiscally prudent budget that meets our Nation's needs, and I look forward to continuing to work with him to honor the commitment to our Nation's veterans.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman of the House who has probably some of the heaviest lifting to do with regard to controlling spending, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my chairman yielding me time.

I really come today to express my very sincere and deep appreciation to both the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for the fabulous job they do of working together on behalf of all of us to try to make sense out of our budget process.

To say the least, the world on both sides of the aisle and across the country would love to suggest that we provide for them every program at a maximum level that they might have on their wish list. And in turn, that same world wants us to make sense out of balancing our budget. These gentlemen are faced with that horrendous and impossible task, and to them we owe a great debt of gratitude.

As the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) suggested, I have now the responsibility of chairing the Committee on Appropriations where, as they help us struggle with the budget, we spend money that has a propensity to violate that which is their guidelines for sensible budgeting. But in turn, over the years as I have observed this process there has been far too little communication, that is meaningful communication, between those on the staff level but also the professional level within the committee itself, between the appropriations process and the budgeteers.

I must say that in the time I have had this job, the short time, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has gone out of his way to say time and time again, we want to work with you.

I have committed myself to trying to have the Committee on Appropriations once again be a committee designed to preserve dollars, not just spend dollars; and, indeed, if we are successful in that effort, we will be in partnership with our budgeteers, attempting to make sense out of the budget and eventually balance that budget.

We are not in this alone. And the issues that flow around stabilizing our economy know nothing about partisan politics. And I must say that the Committee on the Budget has provided guidelines; in the past we have not always followed those guidelines. It is my intention to work as partners in this business so we can all be successful. And I can say without any reservation, if we are successful, moving our bills this year very rapidly so they are ready for conference in the early spring, it will be in no small part a success of the work you all have done.

I appreciate that very much and look forward to continuing this relationship.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I yielded to myself to clarify what is in the budget proposal we are proposing versus the budget resolution reported by the committee and sponsored by the Republicans.

Our budget, let me make this clear, matches dollar for dollar their budget on national defense and international affairs, there is not a dime's worth of difference over a 5-year period of time. But our budget does single out veterans as one group deserving of more spending, more than just a current services budget, because the demands are clearly there. So our budget provides $1.6 billion more than theirs, than the Republican resolution, for veterans health care in 2006. And between 2006 and 2010 we provide $17 billion more for veterans health care.

Our budget resolution contains no reconciliation instructions to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. What does that mean? Their resolution calls upon the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to report savings out of mandatory programs that will save $798 million. There are only two places those savings can come from: either cutting disability benefits or raising the fees that veterans must pay to use veterans facilities.

Our budget resolution contains special provisions for our troops to make sure that the increases in life insurance to $400,000 for combat fatalities voted up in the supplemental for 1 year will be extended for future years, and that the death gratuity raised to $100,000 will also be continued for future years. And we will provide more funding for family separation centers, for deployed troops, and more community-based health care for returning troops and their families, two things that have been critically noted.

Our resolution recommends that the funds be taken from the Missile Defense Agency and advanced satellite programs to pay for these personnel benefits. We think it is a good tradeoff.

Our resolution also contains more in the four functions that fund homeland security and make special provisions for increasing the budget for cooperative threat reduction, so-called nonproliferation, by $200 million.

So in summary, for our veterans, for our troops and for the emerging threats facing us, terrorists armed with WMDs, our budget is not only better funded, but better focused than theirs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) for a response.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), may want to hide behind a fig leaf of charging demagoguery, but let us review the facts he did not refute.

Fact number one, this budget will cut veterans pensions compensation and education benefits by nearly $800 million.

□ 1745

Fact number two, over 5 years it will cut veterans health care by nearly $14 billion. Fact number three, in this same budget someone making a million dollars a year in dividend income will get to keep every penny of his $220,000 tax break. They may call it demagoguery. I think America's veterans

will call it wrong, wrong what they are doing to our service men, women and our veterans.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his leadership on this budget matter.

Shame, shame, shame. I cannot believe the Republican budget. Our men and women that serve this country are putting their lives on the line, and what are we doing? Cutting benefits and refusing service. I am reminded of the words of the first President of the United States, George Washington, whose words are worth repeating over and over again.

''The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, should be directly proportional as to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars are treated and appreciated.''

The independent budget puts support by the veterans community as $300 billion short. I say that President Bush's budget and the House Republican Bush budget should be dead on arrival. Let me repeat that. I said that Bush's budget and the House Republican budget as it relates to veterans should be dead on arrival.

On top of all of this, this budget tells the Veteran's Affairs Committee, which I am on, to find $800 million in cuts over the next 5 years for savings.

You know, the Republicans practice what I call reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the veterans to give tax cuts to the rich. The President keeps telling us we are at war. Well, put your money where your mouth is.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the House Democratic Caucus Chairman.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time and for his work in developing a budget for all Americans. Every year the administration and Congress are taxed with developing a budget that reflects our Nation's priorities in spending, priorities that reflect our country's values.

Unfortunately, the budget resolution we have before us, and the values it represents insults the true values of the American people, given the extensive cuts to first responders, community policing, veterans benefits, health care, and education funding.

Under the Republican leadership the entire budget process has become a complete fraud on the American people. This budget adds more than $4 trillion to the deficit in the next 10 years, without even including the enormous costs that have been left out of the budget. It is past time for this House to be honest and restore fiscal responsibility to this process and to the Nation, the same fiscal responsibility that each of our constituents face when they try to balance their household and business budgets.

Unfortunately, this budget shows that the Republican Congress does not share the values of the American people. What type of values would cut funding to the Fire Act Grant Program which helps meet the basic needs of firefighters by 30 percent? Firefighters on the front lines of the war on terror in New Jersey stand to lose $4 million under this resolution, which means they will have less protective clothing, fewer portable radios than they need to protect our citizens.

What type of values would slash funding to the COP program by 95 percent, a program that has put over 4,800 police officers on the street in New Jersey? In doing so, this budget dismantles a critical instrument in New Jersey's fight against crime.

What type of values would raise health costs for many of the over 620,000 veterans in New Jersey, increasing drug copayments and imposing new enrollment fees that will cost veterans more than $2 billion over 5 years and drive more than 200,000 veterans out of the system entirely?

What type of values would cut discretionary health programs by 6 percent and slash Medicaid by billions of dollars?

New Jersey would lose more than $100 million per year in Federal Medicaid funding, enough funding to provide health coverage to 6,400 seniors or 34,000 children. And what type of values would underfund education and, specifically, the No Child Left Behind Act by over $12 billion, creating a 4-year deficit between what was promised and what was actually delivered of $39 billion?

If this budget passes, over 53,000 children in New Jersey will go without promised help in reading and math and 34,000 will no longer be able to enroll in the afterschool programs that not only keep kids safe but also boost academic achievement. That is why the Democratic substitute will restore fiscal responsibility to secure our homeland, provide for America's seniors and veterans, fund education initiatives to guarantee our children's future success in an ever increasingly competitive world and lay the foundation for a society that truly reflects our values and our commitment to a better more prosperous and stronger America.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute and vote down the woefully inadequate Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), a veteran of the United States Marine Corps, the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 95 and in support of both the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). The GOP budget resolution will put the Department of Veterans Affairs programs at least $3.2 billion short to meet the current level of needs to our veterans.

It is not just a matter that VA will not be able to make critical program enhancements for servicemen and women returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. It is even short of meeting current services.

The Bush administration's budget submission for 2006 requested less than half of a 1 percent increase for its health care services. The VA has testified that it requires a 13 to 14 percent increase to sustain services annually. Both the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from South Carolina's (Mr. SPRATT) amendments will support increased amounts funding for our veterans.

If we thought it was ridiculous to grant tax cuts to millionaires while the deficit soars, how about cutting veterans' programs in the middle of the war? Are we really going to promote a point of view that instead is deserving of our support by cutting benefits?

Mr. Chairman, I hope not. If we do, we should be ashamed.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the resolution under consideration.

As a former State legislator, I know how important Federal Government investments are. They allow State and local governments to meet our obligations without assuming the responsibility for Federal shortfalls or passing those costs along to local taxpayers. Federal investments acknowledge the shared responsibility for promoting economic growth, meeting health needs and ensuring educational opportunity.

I strongly believe that the Federal Government must recognize its obligations, work within budgetary limits to meet them and to make smart investments focused on the Nation's current and future fiscal well-being. Unfortunately, the budget resolution before us does not meet these simple tests. Instead, it prioritizes tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and largest corporations over meeting our obligations to average Americans. It fails to live within available revenues and increases future deficits.

I fought for a seat on the Committee on the Budget because my constituents want me to be an advocate for strong fiscal discipline and wise Federal spending. During Committee on the Budget consideration of this budget resolution, I was proud to join my Democratic colleagues in putting forward amendments aimed at refocusing our spending and investments on the

priorities that matter to the everyday lives of all Americans: creating and keeping jobs, supporting community development and providing for a safe and secure homeland. Specifically, I led the effort to better ensure adequate funding for police, first responders and security at our ports.

Democrats and Republicans alike agree that our Nation's top priority is keeping Americans and this Nation safe. After all, nothing else will matter if we cannot protect the people of this country right here at home.

Yet, at the same time, fire departments, police forces, ports and rail stations across the Nation are ramping up efforts to implement safety measures and better prepare for any kind of terrorist incident or extreme emergency. This budget proposes cutting the very programs that will help them meet these responsibilities.

Despite these dire warnings of security at our ports in particular, this budget falls $4.7 billion short of what the Coast Guard estimates it would cost to secure our ports.

Despite the fact that we cannot afford our first responders to be unprepared, this resolution recommends a reduction of $560 million in first responder funding.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that we must do better, that we have to make sure that our first responders at our ports meet the obligations to all Americans, that we do all that we can to make sure that our government, the Federal Government, helps our local communities be strong and be safe.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about who wins and who loses in the Bush Republican budget.

Three hundred thousand working poor who have children will be cut from the Food Stamp Program. I received a call today from a constituent from Lithonia, Georgia, complaining that her children depend on the food stamps she gets to stretch the family food budget.

LIHEAP is the Low Income Heating Assistance Program that makes sure our working families do not freeze during the winter, and the Republicans propose to cut that program even as heating costs rise.

While the Republicans want us to believe that they really care about our children, the proof is in where they choose to put taxpayers' money.

The Pentagon cannot account for $2.3 trillion. Halliburton walks away with over $100 million undeserved dollars. Secretary Rumsfeld says the U.S. can afford record defense expenditures, while the President proposes to cut all vocational education at the high school level, the Safe and Drug Free Schools program, the Upward Bound program and even dropout prevention. What could be more important to the Education President than to make sure that our young people graduate from high school with an education that has prepared them for life.

Well, I know the answer to that question. Not the mom and pop businesses on Main Street and their families, but the wealthy scions of industry on Wall Street.

Even chairman of the Federal Reserve System, Alan Greenspan, lamented before our committee the growing wealth and education disparities in our country. The Republicans will talk about growth, but they will not talk about how our country is growing apart.

They tell us that homeownership is on the rise, but they will not tell us that three-quarters of white families in this country own their homes while the majority of Asian Americans, Native Americans, Latinos and African Americans remain renters.

According to just about every reputable study, the disparity between black quality of life and white quality of life is not narrowing nearly as fast as we would like it to. In the last 6 years, wealth for white families grew by 37 percent while wealth for families of color fell by 7 percent. These numbers represent real people who have not felt one bit of Republican growth.

□ 1800

Mr. Chairman, too many Americans, especially African Americans and Latinos, cannot afford health care, housing and even a college education.

We have two choices: we can grow together, or we can grow apart. When we invested it in our people like Social Security, the GI bill, civil rights laws, affirmative action, America grew and we all grew together. But now because of the policies coming out of Washington, D.C., today's wealthiest 10 percent own 70 percent of America's wealth. It is clear that Americans are growing apart. The Republican budget ought to provide opportunity for all to experience America's coming prosperity, but it is also clear it does not.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate with great interest, and I keep hearing about cuts in the budget. They are not there. All of the specific cuts are just not there. They do not exist in this budget.

What this budget does do, however, is it fulfills our Federal obligations while at the same time it reduces the deficit in half by the year 2009. We all know why we have a deficit. We have a deficit because when President Bush got elected, he inherited a recession. He inherited the burst of the Internet bubble, he inherited Wall Street scandals, and the mother of all economic and all other problems, which is 9/11.

Despite that, because of the Bush policies and economic policies of this House, the economy is doing well again. If it was up to the Democrats, they would have raised taxes massively and destroyed the economy. Luckily we prevailed; the Democrats did not. And, therefore, we reduced taxes and the economy is once again doing well.

But I just heard again tonight the Democrats all concerned about the deficit. Yet let me show Members what the Democrats, who tonight have been talking about how concerned they are about the size of the deficit and spending, what they proposed just a few days ago.

They proposed in committee amendments that would have again increased spending by $67.1 billion, and yet they give us lip service tonight and continuously state they are concerned about the deficit. To borrow a phrase from a very well-known Democratic leader, Democrats are concerned about the deficit, they support reducing the deficit before they are against reducing the deficit. They cannot have it both ways.

We have a deficit that is caused by too much spending. We have to reduce the deficit, so lip service and lip balm is fine; but when push comes to shove, they cannot complain about the deficit and then try to increase spending.

What the budget that the chairman is proposing does, it does address our responsibilities while reducing the deficit and while responsibly spending the taxpayers' money.

I also heard, Mr. President, put your money where your mouth is. It is not our money, it is the taxpayers' money.

That is the big difference. We remember it is not our money. That is why we are not willing to throw it away. It is the taxpayers' money. This budget spends it responsibly. I thank the chairman for this very responsible budget and urge adoption of the budget.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for presenting a budget that has a better vision for the American people, and for the gentleman's hard work that he does for the American people.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third year that I have been in the Congress. There has been a similar routine every year I have been here. We debate the budget and our side says it is a statement of our values, and we say it is a statement of who we are. I would add one observation to that. This is a process that tells us a great deal about whether we are who we say we are, because there is an irony that I see with my friends from the other side of the aisle.

As we move into the year and move into the holiday season, we spend a lot of time talking about shared benevolence, but they will pass a budget tomorrow that will cut $5 billion from

food stamps, and only 2 percent of people who are eligible receive food stamps. It is not a program filled with waste and fraud.

A lot of our friends on the other side of the aisle will talk about benevolence and their belief in families and families having strong values, and yet they will vote tomorrow night to cut child care assistance. A lot of our friends on the other side of the aisle will talk about cutting taxes, and yet they will vote tomorrow night to raise taxes on people receiving the earned income tax credit.

And the other side of the aisle will talk about their belief in Social Security and their faith in that program and their refusal to touch it, and then they will cut SSI payments which are a major part of Social Security. A lot of our friends on the other side of the aisle will talk about their commitment to housing, and then they will vote to eliminate one of the most effective housing programs in this country.

And finally, a lot of our friends on the other side of the aisle will talk about their commitment to children and helping families raise their children with the right values, and then they will vote to freeze or leave virtually frozen child care services and day care services.

I am not one who likes to call names, but the word ''hypocrisy'' means you say one thing and you blatantly endorse another set of practices.

This is a debate about exactly who we will ask to sacrifice in this country. There is no question we have asked our veterans to sacrifice an enormous amount, and they belong in a category of their own; but there is another class of Americans who we also ask to sacrifice in this budget. We ask the most vulnerable people, the people in our society who are working and living by the sweat of their brow every day. We ask them to give up so much in this budget, and there is an irony because we have heard it said by the chairman and various other Members on the other side of the aisle, we have heard it said that people want these tax cuts and they will trade these programs off for the prevalence and the prevailing of these tax cuts.

But here is the problem. The average people that will receive the cuts that I described got a tax cut of $28 to $35 a month. That is not an equitable trade-off; that is not a fair trade-off.

I simply end by saying the Spratt budget presents a better vision for the American people and introduces a six-letter word into this debate that we have not heard all day, a word called ''equity.'' That is what separates our approach from theirs.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, colleagues will remember the Biblical story of the prophet Nathan coming to the mighty King David. Nathan told David a story about a rich man who had many sheep but took the one little ewe lamb of a poor man to feed a visiting friend. David flew into a rage at the rich man and proclaimed that anyone who should do such a thing deserved to be put to death for abusing his power and showing so little compassion. Then Nathan turned to David and said, ''You are that man.''

This story should lead us to look into the mirror. Are we in danger of becoming ''that man''? The Republican budget removes support for housing, education, Medicaid, community development, and small business lending. It raises taxes on the poor. And it does all this so the Republicans can afford new tax cuts for the wealthiest among us. If ever there were a moral issue before this Congress, surely it is this one.

One might expect that these cuts would at least result in significant decreases in our deficits, but this is not the case. We continue to face the worst-of-both-worlds scenario in which we suffer both devastating cuts and dangerous increases in the deficit. We continue to borrow from our children to pay for tax cuts, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the President's Social Security privatization.

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to be good stewards of the resources of our government, not simply to look at our immediate desires, but also to the needs of our children and our children's children, including their need to be free of a crippling debt.

Republicans claim to be the party of moral values, but their budget belies that claim. The Democratic alternative maintains current funding levels for our country's critical domestic and security programs while also providing meaningful tax relief for middle-class Americans. Furthermore, the Democratic budget recognizes that fiscal responsibility is also a moral value by reinstating a real pay-as-you-go rule and by balancing our budget within 7 years. The Republican budget, on the other hand, continues to run up record deficits for as far as the eye can see.

Mr. Chairman, the budget process provides each party with a chance to put its money where its mouth is, to act on the rhetoric we all hear around here year round. A budget is a statement of moral priorities. May we do justice to those imperatives in the vote we cast tomorrow.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for an opportunity to speak this evening, and I appreciate the work the gentleman has done to provide a balanced approach to meet our requirements in a fiscally responsible manner. I particularly appreciate the work done by the Democrats on the committee to deal with the environmental priorities of America.

I am saddened by a party-line vote that these proposals were rejected to be a part of the proposal brought forward by the majority. This budget is stunningly out of sync with where the typical American is in terms of protecting our environment and our natural resources. From oceans to brownfields, we have found environmental quality to be victim of the obsession of misplaced budget priorities and an obsession with more tax cuts.

In areas of clean water, every independent outside organization, and most of them within government, have identified that we have a serious problem with the Nation's aging water systems required to ensure safe drinking water; yet the President's budget and what we have here today reduces almost $700 million for water quality responsibilities.

In the land and water conservation fund, we are breaking the promise that was negotiated here in the year 2000 where the conservation trust fund was established that should by now by rights, as a result of this bipartisan, bicameral agreement be moving funds in the neighborhood of $2 billion for this fiscal year. But, unfortunately, this budget would turn its back on that responsibility.

Another important element is the land and water conservation fund authorized at almost $1 billion; yet this budget includes only $147 million for actual programs to help preserve parks, forests, wildlife refuges and open space, things that touch people where they live at home, garnering broad bipartisan support. This year the President and the Republicans go even further by eliminating the land and water conservation State grants programs which have provided critical funding to States and local communities to preserve open space and develop recreation facilities.

And one of the most significant broken promises is in the area of conservation in the agriculture sector. One of the elements that was negotiated as part of the farm bill, there were going to be investments in farm conservation; and yet this budget takes something that is so critical to America's farmers, particularly small and medium-sized operations, and cuts more than a half billion dollars from these vital farm bill conservation programs that unite rural America, conservation interests, people who care about natural resources.

There is currently over a $4 billion backlog of producers waiting to participate in these critical farm conservation programs. It is a travesty as far as the environment is concerned; and it is a sad, sad story for America's farmers who deserve better. I strongly urge the rejection of the majority proposal.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to amplify on what the gentleman from Oregon has stated.

Our budget would be $2.9 billion above theirs for the year 2006 for resources and the environment. That

makes a big difference when it comes to EPA, safe drinking water, the Land and Water Conservation Act; and over 5 years, our budget is $23 billion in resources and environment better than their budget.

□ 1815

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the shameful Republican budget. Yet again the Republican leadership neglects the needs of low and middle income families in order to provide hundreds of billions of dollars in tax cuts to the wealthiest of Americans. We should not be supporting this unfair budget that leaves people without adequate housing, without opportunities for a decent education or job training, and which passes billions of dollars of debt to our children.

I am especially concerned about the Community Development Block Grant. Mr. Chairman, the Community Development Block Grant is something that should have the support of both Democrats and Republicans. This Community Development Block Grant is the only source of funds that some of our small towns and cities have to deal with housing, to deal with programs for senior citizens, at-risk youth or to deal with the infrastructure. Many of the small cities just do not have the money to deal with some of the problems of the sewer systems and roads and other kinds of things. But with the Community Development Block Grant, they have the flexibility. This is a very, very respected program. They have the kind of extensive community planning that brings in all of the community groups and organizations, the 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations, and they actually go through all of the programs and they decide which of these programs will be funded. To talk about cutting this is very, very cruel. I have received just hundreds of calls from mayors and city council members who say, ''Please, whatever you do, don't cut CDBG.''

Since the President initially proposed consolidating CDBG and other development programs into one grant program, not only have I received all of these letters from members of city councils and mayors, they have basically said without this program, many of their cities will simply collapse.

In addition to these cuts, the President has already proposed to cut public housing by 10 percent, section 811 disabled housing by 50 percent, housing opportunities for persons with AIDS by 14 percent, and other HUD programs. Yet the Republican budget resolution proposed to make even more draconian cuts to this function. We simply cannot afford to do that.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget and to support a budget that invests in the future of our country. This is shameful and unconscionable that they can even bring this budget to the floor. I ask for a ''no'' vote on the Republican budget and an ''aye'' vote on the Democratic budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the budget brought forth by the gentleman from Iowa and the Committee on the Budget. We have not only, I think, the right but the duty as the legislative branch of government to perform the oversight function of the executive branch. As the gentleman from Iowa pointed out before the Committee on Rules yesterday, we really have not done that since 1997. The reality of the matter is that everything has been on automatic pilot basically since 1997 and we not only should, we must perform our oversight duty.

We have heard the word ''draconian'' with regard to supposed cuts being proposed in this budget. I think it is important to look at the facts. What the budget proposed by the Committee on the Budget calls for with regard to what constitutes the most dangerous threat on the horizon to our economic well-being, strength in this country, the great, extraordinary growth in what is referred to as mandatory spending, spending that is built into the law, that the appropriators do not have anything to do with because it is built into the law, this budget initiates a process of review and of study, oversight, so that the growth in what is almost 60 percent of the budget and projected to continue to grow and continue to grow, the growth in the mandatory spending will be reduced from 6.4 percent to 6.3 percent, one-tenth of 1 percent. Not a cut, a reduction in the growth.

We have an obligation to perform oversight, Mr. Chairman. I commend the gentleman from Iowa and the Committee on the Budget as I strongly support this budget. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process of the Committee on Rules, along with our full committee chairman the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the rest of the House leadership and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), we will be doing our part to carry forth what we consider our legal obligation, oversight. We will be studying the budget process and seeing how it can better be enforced.

This is a responsible budget, it is a reasonable budget, it is one meant to contribute to the continued economic health of the United States. I strongly support it and urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), I yield myself such time as I may consume because he is going to address education. I would like to make it clear that education is one of those areas in our budget where we have made a decided improvement and have a notable advantage over the Republican resolution.

Our budget resolution rejects their education cuts. Our budget resolution provides $4.5 billion more for next year, 2006, and over the next 5 years $41 billion more than their budget resolution. This kind of funding, this level of funding, cannot only preserve current education programs such as vocational education, funded at $1.3 billion which the President and their resolution would simply exterminate, wipe out, it can also support increases in priority programs like special education. The additional funding we are providing can also help close the gap in funding for No Child Left Behind, $12 billion below this year and next year below where it was authorized to be when the act was passed.

Our budget rejects the reconciliation instructions to the Education Committee calling for $21 billion in savings over 5 years. We do not know where that is coming from. We do not include the President's student loan proposals that would raise loan fees. We do not end the students' ability to consolidate their student loans at fixed interest rates. We do not eliminate Perkins loans, for goodness sake, and we do not force colleges to repay prior Perkins contributions. We do provide the funding to raise the Pell grant, not just $100 every year for 5 years but $100 every year for 10 years. The Bush administration and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the Republicans claim that is provided for, but that can only be funded in their budget through reconciliation; that is, through taking it out of other student loan programs.

We have a decidedly different approach to education, a much greater emphasis on education. It is one of those things in our budget which we have singled out as deserving of additional funding. Even though we keep everything at the level of current services, a few things we plus-up to the detriment of other things, but education is one of those things we emphasize and plus-up.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I believe very strongly in balancing our budget and reducing the deficit, but I think we need to set certain priorities that are important to our families. My hope is that we do this in a bipartisan approach, that we develop a consensus, and I do want to thank the gentleman from Iowa and the committee for allowing us to put some committee report language dealing with education in the budget and with results-oriented budgeting which I believe we need here at this House.

We need to balance the budget, but I think we need to protect our families and we need to make sure that we ensure that we are not trying to fix the

deficit on the backs of the country's working class.

The budget includes the termination of 150 programs. Nearly one in three of them are in education. It eliminates programs essential to our children's futures, such as Even Start, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Gear Up, Perkins loans, Pell grants and LEAP programs. It also does not allow us to give the full funding for special education. It also eliminates certain programs, such as the vocational education, nearly $1.3 billion in cuts. The safe and drug-free schools State programs which are so vital to our communities is eliminated.

Again, I believe in education. In my life, education has been one of the most invaluable tools that has made it possible for me to open up doors, move forward to attain higher goals and make my dreams a possibility. I feel very strongly about financial aid. In fact, I think we need to restore the funding to these vital education programs, especially increasing the $100 maximum Pell grant award. This fulfills the President's request of increasing the maximum Pell grant by $100 without paying for it by taking from other parts of the education budget.

As a member of the Committee on the Budget, I think we should ensure that the Federal Government investment is available to fulfill our commitment to helping low income students get into and graduate from college. College enrollment is slated to grow by almost 19 percent between now and 2015. This group increasingly will be comprised of full-time, nontraditional students, college age, first generation, low income and minority students. Most of these will likely need and will qualify for student financial aid.

My test for considering any budget proposal is whether it will make our families stronger. This budget proposal in my opinion does not make our families stronger. I urge our colleagues to vote in favor of strengthening and protecting our young children by protecting education.

Mr. Chairman, again, I hope we do this in a bipartisan approach and find a consensus.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

First let me compliment my friend from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), a new member of the committee. I appreciate his service. We have worked together on a number of issues. But let me give a slightly different tack from what he was suggesting with regard to our record on education because I think it is important for us to see what has come before.

First, with regard to education totals, as you can see, we have grown on an average of 9 percent a year for the last 5 years. There are not many programs around Washington that have grown that fast. Homeland security is the only other department that has grown at that rate. Nine percent. This is the total we have spent for education.

Again, is it enough? You might say no. Could we always spend more? Of course. But I want to put it in perspective. Nine percent annual growth over the last 5 years.

Title I, the main program that affects No Child Left Behind, has grown 10 percent per year since 2000 and was funded at $12 billion for fiscal year 2005. That annual growth, again, every year has gone up. Pell grants has grown 10 percent per year since 2000 and $12.4 billion in this fiscal year. No Child Left Behind has grown at 40 percent under President Bush. I understand there will always be this debate that programs are authorized at one level and then they are appropriated at yet another level. Everyone around here knows this, but it is a game that we play with our constituents. There is almost no program that is funded at its authorized level. That is not a floor. It is a ceiling. That is always the way it has been approached in Congress.

Special education, a program that I feel a personal affinity toward and it was a personal goal and leadership that I took with regard to special education to our States and to our schools and to our classrooms and for our kids with special needs, I am proud of what we have done. These green charts do not mean anything compared to what it has meant in the lives of the kids that are receiving a quality education and it has unlocked opportunity for them that is boundless. That is because we have invested some resources there.

I just want to end with this. It is not only about the money. We come down here with these green bar charts as if to say, if I spend this much it means that I don't care and if I spend this much it means that I care a little more, or here I am caring a little bit more now. Watch out, here I am caring some more. It is getting higher. I am caring even more.

□ 1830

And the more we spend, the more we care. And the more we invest, the more we care. And we measure by green charts the compassion, the caring, the value, as if money alone is the only measure.

I have got to tell my colleagues something. Take special education. Go talk to any one of their teachers back home in the special education classroom and ask them whether they have seen these increases in their classrooms. Do the Members know what is going on, Mr. Chairman? The States are taking that money, and it is not getting through their bureaucracy. We are getting this money out of Washington, but it is not getting to the classroom teacher teaching our child.

So their chart may look a little bit bigger; our chart may look a little bit bigger, and our charts look great, and if I care at $5 and they care at $6, maybe they care $1 more, and we get into all of this. And we are not looking at the results. We need to look at the results of these programs and find out whether they are getting to the kids in the classrooms. And I have got to tell my colleagues right now it is not. So we have got to provide the oversight. It cannot just be about the money.

And that is the last chart I want to show. For all of the chest beating about education and the priority, see that little red line of the total amount spent on education in our country? That is what the Federal Government kicks in. We are talking, on any given day, like about 6 percent. The people who are really doing the work here are our local school boards, our local State legislators, our local parents and community leaders. They are kicking in all this amount right here. That is what is being kicked in. It is this little red part that we all of a sudden think is so important and that we beat our chests about.

The Federal Government is not going to solve education, Mr. Chairman. Not with a big red line or a little red line or with this money or that amount of money. It is not about the money. It is about results. We have got to focus on results in education, and this budget accomplishes that.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I have a great deal of respect for the chairman of the Committee on the Budget. He is a friend of mine. He has got a tough job, trying to bring forth a budget priority that reflects his caucus's wishes in that.

But let us set the facts straight here. The Democratic alternative does a lot better when it comes to support of the education programs than our Republican counterpart. We also in our budget proposal reinstitute the pay-as-you-go rules so that if we are proposing a spending increase or a tax cut in one area, we are going to find an offset in the budget to pay for it. Their budget does not do it.

Our budget is also out for 10 years that shows that we come to balance by 2012. Their budget is a 5-year proposal. And the reason they do not do it at 10 years is because their deficits explode in the second 5 years. But their budget has also hidden the true and real cuts that are occurring in their education programs, ones that affect real people, real students in real-life conditions and will not help improve the condition of education or access to higher education, which we desperately need in this country.

Their budget proposal actually calls for eliminating $4.3 billion worth of education programs in the next fiscal year alone. They completely wipe out vocational education, the Federal commitment to that. They completely wipe out all the Federal education technology programs that exist. They wipe out the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Grant program. They also get rid of TRIO and GEAR UP, targeting low-income students who want to go on to

post-secondary education opportunities. They wipe out Even Start Family Literacy programs. And their proposals also hurt students by raising fees for student loans for higher education, ending students' ability to consolidate those loans at a lower fixed rate interest, and not only eliminating the Perkins loan program, as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) indicated, but also forcing colleges to repay prior Federal Perkins contributions.

The Democratic alternative is better than that. We restore these funding cuts as well as $4.5 billion in the next fiscal year alone. Talk to any administrator, any teacher throughout the country wrestling with implementing the unfunded Federal mandate called No Child Left Behind, and they will say what these requirements are doing to their school districts with the lack of funding to back up those requirements. Talk to special education teachers, and they will say how the lack of education commitment at the Federal level, only 18.6 percent of the 40 percent cost share that we promised for special education funding is pitting student against student in our public classrooms throughout the country.

We can do a better job. The Democratic alternative does do a better job, while staying true to fiscal discipline and fiscal responsibility by reinstituting the pay-as-you-go rules that worked very well in the 1990s and led us to 4 years of budget surpluses, while also maintaining a crucial investment in education programs.

As a Member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I am heading to China in a couple of days in order to visit their colleges and universities. Guess what? China and India are making a major education investment in the future of their countries. They are graduating more engineering students than we are today. They are emphasizing the math and science and engineering programs while we are starting to cut back in these crucial education areas. Do people want a recipe for economic disaster? The Republican budget and their lack of commitment for education is a sure way of getting us there.

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

For the purposes of entering into a colloquy, I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS).

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Over the past decade, funding for NASA's Aeronautics Research has declined by more than half, to about $900 million. The President's budget proposes to cut aeronautics research by 20 percent over the next 5 years.

I am concerned that the United States is losing critical expertise in aeronautics research and development. This degradation will have a tragic impact on military and civilian aviation, which contributes significantly to our national defense and our economy. I believe that the President's funding levels for aeronautics programs should be reassessed and that the House should give priority to restoring these vital programs.

Will the gentleman commit to bring to the conference report language that will clarify that the resolution makes no assumption regarding the President's proposed funding level for NASA's Aeronautics Research programs?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the answer is yes to start with. First and foremost, I appreciate her leadership and concern about the research programs that we have for NASA. She does an excellent job there, and we really appreciate the leadership she takes in that.

The gentlewoman knows that the resolution, while it tracks the President's overall number, it does not make any specific decisions about the different funding levels that we have in some of these major categories. It goes actually back to what the gentleman was saying on education. We cannot find in the budget any of what the gentleman from Wisconsin just talked about in education. It is a great speech, but we cannot find it in the budget. And the same is true with so much of this.

So the Committee on Appropriations is the one that is going to make these determinations. The same is true for NASA. And we appreciate that her advocacy and mine is going to have to be brought to bear as we work on that.

So that being the case, I do commit to the gentlewoman to bring back from the conference language clarifying that the budget does not make these specific assumptions regarding the President's proposed level for these programs and urging that the levels for NASA should be reassessed. There is no question that R&D is important, and I know the appropriators agree with that. I know the gentlewoman from Virginia agrees with that. I agree with that, and I have no doubt that they will bring back a bill with that in mind.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for his answer.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a former mayor, to talk about community development programs in our budget resolution versus theirs.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Members on the Republican side of the aisle this evening to find one Republican mayor in America, one, who favors what they are about to do to the Community Development Block Grant program.

The Community Development Block Grant program has been extraordinarily successful. It has had broad bipartisan support for as long as I can remember. And we ask, how did that come about? It came about because there was a Republican President named Richard Nixon who created what he believed to be the new federalism, and there were overwhelming majorities of Democrats in the Congress who accepted that leadership with this simple idea, that, yes, Washington, because from time to time they exacerbate problems at the local level, and if that was to be the case, how would we funnel some resources to the local government but allow, and listen to this because it is a critical aspect of the Community Development Block Grant program, local decision-making, meaning that the problems that confront Seattle, Washington might be different from those that confront Birmingham, Alabama, that might be different from those that confront Portland, Maine, from those that might confront Dallas, Texas. An extraordinary principle, the national principle.

So what does this Congress decide to do with this extraordinarily popular and successful initiative? They are going to cut it. They are going to cut it back. I do not think we can find a Republican Governor in America who supports what they are about to do with the Community Development Block Grant program.

And what is it used for? Overwhelmingly, it is used for housing. The number of substandard units of housing in America that have been brought back to life because of CDBG allocations is most impressive. And then let us throw in the next part of what CDBG does. It provides ample opportunity for economic development. They might expedite the paving of a roadway to an industrial park so that there can be new business growth and new job opportunities in cities and towns across America.

And what else might they do with it? There are all kinds of public parks across this country that have succeeded because of Community Development Block Grant programs. Some of them in the lowest income neighborhoods of America. And do my colleagues know what else? Some of them in great middle-income neighborhoods across this Nation as well.

As a member of the alumni association that is exceedingly small in this Congress, called Former Mayors, I might point out that if we assembled mayors across America, the United States Conference of Mayors, we would be hard pressed to go into that room and find one mayor who supports what they are about to do to the most popular domestic urban program called Community Development Block Grant money.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

In response to my friend from Massachusetts, he is right and I agree with

him. Let us get that in the RECORD right now. There are those moments in time. In fact, he was not here for our colloquy earlier; so let me just report to him. I am sure I am not going to get his vote, but I will report to him anyway. We agree with the local control aspects of CDBG. There are so many on our side, including myself and so many others, who agree that this is local control, local decision-making, getting this back to communities.

In the budget that we have, we did not take the President's assumption with regard to CDBG. We do not necessarily foreclose the ability to look at the program and make improvements. But we plussed-up the function for CDBG by $1.1 billion, and we increased it for that purpose; and we also did not make any assumption with regard to the President's new proposal of the Strengthening America's Communities Block Grant or transferring the program from HUD, Housing and Urban Development, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The bottom line is there are many things that we will disagree with on budgets, and like I said, I doubt I am going to get the gentleman's vote, but I do think we have a bipartisan commitment to this. It is one area that I know we will continue to work on. And there may be other disagreements, but this is an area that we have worked on together.

I commend the gentleman for his leadership, and we are providing that leadership as well. And we hope the President can come forward with a little better rationale as to why this program, in particular, needed the changes that he proposed in his budget. If there are reforms that are needed, then let us reform the program. We will work together. If there are bad apples spoiling it for the rest of the bunch, then let us get rid of those bad apples. Let us figure that out. But let us not throw the baby out with the bath water. I agree with the gentleman.

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

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

I take the chairman of the committee, my good friend, at his word; but I have to point out the language of the resolution does increase the allocation for Community Development and Regional Development programs by $1.1 billion more than the President requests. But it is still $1.5 billion below this year's level adjusted for inflation.

What we have done in our resolution is to make amply clear that the CDBG will survive intact and will be fully funded, not suffer some crippling cut, as we have provided $9 billion more than their resolution for Community Development programs over 5 years. That will guarantee, virtually, if the committees are willing, that the CDBG and other important Regional Development and Community Development programs will not have to be cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

□ 1845

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution and in support of the Democratic substitute. In the last 3 years, the Republican Congress has enacted three tax cuts, resulting in the three largest deficits in history, all the while on top of the record $400-plus billion deficits and $2.4 trillion of additional debt. This budget does not account for the $300 billion of the Iraqi-Afghanistan war, the $800 billion for the prescription drug benefit they passed, and the $1.9 trillion needed to privatize Social Security.

If this is an example of what a conservative philosophy is, we cannot afford this fiscal mess any more, and the one thing we can always say about the Republican budget is we will be forever in your debt.

The CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, has attested to all of these figures, but none of them are honestly reflected in this resolution.

But while leaving a sea of red ink for future generations, what does this budget do to the middle class, who are facing rises costs in health care and college tuition? This budget makes it all the more difficult for the middle class to afford their health care and college education. This budget cuts the health care professional training by $300 million, it cuts community health by $289 million, it cuts extended health care facilities for veterans by $105 million, and it eliminates the Preventive Health Care Block Grants. It also underfunds the National Institutes of Health and Maternal and Child Health Care Block Grants.

It is a fascinating approach to investing in America's future. Who knew when George Bush declared he was against nation building, it was America he was talking about?

We need a new direction and a new set of economic policies to put the middle class families and their economic interests at the heart of our economic policies. To think that the policies or the stewardship of the Republican Congress over the last 4 years has led to $2.4 trillion in additional debt, three consecutive years of the largest deficits in the history of the country, and all under the rubric of being a conservative, it is a fascinating approach, and all the while we are cutting health care, investments in America, cutting college tuition assistance to middle class families, opening doors to their future, it is a fascinating approach nobody has ever really thought of as a way to build America's future as one that is brighter.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just respond and say it is fascinating. It is fascinating how we got into this situation. And if you heard the gentleman who just spoke, if you wondered whether or not he maybe had been reading the newspaper and may be forgetting all of the things that have been happening to our country over the last going on 4 years, you might wonder if anyone has been paying attention, because he is correct.

On September 10, 2001, we were running a surplus. There is no question that that was a good thing, something was very positive about that. But, unfortunately, we learned the very next morning that we had a homeland security deficit, that we had a national defense deficit. Our economy was already in a recession, and we found out we had an economic growth deficit. So even though there was more cash in the Federal Treasury than we were using, and you can call that a surplus, that did not mean we were meeting the needs of our country. There were many other challenges that we had to meet, and that next morning we found out.

And all of the votes, all of the spending votes, I will go back to the record, all of the spending votes that the gentleman was just talking about under our management, the gentleman from Illinois voted for; voting for our troops, voting for homeland security, voting for education. I will go back to each one of those appropriations bills and the gentleman from Illinois voted for each one of those. The only one he does not like, if you take away all of the clutter, is he wants to increase taxes. He did not like that part. But all of the spending he voted for.

So, let us just boil it down: There are people who want to increase taxes, and that is fine, and there are people who want to control spending, and that is also fine. But it is not all of this mismanagement.

People say Republicans did all of this mismanagement. I think Osama bin Laden had a lot more to do with where we are today with the deficit than anybody else, than anybody else.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of me taking this time was just to remind everybody that it was not just Republicans that were here voting for those things, and there were probably a lot of reasons why we got into this situation that had nothing to do with JIM NUSSLE or the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL). It probably had more to do with Osama bin Laden than just about anybody else.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, democracy is sweeping the world and we should be proud that our country has become the greatest force for dignity of men and women in history. But if you look back at history, at past democracies, you will see that many collapsed because they voted by majority to go into debt. Athenians and the French republics, the budding democracies in Latin America, all collapsed in debt, which led to dictatorship. But that should

never happen here. This is a hard line budget, because the threat to freedom is also overspending, debt and instability.

In America, the Federal Government made a basic promise in the 19th century to provide for the common defense. In an age including the War on Terror, this promise to defend America is very expensive. It is expensive to send armies to Afghanistan or to stand watch across the demilitarized zone in Korea. But we must do this, and we must fully support Americans in uniform.

In the 20th century, the Federal Government made a second promise, to ensure retirement security for Americans who worked hard and played by the rules. The Social Security and Medicare programs face real challenges as the baby-boom generation retires. We are now expecting the number of people under Social Security and Medicare to rise from 40 million to 90 million.

Social Security recipients used to live, when Roosevelt created the program, an average of only 11 months, but now people are on Social Security on average 22 years. So the size of meeting the retirement security promise is extremely large, in fact beyond the current means of this government.

We are commanded to be fiscal conservatives to meet the needs of our common defense and the 20th century's promise of retirement security. We cannot start new programs, because we should honor these promises first.

Some say we should borrow more, but we already borrow too much and we have seen past democracies drown in debt. Some would like us to raise taxes, killing economic growth, but we cannot kill economic growth. Our growing economy right now is already yielding more tax revenue to meet the Nation's needs, but for the foreseeable future those new dollars should be used to support Americans in uniform and to already honor the retirement security promises that the Federal Government has made.

Our chairman has done a good job, a budget that stands for restraint, that continues the course of a free people being free, that grows our economy. We could say yes to everyone. We could say yes, and then we would be much more popular in the short run. But in the long run there would be more debt, a smaller economy, a smaller future for our children.

I am for less debt, rather than more. I am for more economic growth, rather than less. I am for honoring the basic promises the Federal Government has made to provide for the common defense and the retirement security of older Americans.

That should not be done on borrowed money, on borrowed time. It should be done with a growing economy. It is under this restraint, with this discipline, that this budget comes before the House, and we should honor that work.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget that we are considering assumes funding for the Community Development Block Grant Programs that for this coming year is $1.5 billion below last year's level adjusted for inflation. And while it may be reassuring to some to hear the words of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget tell us that they like local control of Community Development Block Grants, they seem to like it $1.5 billion less than they did last year. And when they tell us that they like Community Development Block Grants so much that they are funding it more than President Bush proposes, that just means they are poking it with one fist instead of with two, because his is a really draconian cut, and they have made it just a little less painful than what he proposes to do.

Community Development Block Grant is a mouthful, but in a little town like Freer, Texas, it is concerned with holes, the holes of abandoned septic systems where several children have drowned, and they do not have a reliable sewer system there, so they have used the Community Development Block Grant Program for the health and safety of that community.

In McAllen, Texas, in Austin, Texas, it is the principal source of funding to help with affordable housing for seniors, for those with disabilities, for poor people, to have a chance to share in rehabilitated housing, some new housing.

In many of these communities, the dollars are going to food banks, they are going to assist in a variety of social programs that are stretched and strained that municipalities could not do without Community Development Block Grant projects.

The reason we are faced with this kind of challenge, as with the other challenges in this budget, it does not have anything to do with Osama bin Laden; it has to do with the decisions that were made down the street on Pennsylvania Avenue and that were implemented by this Republican Congress.

Indeed, with the budget that we are considering tonight, this administration says to those who are poor, who are uninsured, essentially what Leona Helmsley said, that only the little people pay taxes. Well, this administration thinks that only the little people, like the folks in Freer, Texas, only the little people ought to bear the burden of its fiscal irresponsibility.

We have never had a more fiscally irresponsible administration than the one we have in office today, that has driven the deficit to the highest level in American history and then turns to poor people in Freer, Texas, to kids that are trying to get a decent education, to our veterans, and says you bear the burden. You dig us out of this hole we dug into with your little shovels to make up for the big shovels where we shoveled out all the revenue to those at the top of the economic ladder.

It is unfair, and that is why this budget ought to be rejected.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I found the rhetoric on the budget particularly interesting over the course of a wide variety of issues. One near and dear to my heart is the issue of veterans care. I can speak to this issue with a great deal of authority that very few of my colleagues in this body can as a member of the American Legion, a member of the 82nd Airborne Division Association, a member of the Army Ranger Association and a member of the Association of Graduates of the United States Military Academy.

Being both a former enlisted solider and an officer who served here and abroad, I am concerned that we keep our commitment to our veterans, those who have laid their lives on the line and in many cases borne a great price to pay for the freedoms that we have here to have this dialogue.

Unfortunately, there is a tremendous amount of misinformation that is going around the public right now, I found this unfortunately being passed out to veterans in my own district, that completely disregards the facts in favor of what I would consider a shameless play at political power.

The facts speak to themselves. As a former numbers person, I would like to point out that in the chart that we referenced, that spending per veteran has increased dramatically. Indeed, total veterans spending in the 2006 budget is $68.9 billion. There are considerable monthly payments for veterans, and the budget provides $31.7 billion, an increase of $877 million, for veterans' medical care and other discretionary spending.

These increases in this budget carry on a commitment to our Nation's veterans that, over the past 11 years, has been reflected in veterans spending since 1995 when Republicans took control of Congress.

We can see that the rhetoric from the past is hollow from when there was a Democratic majority in this body and also a Democratic administration.

What we have seen since Republicans took control of the House is a steady increase, particularly after President Bush was elected, in making sure that our veterans' needs were cared for. Spending for veterans' medical care has increased 85 percent, from $16.2 billion to $29.9 billion. Indeed, the number of veterans receiving care has increased from 2.5 million veterans to 4.8 million, a 92 percent increase.

□ 1900

The facts speak for themselves. And, again, the shameless rhetoric is hollow.

Education benefits, under the Montgomery GI bill, have more than doubled during this same period and total per veteran spending has increased by nearly 103 percent.

I respect our national leadership. I respect the leadership of our party, the leadership in this Congress who has led the way, not with hollow words, but with straightforward actions to take care of the veterans in this United States who I am proud to represent.

Since we took control of Congress in 1995, we have made tremendous strides in improving benefits for our Nation's 25 million veterans, and we will continue to do that into the future with new strides in technology, reaching out to cover those who have legitimate needs who have served our country and served in harm's way.

Moreover, the Republican Congress has expanded eligibility for medical care in 1996 and 1999. That has increased the number significantly. In the end, this budget provides significant relief for veterans who have served. I am proud to support it. I stand with our leadership; I stand with the veterans in this Congress who are rightfully supporting this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, do I have 18½ minutes remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. COLE of Oklahoma). The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, for purposes of control.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair may not entertain that request in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman yields time, if I might yield 5 minutes to a Member, and then I would also be willing to contribute a little bit of time to the debate here.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN), a member of the committee.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to be here on the floor speaking on this subject since some may know I left this place for 16 years, and coming back to the floor of the House and having an opportunity to serve on the Budget Committee has given me a perspective that I did not have before. Being away from this place for 16 years gave me a little bit of a bird's eye view of how the rest of the public views what we do here. And I just must say that during the several years that I was embarking on my endeavor to return to this House, I was constantly reminded by the people that I came into contact with in my district as to the spending spree they believe the Congress has gone on and been involved in over the last number of years. The amount of discretionary spending that we have had in terms of its increase is remarkable.

I wish they could go back 16 years from when I left this wonderful institution back in 1989 to show what we are talking about. This chart merely goes back to 1994, but it shows us spending $513 billion in 1994, and we are talking about now stretching our way to $900 billion.

I was in my office watching some of this debate, and I heard what appeared to me to be crocodile tears expressed by some on the other side about how much we are cutting. And I guess only in this institution is a little restraint in the amount that we are spending in addition to what we have spent in the past considered a cut. Where I come from, cut is not a four letter word. Most American citizens, most of the people in my district believe that if you spent too much, maybe you ought to look on the side of spending restraint.

The response we got in committee time and time again from the other side was, why do we not just raise taxes? And I cannot even calculate the increase in taxes they suggested to cover all the programs they want.

As part of the requirements under the budget act, the Budget Committee gives an opportunity for any Member in the House to appear for 10 minutes to talk about any particular matter within the province of the Budget Committee. And I was privileged to accept that duty for perhaps the last hour. And I remember those coming up to talk about the Community Development Block Grant program. They even were effective in citing a quotation from the mayor of the town in which I was born, someone whom I know.

And in response to that, I said, I think it is a worthy program, but could you please tell me, if we do not cut this, where we should find the money to fund it? And the response I received was, that is not our job; that is somebody else's job. And that is the problem with the Congress, at least as I see it. It is always somebody else's job.

But the job of the Budget Committee is to bring us, I think, some fiscal sanity by suggesting with some enforcement mechanisms, numbers within which we will live, which is no different than what we do in our daily lives and our family lives.

And all I can say is, having been gone from this place for 16 years, the image that I obtained from people on the outside looking in is, frankly, not that we have been very restraining in terms of our spending. The average person would, I think, stand with their mouth agape at some of the conversation that has been on this floor. We are not really restraining ourselves very badly when you look at the numbers that we have seen here. Only in Washington, D.C. could a restraint on increased spending be considered a cut.

That may be very simplistic, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry for being simplistic; but I have been away from this place for a long time, and where I come from, again, cut is not a four letter word. And I would just ask, if people could understand, if other Members could have the chance I had to leave this place for 16 years and come back and see the change, people coming to us asking for spending, no longer requesting it, but coming with the expectation that it is an entitlement in the area of discretionary spending. It is so different than what it was 16 years ago. It is, as we used to say, the difference between night and day.

I want to thank the gentleman, the chairman of this committee, for leading our committee and bringing forward a product which will put us on the path towards restraint, the type of restraint that not only is necessary but is expected by the folks back home.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, so he can discuss the alternative that the CBC is offering.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me time.

At some point tomorrow, the Congressional Black Caucus will be introducing an alternative budget which we will discuss in detail. Unfortunately, we have been allotted only 20 minutes on our side to discuss the details of that proposed, budget and I am delighted that the Committee on the Budget has seen fit to provide us a little bit more time this evening to discuss some of the benefits we believe will enure if the Congressional Black Caucus Budget is adopted.

We will be asking the Members of our House of Representatives to make some basic choices because we believe that a budget is about making choices. There are two choices in particular we will be asking them to consider: Would you rather provide a tax cut to people who make more than $200,000 per year, or would you rather spend approximately $30 billion dollars that you would save if you did not provide that tax cut on a series of things that would benefit our community and have a substantial potential of closing some of the disparities and gaps that have existed for years and years between African American citizens and white citizens in this country?

The second question we will be asking will be: Would you rather spend $7.9 billion on a ballistic missile defense program which has been tested time after time after time and has failed all of those tests, or would you rather spend that $7.8 billion on providing more security to our troops, body armor, personnel support equipment, and other protective gear for our troops, and providing more benefits to our veterans in this country?

This is a basic choice that we at this point need to debate. Our budget that we will be submitting and detailing tomorrow morning when we offer the Congressional Black Caucus substitute budget will ask Congress, What are your priorities?

That is what budget-making is about. And there is no trickery here. It is

straightforward, and we will be asking our Members to make those choices.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague and good friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to support the Congressional Black Caucus fiscal year 2006 budget substitute which has three main focuses.

First and foremost, it restores fiscal responsibility to the Federal budget process. Secondly, it keeps our Nation's promises to our veterans and provides the equipment and materials needed to support our men and women on active duty. Thirdly, this budget funds efforts to close gaps and eliminate disparities in America's communities and among its citizens.

We restore fiscal responsibility by closing tax loopholes and eliminating the repeal of the limitation on itemized deductions, the phase-out of personal exemptions scheduled to take place between 2006 and 2010. We get rid of abusive shelters and tax incentives for offshoring jobs. This budget reduces the deficit by $167 billion over the House majority's budget over the next 5 years which reduces our interest payments by $27 billion.

Mr. Chairman, our colleagues on the other side are fond of talking about supporting and respecting our troops, but they do not put their money where their mouths are. The Republican budget resolution mandates almost $800 million in cuts to veterans mandatory programs. These are reductions in disability compensation, pension benefits, education benefits, and death benefits.

The President also proposes to increase fees and drug payments on veterans. The CBC budget increases funding for veterans by $4.65 billion. We restore veterans health care, enhance survivor benefits, medical and prosthetic research, long term care, and mental health care.

Mr. Chairman, under the issue of education, the President's budget eliminates 48 education programs that receive $4.3 billion this year. The CBC budget increases funding for education by $23.9 billion. It fully funds No Child Left Behind. It provides $2.5 billion for school construction, increases vocational educational job training, increases Pell grants by $450 million, increases Head Start by funding by $2 billion.

Mr. Chairman, unlike the President, we are not playing budgetary games. We increase funding for Pell grants by tapping into new revenue.

□ 1915

The President, on the other hand, has increased funding for Pell grants by taking needed funds from programs such as the school lunch program for low-income children.

Mr. Chairman, there is no greater betrayal or broken promise to the American people than that which can be found in the President's budget for rural America.

The President recommends cutting agricultural programs by $9 billion over 5 years, and the Republican budget has suggested cutting the program by only $5 billion.

On the other hand, the CBC budget increases funding for programs that benefit rural communities by more than $3 billion. We increase funding for agricultural issues by more than $300 million; increase funding for community and resource development by more than $1.5 billion, Community Development Block Grants by $1.1 billion.

In addition, the Republican budget cuts funding for 17 different community and economic development programs that provide housing, water and sewer improvements and small business loans.

Mr. Chairman, in this budget we maintain tax cuts for wage earners making less than $200,000 a year, and we roll back cuts on the top 2 percent of Americans, and by doing so, we have saved almost $47 billion that we have used to invest in the human assets of this country, the American people.

I thank my colleague so much for yielding me the time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, first, let me just thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and for his leadership; also to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), the Chairman of our Congressional Black Caucus, and to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for their leadership in spearheading this very responsible alternative budget.

The CBC budget is not only fiscally responsible but it also reduces our Federal deficit by $167 billion. It rescinds the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts for individuals making more than $200,000. It closes tax loopholes and it drastically reduces funding for the Ballistic Missile Defense Program by about $7.8 billion.

The Republican budget, quite frankly, fails to live up to any standard of morality that requires us to care for the least of these. From port security to health care, the Republican budget falls short on every count. On the other hand, the Congressional Black Caucus budget shows how national security priorities must include the economic security of all Americans. A strong America cannot have desperate, vulnerable people.

As a Member representing one of the largest ports in the country, it is clear to me that there needs to be significant increases in port security funding. The CBC budget provides $500 million more for port and container security. At a time when our ports remain one of our most vulnerable targets, allocating funds for container security is essential. Unfortunately, the Republican budget fails to adequately support homeland security priorities.

Our budget strengthens economic security priorities by easing disparities in housing and health care for example.

The President's budget eliminated the Community Development Block Grant program which provides financial assistance towards improving housing and economic conditions in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods. That is why I am very proud to support the CBC budget that provides $1.12 billion more than the Republican budget to the CDBG initiative. The President's budget also eliminated the Brownfields Redevelopment Program, but our budget adds $24 billion. The Brownfields Redevelopment Initiative provides important incentives for hazardous site cleanup and redevelopment. It is crucial to the health and safety of our communities, especially our children.

The CBC budget also provides an additional $880 million for Section 8 housing and $500 million more for HOPE VI. All of these programs are crucial to ensuring the economic security of the most vulnerable Americans. The CBC budget also restores approximately $50 million in funding to the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program. It allocates $490 million to the Minority Health Initiative and $500 million for Community Health Centers. These programs are vital to providing primary health care for our minority communities.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget punishes people. It punishes them by making them choose between their health or their housing. The CBC budget allows people to have access to both.

The Republican budget erodes our economic security. It weakens our community. It leaves our infrastructure crumbling. The Republican support of outdated weapons systems, wasteful defense programs, reckless tax cuts, and irresponsible deficit spending relegates economic security priorities to the back burner.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, 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.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for the time. I thank the chairman for yielding the additional time, and I do rise as well to thank the ranking member for a very creative, a very important statement on the alternative budget offered by the Democrats, and I look forward to supporting that vision that really helps to balance the budget and bring us back on line and also keep us in line with Social Security, which I will discuss, does more for education, and of course we do not forget the veterans.

Just as an anecdotal story, we were in the Committee on the Judiciary earlier today looking at the bankruptcy

bill, and there were several amendments that had to do with veterans' catastrophic health conditions, and unfortunately, in the bankruptcy bill markup we did not succeed in supporting veterans, those of us who supported that, particularly Democrats. So I rise to as well support the Democratic alternative over the Republican budget—because both the CBC Budget and the Democratic Budget supports people.

I want to spend some time on the Congressional Black Caucus budget and really focus on why this is so very important, what it means for us to rise on the floor of the House and to argue a certain focus, and I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for leading us in this direction and, of course, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who will offer this amendment tomorrow.

Let me start out by saying something that I am not making up, but let me just hold up a sheet of paper that shows that the President's mark, the administration's mark, his first thought was to cut $60 billion out of Medicaid. There is some plussing up, $15 billion, and so someone said there is a net of $44 billion in cuts because we have got a little increase, but let me just say the intent of the administration was to cut $60 billion out of Medicaid. That goes to the very heart of health care for the uninsured, the disabled, those in nursing homes, and we are to pass a budget with that kind of insult, if you will, to the needs of Americans around this Nation?

In addition, the budget that was offered cut the community block grants $1.5 billion, and here is where the Congressional Black Caucus budget comes into play.

We understand the need to protect the troops. We have provided dollars for armor. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we have provided some $6.7 billion, or $75 million for body armor, $10 million for ammunition for the Marine Corps and small arms for Army, $1 billion for building maintenance and $5 million for studying instances of waste, but at the same time we provide $1.12 billion back into the Community Block Grant Program which helped to reinvest in our local communities and helped to provide for affordable housing. We believe in investing in America. The community is the most important element of this budget process, the rural community, the urban community, and that is what the Congressional Black Caucus does.

So we restore the Medicaid funds. We ensure that in restoring those Community Block Grant funds we answer the question.

In the President's budget, child care funding, losses in purchasing power, billions of constant dollars, we will see in that budget the inability, up to 2010, to be able to provide real child care for those who need it, and if there is anything that I get asked about when I go home, it is the parents, single parents and young parents, with low income who cannot afford to provide child care, and as we can see the purchasing power will go down, down, down up to 2010, and we will not have the ability to purchase child care in America for those who actually need it.

So the Congressional Black Caucus recognizes that and provides that funding. In addition we also, if you will, take care of Social Security.

In the President's mark, there is a mention of a Social Security transition cost, but there is no accounting for it. There is no money for it. So the Congressional Black Caucus budget takes into account affordable housing, Medicaid, the needs of our troops, investment in security and as well a provision for the Border Patrol agents and the Customs agents.

It is a comprehensive budget. It is a budget that should be passed. The Congressional Black Caucus budget is a budget for all of us to support.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today being very disturbed with the direction that the Republican Proposed Budget and this Administration is taking our great nation. The prime reason for my concern is the national budget which stands before this body today. The Nussle budget clearly does not improve upon the severely flawed Bush Administration budget. The needs of average Americans are still ignored. The interests of a wealthy few outweigh the needs of an entire nation in this budget. I say this not out of partisanship, but from a statement of the facts. I want to highlight a few areas in this budget that are particularly egregious.

This President and the majority party in this body have spent so much time talking about their record on education and as hard as I try I can not see what they have to be proud of. It is one thing to address areas of critical need with rhetoric, but to advocate a policy and then not fund it sufficiently is plain irresponsible. This budget eliminates 48 education programs that receive $4.3 billion this year. These eliminations include wiping out $1.3 billion for all vocational education programs, $522 million for all education technology programs, and $29 million for all civic education programs. The budget eliminates other large programs including the Even Start family literacy program ($225 million) and state grants for safe and drug-free schools and communities ($437 million). The President's budget cuts 2006 funding for the Department of Education by $1.3 billion below the amount needed to maintain purchasing power at the current level, and by $530 million below the 2005 enacted level of $56.6 billion. This is the first time since 1989 that an Administration has submitted a budget that cuts the Department's funding. This Administration and the majority in this Congress promised to leave no child behind, but clearly they have reneged on their promise.

Our brave American veterans are another group who were outraged by the President's budget and will unfortunately be disappointed with the Republican House Budget. I hear so much in this body from the majority party about the greatness of our Armed Forces, and their right, but again its just empty rhetoric on their part. Those brave men and women fighting on the front lines in our War Against Terror will come back home and find that the Republican Party looks at them differently once they become veterans. Almost all veterans need some form of health care, some will need drastic care for the rest of their lives because of the sacrifice they made in war, but the Republican Budget continues to turn a blind eye to their needs. The fact is that $3.2 billion more than the current budget proposal is needed just to maintain the current level of health care programs for veterans.

The entire Department of Veterans Affairs is going to suffer because of the Republican agenda. I have heard from veterans groups throughout my district in Houston and I am sure each Member of this body has heard from groups in their own district because veterans are one group that come from all parts of this nation. These brave veterans have told me their stories of how they are suffering now with the current state of Veterans Affairs, I am going to have trouble telling them that not only will things continue to stay bad but if this budget passes this body things will only continue to get worse. That is not what our returning soldiers from Iraq and Afghanistan should have to look forward to, a future where their needs are not only unprovided for, but are in fact ignored.

Education and Veterans Affairs are not the only two areas where Republican budget fails Americans. The truth is there are many other programs and services vital to our nation that are at risk because of the Republican agenda. At this point, an average American may be asking why the Republican leadership finds it necessary to cut so many fundamental programs. The answer is simple, yet disturbing; the majority is cutting important programs in order to finance all their irresponsible tax cuts. They will continue to make the argument that tax cuts provide stimulus for our economy, but millions of unemployed Americans will tell you otherwise. In fact the Congressional Budget Office itself said "tax legislation will probably have a net negative effect on saving, investment, and capital accumulation over the next 10 years."

While the Republican leadership continues its offensive for irresponsible tax policies they allow our national deficit to grow increasingly larger. When President Bush came into office he inherited a budget surplus of $236 billion in 2000. Now, however, this Administration has raided those surpluses and its fiscally irresponsible tax policies have driven the country ever deeper into debt. A $5.6 trillion ten-year projected surplus for the period 2002–2011 has been converted into a projected deficit for the same period of $3.9 trillion—a reversal of $9.5 trillion. Much like the President's budget, the resolution before us omits the longer-term costs of either the war in Iraq or fixing the AMT, yet still tries to make claims of reducing the deficit. It's clear that the Republican Party is hiding from the American people. This President and this majority in Congress have yet to advocate a fiscal policy that helps average Americans. Special interests have become king in this budget at the price of sound fiscal policies.

This body was made to stand for the will of all Americans; if we allow this budget proposal to take effect we will have failed our mandate. I for one will not stand by silently; I have a duty to my constituents and indeed to all Americans to work for their well being and I will continue to honor that duty.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume to just respond gently, firmly in some respects to some of the characterizations I disagree with of the budget that I am presenting and the Republicans are presenting.

I definitely respect the Congressional Black Caucus in their effort to put together a budget. I admire anybody who tries to go through this process and comes out of the other end with an actual work product that they can come to the floor to defend.

So, as a result of that, I am pleased to yield time so that they can present that budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) so that we can continue this discussion.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank the chairman for yielding these 4 minutes to me. One of the hazards of being one of the lowest in seniority on this side of the aisle is that we run out of time so quickly. So I thank the chairman for yielding this time. I want to thank the ranking member for the work he has done in the process.

Mr. Chairman, I represent North Carolina's 1st District. We are the 15th poorest district in America. We are working very hard to lift our communities in meaningful ways and it is difficult.

The one area in which we are succeeding is in the area of making higher educational opportunities more available to minority and low-income students. I am so proud of the fact that we are beginning to eliminate the educational disparity that exists between black, white and brown.

One program, Mr. Chairman, that has significantly contributed to this success is the TRIO program. TRIO programs are working. This program is serving 6,200 young people in my district, a total of 17 projects. Across the country, more than 870,000 low-income Americans are being served.

TRIO has a Talent Search Program which serves young people in grades 6 through 12. In addition to counseling, participants receive information about college admissions requirements, scholarships and various student financial aid programs. This early intervention program helps people from families with incomes under $24,000 to better understand their educational opportunities and options. Over 387,000 Americans are enrolled in 471 Talent Search programs. The President's budget and the Republican budget eliminates these programs entirely.

TRIO has an Upward Bound Program which helps young students to prepare for higher education. Participants receive instruction in literature, composition, mathematics and science on college campuses after school, on Saturdays and during the summer. Currently, 770 programs are in operation throughout the country. This program, Mr. Chairman, is scheduled for extinction.

The alternative Congressional Black Caucus budget is a responsible document, and I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for the work that they have done in developing this great document. This budget restores funding for TRIO. It reduces spending while maintaining strong funding for national defense and homeland security.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican budget and to vote for the Congressional Black Caucus budget as this budget restores funding for the TRIO program which is a very, very deserving program.

□ 1930

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) to close the debate.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) for providing the Congressional Black Caucus a little extra time to talk about the CBC budget, and I want to summarize what our proposed budget which we will be introducing tomorrow will do.

It will roll back the tax cuts on people with adjusted gross incomes that exceed $200,000 per year. Most of the revenue raised in the CBC budget will be used to address disparities in America's communities. A substantial portion is reserved to reduce the deficit.

On the military side, we would roll back $7.8 billion in ballistic missile defense spending leaving using $1 billion for research to continue regarding the ballistic missile defense system. All of these funds are spent on other defense items to support our troops, homeland security needs, and veterans program and benefits. The total for defense, homeland security, and veterans is equal to the Republican budget.

The bottom line is that the CBC budget addresses critical domestic challenges and supports our troops. The CBC budget reduces the deficit by $167 billion compared to the House majority's budget over the next 5 years. This fiscal responsibility is rewarded by a reduction of $27 billion in interest payments, compared to the House majority's budget over that 5-year period. We will have a responsible budget, and I look forward to having the support of our colleagues in this body and look forward to discussing the proposed CBC budget in more detail tomorrow when our substitute is presented to the House.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time for the purpose of closing general debate.

Mr. Chairman, we have put before the House a substitute resolution as an alternative to the resolution supported by the Republicans and reported by the committee.

What does our resolution do? First of all, in the realm of fiscal discipline, we would reimpose a rule found to work and work well during the 1990s, a rule that was first implemented by a bill signed into law by President Bush, the first President Bush, in 1990 as part of the Bush budget summit agreement, which laid the foundation for the phenomenal success in the 1990s when we finally moved the budget out of intractable deficits into a surplus in 1998 and into a monumental surplus of $236 billion in the year 2000.

Part of the budget process changes that helped us achieve those impressive results was a rule called pay-as-you-go, which simply stipulates that before anyone can increase an entitlement or mandatory spending program, add to its benefits, they have to either pay for the benefits by an identified revenue source, or they have to offset the increased expenditure by decreasing expenditures elsewhere.

In addition, it provides when anyone wants to cut taxes, when we have a deficit, must offset the tax cut so it will not contribute to the deficit; it will not further enlarge the problem on the bottom line. So we first of all would reinstate the PAYGO rule. As I said earlier, this is not just some notion we have concocted. Three times Chairman Alan Greenspan of the Federal Reserve has testified before the Committee on the Budget that he would reinstate the PAYGO rule and he would apply it to expiring tax cuts that are renewed.

On the spending side of the ledger, we have brought spending back to current services, in many cases restoring deep cuts made by the Republicans. We have brought it back to current services, but we have held it at that level. Current services is basically today's spending level carried forward with inflation.

What do we do by instituting those two practices? What do we accomplish? Well, our budget moves to balance in the year 2012, which the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) cannot say with respect to his budget resolution.

Secondly, we incur less in deficits each year and over the 10-year period of time that we run out our numbers, even though we provide current services funding.

Thirdly, we protect Medicare and Medicaid. The Republicans would cut Medicaid by $60 billion. I met with Governors, Republicans and Democrats, who have told us a cut of that magnitude would be devastating and we should not cut Medicaid by any significant amount so that when the program is revised, it has to be revised in pursuit of some arbitrary savings number.

Finally, we match funding for defense, function 050, dollar for dollar the same as their resolution. We match funding for international affairs, function 150. There is no difference between us there, but we have made some changes in our budget resolution which recommends that resources within the defense budget be shifted to personnel benefits and in particular to see that the $400,000 life insurance increase just

provided in the supplemental will be carried forward and that the $100,000 increase in death gratuities will also be carried forward and funded in the future.

So we have a budget resolution with many positive features to it, but also with fiscal discipline. A signature element is that in the year 2012 it gets to balance, but it gets there with balanced priorities.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, first let me say to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), there is absolutely no one on the Democratic side that I admire more than the gentleman and the partnership we have in working on these budgets. This is the culmination when we come to the floor and have these debates, and I really respect the way he handled the debate. We appreciate that.

We disagree how we are going to accomplish the goals that our Nation needs to set, but we know the goals are pretty important. We have to keep the country strong. There is no question about that. It is really nonnegotiable. There is not a constituent I talk to that would suggest at this point in time in our history we do not want to protect the country. Our borders, everything from terrorism to illegals and drugs and all sorts of things coming into the country, we have to protect the country, number one.

Number two, we have to make sure that the economy keeps growing. That should not be an item up for negotiation. It is so important that families have the resources to deal with the challenges that they face every single day.

We come out here and talk about other people's money very easily on the floor of the House, what the taxpayers send us in order to solve problems; but we really do need to be mindful of the fact that the most important budget that we ought to be focused on is the budget decided and discussed and sweated over and argued about around kitchen tables across the country. That is such an important budget.

We worry about education here, but parents do that every night after their kids go to bed. We worry about health care here, but seniors do that every night when they are laying in a bed in a nursing home. We worry about creating jobs, but small business people do that every night in the quiet of their closed shop. They try and make sure their cash register all added up.

It is funny, I have heard people say we should not worry about the error rate in the food stamp program, which is now 6 percent. Mr. Chairman, 6 cents on every dollar in this country in food stamps is wasted. We say that is an improvement because it is down from 19 percent. The interesting and fascinating thing about that is if a small business person ended the night, closed that shop door and turned the open sign around to closed and rang up the cash register and they were missing six pennies, they would stay all night to find it, all night long to find those six pennies that did not add up in their cash register. But we say, oh, that is an improvement. Amazing. It really is amazing. That is what I turn to first.

This is the record of Federal Government spending over the last 10 years. In these numbers is what I was talking about, the concern of education, the concern of homeland security, the concern of national defense, the concern of job training, the concern of our environment, the concern of transportation, the concern of research and development. All of the concerns that we have talked about are embodied in numbers because in Washington we define compassion from one year to the next, solutions from one year to the next of spending more.

We have all seen that. If I spend just a little bit more from one year to the next year, I must care, I must be solving problems, I must be dealing with real solutions. If I just spend a little bit more money, I will solve all of the problems in the country. Every problem that every family ever addressed around their kitchen table can be solved with just a little bit more Washington spending. That is the fallacy of what we are debating tonight, and that is that if we believe, truly believe that all we have to do is take more money to Washington in the form of taxes and define and design and develop just one or two more programs that hires a number of more bureaucrats, that builds maybe a few more office buildings to be filled with those bureaucrats, and they drive in from Virginia or Maryland or wherever they drive in from, so that they care more about what is going on than the families back home, if we really believe that is solving problems, then Members are going to have a budget to vote for.

It spends more money, it increases taxes, and it purports to solve problems. Unfortunately, we are not solving those problems by doing that. My favorite saying that I heard on the floor, and I do not remember who said it, a long time ago, if you always do what you always did, you will always get what you always got.

If Members think about it, we have been trying to solve problems in Washington with more spending for quite some time now, and those problems do not seem to go away. Last year we decided to put the brakes on spending. We said yes, we have had the excuse of September 11, of the war on terror, of needing to deal with homeland security and needing to deal with our economy; but it is time to be done with all of that. And so what we did was we said let us put the brakes on spending just a little bit.

What happened? When the economy grows and when we control spending, just like the Republican budgets in the late 1990s when we got back to balance, and President Clinton can take credit for anything he wants, that is fine. But everyone who has studied government knows that the buck stops here when it comes to spending. When it comes to fiscal responsibility and article I of the Constitution, we are the ones in charge of the budget. Members know that.

As a result, last year with fiscal discipline and a growing economy, we were able to reduce the deficit 20 percent in 1 year. That is good news, but we need to build on that.

□ 1945

What our budget does is it says, let us continue to build on that success every year with more and more deficit reduction. That is what we accomplish with the spending discipline within this budget. We say not only should we hold the line on discretionary spending, that is the spending we will argue about every day out here during the appropriations process. We want to actually reduce some spending there. We want to have the first reduction in non-security spending since Ronald Reagan was in town back in 1980. That is good news. We also know that we have to start tackling what we call the mandatory spending, or the automatic spending. And so we accomplish that because we know that mandatory spending, that is this yellow part, the part here that back in 1995 was half the budget and now is more than half the budget and is growing to even more than half the budget, almost two-thirds of the budget if we do not start controlling our spending in these accounts.

I want to give you an example of what we would have to do. As much as there will be all sorts of discussion today, and there has been, and tomorrow about Medicaid, you cannot find the word Medicaid in the budget. The reason is because what we do is we say the committees of jurisdiction, in this instance the Committee on Energy and Commerce, should be given responsibility to look through the programs and see if they cannot only find savings but reform the program, to do a better job of delivering the product to the people who need it. If it is true that people sit up at night worrying about how they are going to pay their bills, how they are going to meet their health care needs, then let us help them figure that out. But let us not continue to do a program that every single Governor would admit is unsustainable. We have got quotes from here to the end of the day from Governors who have written us that have said, This program cannot continue. It cannot continue.

All right. So what do we have? We have one budget on the Democratic side. We actually, I think, will have two or three budgets on the Democratic side that do nothing with regard to Medicaid. No reforms. No changes. Let us continue to always do what we have always done, and that is continue what has been what some people say is fraudulent transfers that are going on at the State level, where Governors

and State legislators are put in a position where they actually have to figure out how to game the system, how to manipulate the system so that they can get more money from the Federal Government. I have heard of situations that colleagues of mine have told me from around the country where we actually have a situation where kids, teenagers who are eligible for foster care, good kids, good teenagers, that are difficult to find families for so that they can integrate and become part of a family again, but the State, a couple of States in particular, what they have done is they have devised a way to lock those kids into mental health residential treatment centers. Why? So they can get more money from the Federal Government. If you are a foster parent or you are someone who is thinking about adopting, opening up your heart, your family, your home to a child, to a kid, to a teenager and giving them a life, try doing that with a stigma of having mental health problems, of having challenges in that regard, because of the stigma of being part of that State program, not because they were helping the kid but because they wanted more money. We are hurting people with some of these programs.

I realize if you measure your compassion from one year to the next with spending, I cared at $92 billion this year. Oops, there I went and I cared a little bit more that year. Then I cared at $101 billion. Then I really cared at $108 billion. Boy, my caring and compassion is going up. That is not how we should measure it. We should measure it on results. Are these programs working? Are they helping families? Are they helping kids? Are they helping communities? Are they solving the problem that Medicaid ought to be solving for people with long-term health care concerns, people with disabilities, people who require indigent care? That is what we ought to be asking.

What do we do in this budget? We say, Commerce Committee, go to work. Invite the Governors to come to Washington to give us their proposal. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and I sat in a room with Governors where they said, ''Don't arbitrarily let the number drive the policy.'' That is exactly right. The number should not drive policy. This number should not drive policy any more than it ought to determine compassion. But there is only one way to get the Governors to come back to Washington. They were here the first time. The only way to get them back the second time is to have a process that requires reform and that is exactly what this budget does. It says, by September, we want you to come back with ideas for reform. Just as a result of this, they have committed to come back by June with a reform proposal that the Governors are going to offer that we can work together with the administration to try and come to a solution and try to come to some agreement on. That is a positive step forward. That helps us with a program that most people think is unsustainable and that helps us solve the problem of making sure that this goes to people who cannot help themselves.

What does the so-called reduction in growth look like? We have heard all the complaints on the floor today. One would think we were just eliminating the Medicaid program. I want to show you the chart of what this looks like after we are all done. This is what the Governors would complain about. This is what some of the advocates are complaining about. In other words, we are asking for just a little sliver, just slow down the growth. But it is growing every year. Every year it grows. We are just asking for a little bit of change, just a little bit of reform, make the program work better, less it help seniors, let it help people with disabilities, make sure it is solving the problem for families that do not have the resources to meet their health care needs. Let us also instill some personal responsibility. Do not just hand it out and give people first dollar Cadillac coverage without saying in return, Folks, you have got to be healthier, you have got to practice prevention, you have got to be personally responsible. That is what reform can give you and a budget without that reform will not give you.

I understand that between today and tomorrow we have got a big decision to make. The decision as it boils down to me is very simple. If you believe that taxing a little bit more, taking a little bit more out to Washington from all of these hardworking families across the country and hiring more bureaucrats and inventing more programs and trying to solve more of these problems from Washington, if you believe that is the solution, you need to vote for the Spratt budget. You need to vote for the Democrat alternative budget because that is what it does. It says increase taxes, increase spending and you will begin to solve these problems.

But there is an alternative and it is the majority. What the majority is saying, Stop the madness. It is the spending. We have got to get the spending under control. We know the other body left to their own devices may not do it on their own. We have already seen in a kind of a disappointing way that they have not really stepped up the way the President has and how we believe the way I have.

In closing, let me just say that we will be able to give, I believe, our kids and our grandkids the opportunity of a debt-free world if we begin with a small step again this year. I ask Members to support the majority budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is a real privilege to rise tonight to take on the role of discussing the statutorily required Humphrey-Hawkins side of this debate; that is, to consider how this budget fits into the overall economic policy of the United States.

We have heard so far a very engaging debate, and may I say, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget has done an extraordinary job of defending the details of this budget. He has been powerful and persuasive and intelligent and, I think, has made a compelling case. The argument that we are going to make in the next hour has to do more with how this fits into the overall economic priorities of the United States. This in my view is perhaps one of the most important reasons for passing this budget, because as we look at where America is today, as we look at the economic challenges we are facing, it is clear that we need to have a strong and responsible fiscal policy that encourages economic growth, that controls spending, and by controlling spending brings down our deficit over time, reassures capital markets and sends the message that the American economy continues to be the safest place in the world to invest. If we continue on the path directed by this budget resolution, we have an opportunity, I think, to lay the groundwork for an unprecedented expansion and to create opportunity and economic growth in the American economy that is so badly needed in many of our communities, including many parts of my district.

There is no question, Mr. Chairman, that the challenges we are facing today are substantial, the deficit is a serious problem and the proposed remedy contained in this budget resolution involves some very strong medicine and, for many individual Members of the House, some very, very difficult policy decisions. We need to pass this resolution because the broad parameters of spending that are the real budget resolution, the blueprint that is the substance of this budget resolution is precisely the vehicle we need to move in the right direction to make sure that we control spending and create the opportunity to continue the economic expansion which is only now just beginning.

Over the past few years, America has gone through a challenging time economically. Nowhere is that more evident than in my district, but at the same time there are very encouraging signs. We know that we have been running a deficit. We know we have been running a deficit because, first of all, understandably, we have been in the throes of a recession and we have never run a surplus during a recession. Second of all, we have never run a surplus in wartime. And even as we have been undergoing a very difficult episode, a combination of a slowdown which

began during the last administration coupled with the substantial damage to our economy that occurred in the wake of 9/11, at the same time we have had to take on a war on terrorism that was not of our choosing. The combination of these two factors, the loss of revenue because of the slowdown of the economy and at the same time the challenge of meeting the war on terrorism have been a substantial drain on our resources. Yet our underlying economy continues to be sound and clearly we have a path that we can pursue that brings us back toward a balanced budget and providing the kind of policy in place that will continue to meet the needs of America.

This budget resolution is precisely what we need. We recognize that an uncontrolled deficit can put pressure on interest rates, increasing the cost of borrowing and putting the brakes on economic growth and investment. Without economic growth, we are not going to be able to generate the revenue to get back to a balanced budget. We also recognize that a lax fiscal policy could further weaken the U.S. dollar in global markets and undermine its standing as the reserve currency of the world economic system. This has been one of the core advantages that America has retained relative to our global competition. That is why the decision we make with this budget is going to be so very, very important.

This budget is a blueprint for injecting spending restraint while encouraging economic growth and stability. Its adoption will signal to the financial markets that a fiscally conservative Congress once more is prepared to sally forth to make difficult decisions necessary to control the Federal deficit and maintain our economy on a growth path. This budget vehicle provides fiscal discipline that will strengthen investor confidence in the renascent economy and act as a powerful tonic to continue on the path of economic growth. It provides for controlling spending without raising taxes, which is precisely the formula that has worked for us and can continue to work for us.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize that we need to maintain a pro-growth tax policy. That is essential to move America toward a balanced budget. This budget resolution allows us to continue and make permanent the successful tax policies that have allowed us to grow the economy. What it does in a nutshell is it cuts the deficit in half over a 5-year period. Perhaps more importantly, Mr. Chairman, it shrinks over time the national debt relative to the economy. That is the burden on the national economy that the capital markets understand. If we have a national debt that is growing relative to the economy, it will roil capital markets over time if it grows excessively. But what matters to the economy is not the absolute size of the debt, it is the size of the debt relative to the economy.

□ 2000

If we can continue to grow the economy and grow the economy faster than the national debt, then that will be a source of confidence and a source of growth in the economy. Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what this budget resolution does in a sound, responsible way. It maintains a strong commitment to economic growth and pro-growth tax policy by controlling discretionary and mandatory spending.

Mr. Chairman, I will have further remarks in support of this resolution.

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

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

As a member of the Joint Economic Committee, I am pleased to speak on the economic goals and policies reflected in the budget.

When it comes to the economy, this is a record-setting administration. The problem is, the administration is setting records for debt and deficits. We now have the largest debt, the largest budget deficit, and the largest trade deficit in the history of our Nation. Republicans have become the party of debt and deficits.

Even worse, the administration continues to repeat the same economic mantras even as experience continues to prove them wrong and more wrong.

This administration has turned a surplus projected in January of 2001 to be almost $400 billion by 2004 into a budget deficit of over $400 billion. And, Mr. Chairman, there is no end in sight. The budget deficit for last month set another record as the first time the budget deficit has gone over $100 billion in a single month in the history of our country. The administration has raised the debt limit three times to a record $7.6 trillion, which means $26,000 of debt is owed for every man, woman, and child in America.

This week the lead story is our Nation's trade deficit; and to no one's surprise, this deficit is breaking records too. Data released today by the Department of Commerce shows that the trade deficit in 2004 was at an all-time high, nearly $666 billion, 5.7 percent of our GDP. Another unfortunate record. The all-time monthly trade deficit of more than $59 billion was set in November, and the total for January was just barely shy of setting a new record.

The administration keeps saying that the ever-weaker dollar will correct our trade deficit for the last several years, and this has proven to be wrong. Our deficits are soaring because it is the policy of this administration to spend money we do not have and to borrow from foreign sources to cover ourselves.

Since the administration is content importing money lent by foreign banks to cover the cost of foreign goods, we are increasingly at the mercy of our overseas benefactors. As of January, foreign governments own $1.2 trillion of our public debt, the highest it has ever been. What if one day they decide to stop propping up our spend-and-borrow habit? We had a tiny taste of that recently when South Korea hinted that they would not buy more dollars and the markets trembled.

America is the greatest economic engine in the world. We should never build our economic system on a foundation of foreign loans. Any day that foundation could become a house of cards. There is absolutely no evidence in the budget resolution before us in the House or in the policies of this budget that the majority understands or even cares about these risks to our economy.

This budget uses smoke and mirrors to give the allusion of cutting the deficit in half, but it leaves out necessary actions such as fixing the alternative minimum tax, which is hurting the middle class more and more and must be dealt with sooner rather than later.

This budget is also mean spirited. In order to preserve the Republican tax cuts, the budget cuts programs for Americans who are struggling just to make it in what for them is a very difficult economy.

Mr. Chairman, this President continues to have the worst job record since President Hoover and the Great Depression. Even worse, the gains the economy has made benefit the bottom line of large corporations at the expense of ordinary hard-working Americans. The gap between the haves and have-nots is growing, and that should be of great concern to everyone in America.

The administration continues to say the economy is recovering, but how good a recovery can it be if ordinary American families can buy less and less with their paychecks? Over the period of job gains since May of 2003, the average hourly earnings of workers in nonfarm industries has actually fallen by .6 percent after inflation.

The administration's budget does not even address the biggest and largest budget buster of them all: the President's plan to privatize Social Security. As a new study by the Joint Economic Committee Democratic staff shows, the President's plan for private accounts would create $5 trillion of new debt in the first 20 years, but it would do absolutely nothing to address Social Security's solvency and would do nothing to increase national saving. In fact, it would weaken the solvency of Social Security and probably reduce national saving, exactly the opposite of what is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I think the President's plan for Social Security is a perfect example of what is wrong with the economic goals and policies of this administration. It manufactures a false crisis around a real, but manageable, problem and then offers a proposal that makes things worse without even addressing the original problem. As I have seen in my own town meetings, Americans understand that privatization of Social Security is a bad idea.

We need honest budgeting and an honest economic policy if we are to foster true economic prosperity to ordinary hard-working Americans.

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

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), a fellow member of the Joint Economic Committee.

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much this opportunity to talk about the budget. In listening to the debate today on both sides of the aisle, there has been a lot of expression of concern about the deficit; and, of course, I am very concerned about the deficit as well.

But I would like to make a suggestion that we are not facing primarily a budgetary crisis or a budgetary problem. I see this more as a philosophic problem, dealing more with the philosophy of government rather than thinking that we can tinker with the budget, dealing with this as a tactical problem when really it is a strategic problem. So as long as we endorse the type of government that we have and there is a willingness for the people as well the Congress to finance it, we are going to continue with this process and the frustrations are going to grow because it is just not likely that these deficits will shrink.

And the gentleman from Pennsylvania rightly pointed out the concerns this might have in the financial markets. I am hoping that his optimism pans out because, indeed, if they do not, there could be some ramifications from these expanding deficits and what it means to our dollar.

But I would like to suggest that in dealing with the budget itself, I see only one problem that we have. And that problem to me is the budget is too big, and I would like to shrink the budget. I have toyed with the idea over the years to introduce and offer a constitutional budget to the House floor. That would not be too difficult because the budget would be so much smaller. It would mean essentially that if one is a strict constitutionalist that they would cut the budget approximately 80 percent.

What would that mean to the economy? It would be a boost because we would be injecting $2 trillion back into the economy, allowing the people to spend their own money. But being pretty realistic, I know that is not likely to happen or be offered or even be able to present that on the House floor. Besides, it could be rather embarrassing to bring something like that to the floor. Not so much embarrassing to me, because I am accustomed to voting in a small group of people on many occasions; but it could be embarrassing to others because, for the most part, most Members would not even conceive of the idea of having a strict interpretation of the Constitution and severely limiting the budget. So we would not want to put everybody on record for that.

The other day I heard an interview with one of our Members, and he was asked about a particular program about where the authority came from in the Constitution for that program. And his answer was very straightforward; and he explained that in the Constitution there was no prohibition against that program, so therefore it was permitted. In his mind, as it is in the minds of many Members of Congress, if there is no strict prohibition, it is permitted.

And that is just absolutely opposite of what was intended by the authors of the Constitution that we would only be able to do those things which are explicitly permitted in the Congress, and they are spelled out rather clearly in article I, section 8.

And then we are given the permission to write the laws that are necessary and proper to implement those powers that are delegated to us. Those powers that are not delegated are reserved to the States and to the people. So it means that those things that are not prohibited are permitted, but I would say that the conventional wisdom today is that people accept the notion that we can do anything that we want as long as it is not prohibited by the Constitution.

I think this improper understanding and following of the Constitution has brought us closer to a major crisis in this country, a crisis of our personal liberties, a crisis in our foreign policy, as well as a crisis in our budgeting.

But it is not simply the ignoring of the Constitution that I think is our problem. I think our other problem is our country and our people and our Congresses and our Senators have accepted the notion of faith in government, faith in the State, that the State can provide these great services and do it efficiently.

Really, there are only two areas that would have to be cut if we were to strive for a constitutional budget. There are only two things that we would have to cut, and it would be welfare and warfare. And then we would get back to some fundamentals. During World War I, a gentleman by the name of Randolph Bourne wrote a pamphlet called ''War is the Health of the State,'' and I truly believe that. When we are at war, we are more likely to sacrifice our liberties; and, of course, we spend more money that we really have. I would like to suggest a corollary, that peace is the foundation of liberty because that is what the goal of all government should be: the preservation of liberty.

We have endorsed a program with this interpretation that spending is going to be endlessly increased, and we have devised a system whereby we have ignored the constraints through monetary policy by not only are we taxing too much and borrowing too much; we have now since 1971 endorsed a monetary system that if we come up short we just print the money. And I would suggest to the gentlewoman that one of the reasons why the workers' purchasing power is going down is we print too many dollars and they are the ones who are most likely and first to suffer from inflation.

And it is the philosophy of government and our philosophy on money that encourages these problems. And the current account deficits and this huge foreign indebtedness that are encouraged by our ability to maintain a reserve currency, it is going to lead to a crisis where this spending will have to come in check.

□ 2015

And that is why the gentleman from Pennsylvania is quite correct that we should be concerned about how the financial markets look at what we do. And hopefully we will be able to deal with this in a budgetary way and institute some restraints. But quite frankly I am a bit pessimistic about that. This program that we follow and this philosophy we followed prompted our Federal Reserve to create $620 billion in order to finance the system. That is the reason that the dollar becomes less valuable, because we just print too many to accommodate the politicians and the people who enjoy the excessive spending.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a member of the committee and a very outstanding colleague.

Mr. HINCHEY. I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me the time. Mr. Chairman, this budget of course is a clear statement of the economic objectives of the people who have put it together, and it is illustrative of where they want this country to be over the course of the next year.

In understanding that, it is important for us to look back at previous budgets that they have constructed and the effect that those budgets have had on the economy of our country.

We have here in Washington today, and have for the last 4 years, a monolithic government. In other words, the Republican Party controls both Houses of the Congress, the House and the Senate, and the White House. So they are in complete control of the budget operation, how we take in money, and how we spend it, allegedly, on behalf of the American people.

Let us just take a look at the effects of their budgets and economic policies over the course of the last several years. First of all, the economy has endured the most protracted job slump since the 1930s. Last year we had some increase in jobs. Government payrolls, in fact, have expanded. And it is interesting, because our colleagues in the

Republican Party talk about shrinking government. But what their budget policies have managed to do is to expand government.

At the same time, there were 544,000 fewer private nonfarm payroll jobs and 2.8 million fewer manufacturing jobs. Their budget policies have cost us nearly 3 million manufacturing jobs over the last several years.

The official unemployment rate is now 5.4 percent. But many more people than that would like to go to work if there was an opportunity for them to do so. When you include the 5 million people who have stopped looking but who would take a job if one were available to them and the 4.3 million people who have been forced to settle for part-time employment, when you consider all of those, the unemployment rate jumps to 9.3 percent.

Four years ago America enjoyed a $5.6 trillion 10-year projected budget surplus. Today our country is facing a $3.3 trillion 10-year projected budget deficit. That is a heroic accomplishment over the last 5 years by these Republican budgets, nearly $9 trillion in negative results.

The public debt has almost doubled and will probably reach $5 trillion before the end of this year, all of that as a result of these budgets, and this particular budget that we are addressing tonight continues these same policies.

One consequence of the low national savings associated with large budget deficits is that we are running now a very large trade deficit. In January, for example, the last month for which we have figures, it was $58.3 billion in trade deficit just for the month of January.

Last year we accomplished a record trade deficit. The trade deficit for the year 2004 was a record $617 billion. This budget continues those same policies. But those deficits are unsustainable. Our economy will not survive if we continue along the same road.

American workers are becoming more productive, but that productivity as a result of these budgets is not showing up in their wages. Private nonfarm industries' wages have fallen .6 percent, after being adjusted for inflation.

This year, this past year alone, typical households will make $1,500 less than they did 4 years ago as a result of the economic policies reflected in this and the previous budgets of the Republican Party.

Since November 2001, output per hour has increased from the average worker by an average of 3.9 percent per year. Over that same period, the hourly wages and benefits of the workers producing that increased output has increased by only 1.6 percent per year.

The current account deficit, which measures the amount we have to borrow from the rest of the world to finance our international trade imbalance, reached a record of over $600 billion. Increasingly, foreign central banks purchase U.S. treasury securities, and that means that we are increasingly deeper and deeper in debt to other foreign countries. That is also a result of these budgets. If foreigners become nervous about the falling value of the dollar, they could stop buying our treasury debt, which would cause the dollar to plunge. The consequence could be an international financial crisis, sharply higher inflation and interest rates, and also stop any economic recovery.

So the debate today on this budget resolution is critically important. The question is, are we going to continue the policies that have put us in this very difficult position where we find ourselves today as a result of the previous four budgets passed by this monolithic government, or are we finally going to wake up, realize the consequences of these policies and begin to take a new course? That vote will come tomorrow.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the immediate past Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time. As a member of the Joint Economic Committee, I rise today to speak on the economic policies of the budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, both the Bush and Republican budgets suffer from the same infirmities, fiscal irresponsibility and self-serving and out-of-touch priorities. Both are wholly inadequate to meet the needs of our Nation and will pass along mounting deficits and debts to generations yet unborn.

First, the 5-year Republican budget will result in a deficit of $376 billion in 2006, $44 million over the President's projection.

The Republicans' budget proposal also has many cost omissions, because they know that their deficit numbers explode after 5 years. As such, this budget does not take into account the cost of fixing the AMT, which will cost at least $642 billion. It does not take into account the $774 billion needed to pay for the President's much-talked about but yet unveiled Social Security privatization plan.

I suppose the Republican budget proposal deserves a little credit for hiking its deficit projection as it at least includes $50 million in 2006 for the wars in Afghanistan and in Iraq. The President's budget proposal contained zero dollars. As a matter of fact, it reported that the costs could not be known. However, both figures are fantasy. The realistic figure over the next 10 years, in addition to the $80 billion that we just passed in the supplemental, is likely to be $384 billion.

To pay for its misguided policies, the House budget resolution cuts nondefense discretionary spending by $12 billion below the amount needed in fiscal 2006 just to maintain current spending levels, and it cuts spending on mandatory domestic programs by $8 billion.

To add insult to injury, the Republican budget provides $18 billion in additional tax cuts. These misguided tax cuts will actually cost much more when the tax cuts actually expire in 2010. In fact, 97 percent of these tax cuts will benefit taxpayers with incomes above $200,000. I think most reasonable people can agree that these priorities are not America's priorities.

While little good can be said about the Bush administration's budget, it at least provides detailed information on the programs it seeks to cut. The House resolution shrouds its cuts in darkness, leaving the American people to wonder what vital programs will find their way to the chopping block next.

Both the Republican and Bush budget proposals are travesties. When the Bush administration took office, the Nation was experiencing record surpluses. It has managed to turn a $521 billion surplus into a $367 billion deficit.

In contrast, the Spratt alternative budget, as well as the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget that we will consider tomorrow, focus national spending on priorities that benefit all Americans and get us on the road to economic recovery. They do this by funding key domestic priorities which address the needs of working families while fully supporting the national defense and protection of our homeland and preserving Medicaid, Social Security, pension programs and student loans.

Let me speak particularly about the budget developed by the Congressional Black Caucus which corrects the irresponsible fiscal and economic policies contained in the House budget resolution by supporting existing programs that are essential to closing disparities, creating opportunities and helping our citizens build their future. It will get our country on the road to recovery, while funding meaningful national priorities for our children, for our seniors, for our veterans and for our communities.

Importantly, the Congressional Black Caucus budget supports these priorities, while also meeting our obligation to our troops in Iraq and in Afghanistan.

The CBC budget funds community development programs, including restoring funding to the Community Development Block Grant Program and supporting increased funding for elderly and disabled housing programs.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget will also restore funding for veterans' health care, rather than imposing new copayments on them for essential services and prescription drugs.

Importantly, the Congressional Black Caucus budget will reduce the budget deficit by $167 billion during the next 5 years below the deficit that will be produced by the House budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget cuts educational, housing and health programs for our children, while bequeathing to them a public debt that has increased by $1.268 trillion over the last 4 years and that will exceed $4.6 trillion even before we begin fiscal year 2006.

□ 2030

These actions are not only irresponsible, they are unconscionable. In the end, one can only conclude that the Republican budget balances itself on the backs of Americans who can least afford it.

I urge the administration to reconsider its ill-conceived economic policies. The Congressional Black Caucus budget is the ultimate expression of our national priorities; and our priorities must be our children, our families, our elderly and our veterans and, of course, our soldiers.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget this evening.

This budget would not only add funding to close the glaring and shameful disparities which have existed too long for African Americans, but it is fiscally responsible. Our budget would provide additional protection for our troops today and provide more funding to honor the debt to our Nation's veterans, including those who are returning as we speak. It also protects us at home by adding funding to address unacceptable deficiencies in homeland security.

But our investment in homeland security goes beyond the important funds we provide for first responders, for fighting bio-terrorism, and providing interoperable communications. Our homeland security also depends on a well-educated citizenry, and so we fully fund Leave No Child Behind, TRIO programs as well as increased Pell grants.

Our homeland security depends on a healthy citizenry. The Congressional Black Caucus budget restores much of the funding for minority AIDS, Health Professions Training, and the Office of Minority Health, as well as provides funding to help close gaps in the Caribbean and Africa. And, Mr. Chairman, we do all of that and reduce the deficit by an additional $167 billion over 5 years; $167 billion more than the majority budget resolution does.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget would make us more economically secure.

Mr. Chairman, the CBC alternative budget, like the Congressional Black Caucus itself, speaks to the conscience, not only of the Congress but to the conscience of our country. It is a budget that reflects our values and seeks to create not just a stronger America but also a better America.

The Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget is a morally and fiscally responsible budget, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it when it comes to the floor tomorrow.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Let me just go through some of the things that the Congressional Black Caucus budget will do in various areas. We are planning to submit this budget tomorrow, and we will be adding an additional $1 billion in the international affairs category for foreign aid to Africa and the Caribbean, Global AIDS Initiative in the State Department, Public Health and Preventable Illness initiatives.

We will be adding half a billion dollars in general science, space and technology in the following areas: NASA Research and Development, NASA Space Shuttle Safety, restore research and development funding for the National Science Foundation, Department of Energy. We will be adding an additional $50 million in the natural resources and environment, historically black colleges and university preservation program.

We will be adding $300 million in the agriculture budget in support of the 1890 land-grant historically black colleges and universities, expanded food and nutrition education programs, the U.S. Department of Agriculture Office of Civil Rights. And we will be restoring and modifying some of the Draconian cuts in agriculture programs that affect minorities in particular.

We will be adding $1 billion in commerce and housing credit for SBA loan programs, the 7(a) program, Microloan, and New Market Venture programs, adult training and dislocated worker programs, Manufacturing Extension Partnerships, home ownership initiatives.

We will be adding $150 million in transportation, most of which will go to Amtrak. We will be adding $1.5 billion to community and regional development to restore the cuts that have been proposed by the President in the Community Development Block Grants, increased funding for Brownfields Economic Development, Empowerment Zones, community development, financial institutions, economic development assistance.

We will be adding $23.9 billion in education and training with which we will fully fund the No Child Left Behind. That is $12 billion to fully fund No Child Left Behind.

We will be adding $50 million to elementary and secondary school counseling, vocational training, job training, adult education, Pell grants, Head Start, Individuals With Disabilities, IDEA, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic Serving Institutions, TRIO, Gaining Early Awareness of Readiness. That is the GEAR-UP program, restoring that. Perkins loans, impact aid.

In the area of health we will be adding $1 billion. In the area of Administration of Justice we will be adding $1 billion. And over on the defense side we are going to be adding money for body armor, personal support equipment, and other protective gear for our troops, ammunition for the Marine Corps, small arms for the Army. We will be adding $4.65 billion for veterans programs, veterans health care, survivor benefit plans, disabled veterans plans, prosthetic needs for veterans, VA medical and prosthetic research, mental health care for veterans. And we will be adding $2 billion in homeland security for rail security and port security.

Now, you are wondering how can the Congressional Black Caucus do all of this? It is simple. Simply roll back the tax cut on people who make above $200,000 a year. And all we are saying to our Members in this body is that these things that I have just described are much higher priorities. Even to people that I know who make more than $200,000 a year, they think these things are higher priorities than getting a little extra tax cut. And I just entreat my Members to please support the Congressional Black Caucus budget. It is a sane budget. It is good.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, when Lem Keyserling wrote the Full Employment Act of 1946, he was an ardent Keynesian, and he believed that the government had a major role to play in stimulating an economy, in seeking to maintain full employment. And if he believed that theoretically, he believed it even more deeply after the war when the enormous demand generated by the war for once made this a full employment economy. The whole country supported the concept.

Keynes believed in deficit financing when the economy was stuck in a liquidity trap and could not get loose. But he did not believe in the kind of deficit financing that we are running today. I think he would be appalled both by the current account deficit which we are running, $618 billion, more than most economists thought was sustainable. It exceeds 5 percent of the GDP. And certainly I do not think he would find at all pleasing to his understanding of economics a budget deficit expected this year to be $427 billion. Not even Maynard Keynes would look approvingly on that.

We have come so far from the year 2000 when after 6 or 7 straight years of

fiscal discipline, we finally put the budget in surplus, a surplus of $236 billion. We had a meeting on the Democratic side of the Committee on the Budget with Mr. Greenspan about what is the best approach we should take to this surplus that we find ourselves enjoying. And it was agreed among everyone there and among Democrats and Republicans in the House that one thing surely we should do since we now have the resources to do it is no longer borrow and spend the Social Security trust fund, the surplus in it.

Indeed, our proposal was that we use this surplus in the future instead of funding new debt and buying new government bonds, instead going into the open market, buying outstanding Treasury bonds and that way reducing the Treasury debt held by the public, increasing net national savings which woefully deficient and lowering the cost of capital and boosting the economy.

It was the first and best step we could take towards shoring up Social Security and making it solvent. It was a truly conservative idea, and we urged it upon the Bush administration when they came into office. But they took a much, much different, almost opposite, path, and that is, big tax cuts tilted toward wealthy Americans.

We did not deal then with our long-range liabilities to Social Security as we could have for the first time in a long time, and today we are suffering the consequence of that. We are dealing with second-best proposals.

What do we have instead? Well, instead of being here on this pinnacle with a $236 billion deficit surplus, we are down here with a $427 billion deficit this year, according to CBO.

Now, the President has told us he has plans and a budget that will cut this deficit in half over a period of about 5 years. But when we put back into his budget everything we know is likely to be incurred as a cost, whether it is the costs of Iraq and Afghanistan, whether it is the cost of fixing the AMT, the deficit that we are dealing with today does not get better. It does not go away. It does not go down; it gets bigger. And by the end of our timeframe, 2015, we have a deficit of $621 billion.

Read the CBO analysis of the President's budget. By the end of that timeframe, we accumulated 5.135 trillion additional dollars as part of the national debt. That surely cannot be the kind of economy that Lem Keyserling or Maynard Keynes had in mind.

Look at this very simple table here, and it tells you a world of facts about what has happened over the last 4 years. Three times in 4 years this Congress at the request of President Bush in order to accommodate his budget had to raise the debt ceiling of the United States three times by $2.234 trillion.

At the present rate, we are adding $1 trillion to our national debt every year, every 18 months, $1 trillion every 18 to 20 months to our national debt. Nobody in his right mind thinks that that course can be sustained. And yet look at the Bush budget again. It only promises in our estimation more and more debt, not less debt.

How do we get away with this? No country in the world could have the kind of current account deficit we have or certainly have the kind of budget deficit that we mitigate the effects of it. Do not feel, do not see the consequences, and therefore do not feel compelled to do anything serious about it. We sell much of our debt to foreigners and that mitigates the effect.

These are not good vital signs for the economy of the United States. And surely one of the things we should be about now is the adoption of a resolution which will take us back to where we were in the year 2000, back to surpluses because we need to be saving, not spending as the baby boomers begin to retire.

□ 2045

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am particularly grateful for the opportunity to be here to make this presentation as required under law by Humphrey-Hawkins because I think it is very important perhaps that the record be set straight.

Any Member of the House who is serious about controlling the deficit, about maintaining the forward movement in the economy, growing jobs, and the social justice that could only come through economic growth should be prepared to strongly support this budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, a couple of points I think need to be made in response to the interesting presentations that were made on the other side.

First of all, on the issue of jobs. We have heard the criticism that our friends on the other side of the aisle try to blame President Bush for an economic slowdown that he inherited from the Clinton administration that was exacerbated by 9/11. The truth is economic policies that have been adopted by this Congress, working with the administration, have been successful in helping the U.S. economy rebound from the recession into a sustained expansion, with strong growth in the gross domestic product and payroll jobs.

Despite all of the problems that this President inherited, the tax relief policies of the past 4 years that our friends on the other side of the aisle are striving to sabotage have helped to restore economic growth and job creation.

During 2004, real GDP grew 4.4 percent, the strongest annual performance in 5 years, one of the strongest growth performances of the past 20 years, belying the glooming forecast we have heard on the other side.

Private forecasters' projections for real GDP growth for this year are being revised upward. Growth for 2005 is expected to be at a 3.7 percent robust rate. More Americans, Mr. Chairman, are working today than at anytime in our Nation's history, and employment is at a record level of more than 140 million. The unemployment rate in February was 5.4 percent, lower than the averages for each of the last three decades. Payroll employment rose by 2.2 million jobs during 2004. It is up by more than 3 million jobs since May of 2003. Last month, we saw employment gains of 262,000 jobs, more than a quarter of a million new jobs in the month of February alone. This suggests that there is clearly forward motion in the economy.

Mr. Chairman, let us compare that to some of our trading partners. Those who last year invoked the Great Depression in describing recent economic conditions have been, after all, often favoring policies that would increase government intervention in the economy. Yet some of those countries where those sorts of policies are applied are not doing as well as we are.

Economic growth in Europe is generally slower than that of the United States. The unemployment rate in Europe is much higher than in the U.S. In January of 2005, Europe had an unemployment rate of 8.8 percent, substantially higher than our U.S. level of 5.4 percent.

The fact is, by following on a path of high growth and low taxes, we are moving the economy in the right direction, and ultimately, if we are prepared to put in place fiscal policies that restrain the deficit, that will allow us to grow the economy in the right direction.

I have heard a couple of extraordinary claims on the floor of the House that we are facing a record debt. I suppose that is true if we look at this in a purely static, green eyeshade perspective, but what really matters with the national debt, as I said before, is its size relative to the economy. The fact remains the national debt today is significantly lower, relative to the economy, than it was in the early 1990s when their party controlled Congress and controlled the reins of spending.

We have heard about record deficits, but here again we propose in our budget resolution to cut the deficits in half relative to the size of the economy. That will send the right message to global markets.

We have heard a little bit tonight about the trade deficit, and I must say that is something where I have some sympathy with the critics. Our trade deficit is much too high, but those who are making these claims tonight perhaps should be questioning whether they supported the Clinton-era trade policies that this administration inherited and put us firmly on the path to large trade deficits.

We have also heard from the other side that they are concerned that there is not enough room in this budget to deal with the problem of the AMT. As cochairman of the Zero AMT Caucus, I have to be sympathetic with their raising the issue, but the fact remains eliminating the AMT is only going to

be possible as part of fundamental tax reform. This budget put lays in place, creates the groundwork for us to go forward later this year and take a look at fundamental tax reform.

We also, notwithstanding this budget, have every opportunity to move forward later this year and consider the issue of Social Security solvency. I believe that the President is right to raise this issue. Anyone who has studied this issue carefully has to concede that for the long-term health of the Social Security system we have a choice of either going forward with a laissez-faire approach that has long been advocated on the other side and ultimately have to see truly draconian cuts as a result, or if we act now we can put in place reforms that will allow us to preserve existing benefits, also provide a solid retirement for the next generation and do so by improving the rate of return within the Social Security system. Nothing in this budget resolution is inconsistent with that initiative.

I am very, very pleased to address the concerns raised by the gentleman from New York about the supposed monolithic government in the Congress that has worked with a Republican administration to do some things that the gentleman finds distasteful. The fact is our economic policies and our economic challenges today are at least partially the result of the gridlock that existed before the last election in which the Senate was at least not able to move forward on key issues like a stimulus bill, like an energy bill, like tort reform, that directly speak to our economic health because of the gridlock implicit in the rules that gave the minority a veto over many of these provisions. Monolithic government is not the issue. The issue here is whether we can move forward and get to a balanced budget ultimately. Our resolution clearly is the one strongest able to do that.

We continue to grow the economy without raising taxes, which clearly is the agenda on the other side, raising taxes that would slam the brakes on economic growth.

At the same time, it is obvious from the laundry list we have heard tonight if the other side were in the majority we would be contemplating a saturnalia of new spending. I can think of a lot of things that I would love to spend money on in the Federal budget, but the fact remains we need to set tough priorities if we are going to get back to a balanced budget. Our spending resolution does just that.

What we provide is low taxes, controlling Federal spending and ultimately the prospect of falling deficits and low debt and ultimately the right economic direction for this country, a true blueprint for economic growth, expansion and opportunity.

With that, I urge all of my colleagues to support the Republican budget resolution. Regardless of any concern about any particular program, we need to move forward with the broad outline of spending that this resolution fairly lays out and put it in place so that we are able to get to a balanced budget over time as we reassure capital markets that we are truly committed to controlling spending without raising taxes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, as a member of both the Congressional Black Caucus and the Energy and Commerce Committee, I rise in support of both the Democrat alternative and of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative to H. Con. Res. 95, the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget. The CBC alternative offers to the American people and to this Congress a rational budget that is fiscally sound and morally responsible. The CBC alternative budget invests federal resources in the programs that benefit the constituencies of all of the Members of this House: education, health care, economic opportunity, retirement security and homeland security. And the CBC alternative budget makes these investments while reducing the federal deficit—which has spiraled out of control and out of sight over the last four years—by an additional $4.0 billion.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget alternative focuses on closing the disparities that exist in America's communities and invests in the future of this nation by fully funding the No Child Left Behind Act at Fiscal Year 2006 authorization levels, expanding the Head Start Programs, doubling the funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Hispanic serving institutions and increasing the size of the Pell Grant allotment for college students.

The CBC alternative restores much-needed federal dollars to the Minority Health Initiative and for Community Health Centers that provide critical health services to urban-based congressional districts like mine and rural-based congressional districts as well. The CBC alternative also increases funding for law enforcement initiatives such as juvenile justice programs and prisoner reentry programs that are so critical to facilitating successful reentry into society by ex-offenders.

The Congressional Black Caucus Substitute invests in education and funding for the minority health initiative. The Congressional Black Caucus Substitute invests in our nation's veterans by restoring the cuts the President's budget proposed in veterans' health care and providing enhanced survivor benefits, medical and prosthetic research, long term care and mental health care.

To meet the needs of America and its citizens, the CBC changes some of the components of the President's tax program, and directs those revenues to making our troops safe in the battlefield and our citizens safe here at home. Mr. Chairman, the CBC's budget is America's hope for tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the CBC alternative budget.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The text of H. Con. Res. 95 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 95

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010 are set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2010:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $1,483,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,589,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,693,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,824,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,928,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,043,903,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $53,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $16,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $24,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $4,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $8,570,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $9,063,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $2,070,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,135,290,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,199,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,314,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,430,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,257,892,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $2,052,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,154,404,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,206,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,298,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,402,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,507,365,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $568,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $564,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $513,034,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $474,087,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $474,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $463,462,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $4,685,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $5,071,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $5,389,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $5,649,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $5,891,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $6,105,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $7,958,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $8,635,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $9,264,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $9,862,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $10,464,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $11,060,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2005 through 2010 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $500,621,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $497,196,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $441,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $475,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $465,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $460,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $483,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $471,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $503,763,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $489,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $513,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $505,908,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $32,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $31,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $34,835,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $35,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,397,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $35,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $34,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,643,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $24,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $24,735,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $25,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $25,851,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $26,162,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,565,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $2,564,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $3,147,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $2,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $2,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $2,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $1,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $32,527,000,000
(B) Outlays, $31,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $30,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $30,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $30,952,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $31,706,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $31,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,254,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $30,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $29,480,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $27,190,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,999,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $25,334,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,281,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $25,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $25,417,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,687,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $16,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,302,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $10,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $10,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $10,040,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $10,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $14,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,393,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $72,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $70,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,393,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $70,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $70,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $70,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $72,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,356,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $23,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $14,179,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $14,196,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,413,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $14,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $14,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $14,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,140,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $94,001,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $91,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $89,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $89,980,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $90,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $89,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,181,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $257,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $262,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $262,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $275,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $274,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $295,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $293,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $317,113,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $313,625,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $336,523,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $335,574,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $292,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $293,587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $331,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $330,944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $371,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $372,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $395,312,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $395,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $420,234,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,828,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $448,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $448,442,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $339,057,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $347,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $347,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $354,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $352,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $359,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $365,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $374,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $378,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $383,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $386,978,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,849,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,849,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $15,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,891,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $17,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,704,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,743,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $24,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,029,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $69,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $68,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $66,321,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $69,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $69,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $70,059,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,787,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $39,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,501,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $40,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $41,390,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $42,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $42,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $42,860,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,803,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $16,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $18,017,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $17,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,999,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $17,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $17,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $17,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,216,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $267,942,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,942,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $310,479,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $310,479,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $359,797,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $359,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $397,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $397,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $426,162,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $453,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $453,172,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $47,903,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$10,368,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$9,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$10,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$9,193,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$13,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$8,738,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$14,484,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$55,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$55,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$63,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$64,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$65,480,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$66,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$60,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$60,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$63,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$62,822,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND REPORT SUBMISSIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS TO SLOW THE GROWTH IN MANDATORY SPENDING AND TO ACHIEVE DEFICIT REDUCTION.—(1) Not later than September 16, 2005, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $797,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $5,278,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $2,097,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $21,410,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(C) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $630,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $20,002,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(D) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $30,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $270,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(E) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $123,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $603,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(F) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $96,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $1,413,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(G) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $12,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $103,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(H) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $155,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $798,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(I) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by $3,907,000,000 for fiscal year 2006 and $18,680,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(b) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR CHANGES IN REVENUE.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report a reconciliation bill not later than June 24, 2005, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than $16,623,000,000 for fiscal year 2006 and by not more than $45,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(c)(1) Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the House of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of that committee may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(2) Upon the submission to the House of a conference report recommending a reconciliation bill or resolution in which a committee has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of this section, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(3) Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of such Act.

TITLE III—CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE

SEC. 301. CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House reports legislation, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for the budget accounts or portions thereof in the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in excess of the following amounts:

(1) for fiscal year 2005: $42,806,000,000,
(2) for fiscal year 2006: $45,899,100,000,
(3) for fiscal year 2007: $47,828,700,000,
(4) for fiscal year 2008: $49,715,400,000, or
(5) for fiscal year 2009: $51,743,500,000,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate budget aggregates and increase the allocation of new budget authority to such committee for fiscal year 2005 and for the period of fiscal

years 2005 through 2009 to the extent such excess is offset by a reduction in mandatory outlays from the Highway Trust Fund or an increase in receipts appropriated to such fund for the applicable fiscal year caused by such legislation or any previously enacted legislation.

(b) ADJUSTMENT FOR OUTLAYS.—For fiscal year 2006, in the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that changes obligation limitations such that the total limitations are in excess of $42,792,000,000 for fiscal year 2006 for programs, projects, and activities within the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and if legislation has been enacted that satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (a) for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays and appropriate aggregates for such fiscal year for the committee reporting such measure by the amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a).

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) EXEMPTION OF OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—(1) In the House, if any bill or joint resolution is reported, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is filed thereon, that makes supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2005 or fiscal year 2006 for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism, then the new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, and receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for purposes of sections 302, 303, 311, and 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for the provisions of such measure that are designated pursuant to this subsection as making appropriations for such contingency operations.

(2) Amounts included in this resolution for the purpose set forth in paragraph (1) shall be considered to be current law for purposes of the preparation of the current level of budget authority and outlays and the appropriate levels shall be adjusted upon the enactment of such bill.

(b) EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.—In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is filed thereon, that designates a provision as an emergency requirement pursuant to this section, then the new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, and receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for purposes of sections 302, 303, 311, and 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—In the House, if a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under subsection (b), the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in paragraph (2). If such legislation is to be considered by the House without being reported, then the committee shall cause the explanation to be published in the Congressional Record in advance of floor consideration.

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any such provision is an emergency requirement if the underlying situation poses a threat to life, property, or national security and is—

(i) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(ii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iii) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(iv) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

SEC. 402. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

SEC. 403. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the appropriate Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 404. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance appropriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) LIMITATION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2007 or 2008 for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $23,568,000,000 in new budget authority.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2006 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2006.

SEC. 405. SPECIAL RULE IN THE HOUSE FOR CERTAIN SECTION 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS.

In the House, the Committee on Appropriations may make a separate suballocation for general appropriations for the legislative branch for the first fiscal year of this resolution. Such suballocation shall be deemed to be made under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and shall be treated as such a suballocation for all purposes under section 302 of such Act.

SEC. 406. SPECIAL PROCEDURES TO ACHIEVE SAVINGS IN MANDATORY SPENDING THROUGH FY2014.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the share of the budget consumed by mandatory spending have been growing since the mid-1970s, and now is about 54 percent;

(2) this portion of the budget is continuing to grow, crowding out other priorities and threatening overall budget control;

(3) mandatory spending is intrinsically difficult to control;

(4) these programs are subject to a variety of factors outside the control of Congress, such as demographics, economic conditions, and medical prices;

(5) Congress should make an effort at least every other year, to review mandatory spending; and

(6) the reconciliation process set forth in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is a viable tool to reduce the rate of growth in mandatory spending.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that concurrent resolutions on the budget for fiscal years 2007 through 2010 should include reconciliation instructions to committees, every other year, pursuant to section 310(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve significant savings in mandatory spending.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule and the order of the House, no amendment to the concurrent resolution is in order except the amendments printed in House Report 109–19. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, except for amendment No. 2, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House report 109–19.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. HENSARLING:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget

for fiscal year 2006 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010 are hereby set forth.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND REPORT SUBMISSIONS

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.
Sec. 202. Submission of report on savings to be used for members of the Armed Forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE

Sec. 301. Rainy Day Fund for nonmilitary emergencies.
Sec. 302. Contingency procedure for surface transportation.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Point of Order Protection.
Sec. 402. Restrictions on advance appropriations.
Sec. 403. Automatic votes on expensive legislation.
Sec. 404. Turn off the Gephardt Rule.
Sec. 405. Restriction on the use of emergency spending.
Sec. 406. Compliance with section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.
Sec. 407. Action pursuant to section 302(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.
Sec. 408. Changes in allocations and aggregates resulting from realistic scoring of measures affecting revenues.
Sec. 409. Prohibition in using revenue increases to comply with budget allocation and aggregates.
Sec. 410. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 411. Entitlement safeguard.
Sec. 412. Budget Protection Mandatory Account.
Sec. 413. Budget Protection Discretionary Account.

TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

Sec. 501. Sense of the House on spending accountability.
Sec. 502. Sense of the House on entitlement reform.
Sec. 503. Sense of the House regarding the abolishment of obsolete agencies and Federal sunset proposals.
Sec. 504. Sense of the House regarding the goals of this concurrent resolution and the elimination of certain programs.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2010:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $1,483,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,589,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,693,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,824,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,928,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,043,903,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $53,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $16,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $24,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $4,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $8,570,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $9,063,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $2,070,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,125,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,185,198,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,291,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,404,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,497,636,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $2,052,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,143,613,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,192,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,275,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,377,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,476,988,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $568,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $553,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $499,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $451,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $448,602,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $433,085,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $4,685,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $5,060,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $5,374,742,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $5,626,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $5,865,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $6,074,877,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2005: $7,958,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $8,623,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $9,249,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $9,839,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $10,438,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $11,029,815,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2005 through 2010 for each major functional category are as follows:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $500,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $497,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $441,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $475,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $465,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $460,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $483,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $471,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $503,763,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $489,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $513,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $505,908,000,000.

(2) Homeland Security (100):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $30,896,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $29,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $29,673,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $30,081,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $32,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $31,404,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,703,000,000.

(3) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(4) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(5) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(6) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(7) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(8) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(9) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(10) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(11) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(12) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(13) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(14) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(15) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(16) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(17) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(18) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(19) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $276,942,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $276,942,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $310,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $310,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $358,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $358,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $395,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $395,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $423,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $423,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $448,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $448,789,000,000.
(20) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $1,325,002,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,315,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $1,399,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,384,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $1,394,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,407,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $1,477,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,444,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $1,505,999,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,493,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $1,566,983,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,553,407,000,000.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$55,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$55,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$63,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$64,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$65,480,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$66,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$60,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$60,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$63,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$62,822,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND REPORT SUBMISSIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.—(1) Not later than July 15, 2005, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $893,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $5,959,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $2,128,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $21,803,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(C) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,419,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006

and $30,725,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(D) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $30,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2006 and $270,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(E) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The House Committee on Government Reform shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $268,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $3,164,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(F) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—The House Committee on House Administration shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $57,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $2,673,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(G) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.—The House Committee on International Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $45,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $504,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(H) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $144,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $826,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(I) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $114,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $1,598,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(J) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE.—The House Committee on Science shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $303,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $3,864,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(K) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $65,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $690,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(L) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $155,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $798,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(M) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $6,534,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2006 and $52,391,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(N) SPECIAL RULE.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may take into account legislation enacted after the adoption of this resolution that is determined to reduce the deficit and may make applicable adjustments in reconciliation instructions, allocations, and budget aggregates and may also make adjustments in reconciliation instructions to protect earned benefit programs.

(b) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR CHANGES IN REVENUE.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report a reconciliation bill not later than June 24, 2005, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than $17,700,000,000 for fiscal year 2006 and by not more than $105,900,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

(c)(1) Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the House of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of that committee may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(2) Upon the submission to the House of a conference report recommending a reconciliation bill or resolution in which a committee has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of this section, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(3) Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of such Act.

SEC. 202. SUBMISSION OF REPORT ON DEFENSE SAVINGS.

In the House, not later than May 15, 2005, the Committee on Armed Services shall submit to the Committee on the Budget its findings that identify $2,000,000,000 in savings from (1) activities that are determined to be of a low priority to the successful execution of current military operations; or (2) activities that are determined to be wasteful or unnecessary to national defense. Funds identified should be reallocated to programs and activities that directly contribute to enhancing the combat capabilities of the U.S. military forces with an emphasis on force protection, munitions, and surveillance capabilities. For purposes of this subsection, the report by the Committee on Armed Services shall be inserted in the Congressional Record by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget not later than May 21, 2005.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE

SEC. 301. RAINY DAY FUND FOR NON-MILITARY EMERGENCIES.

In the House of Representatives and the Senate, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for nonmilitary emergencies, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of that House shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but the total adjustment for all measures considered under this section shall not exceed $20,000,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2006 and outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 302. CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House reports legislation, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for the budget accounts or portions thereof in the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in excess of the following amounts:

(1) for fiscal year 2005: $42,806,000,000,
(2) for fiscal year 2006: $45,899,100,000,
(3) for fiscal year 2007: $47,828,700,000,
(4) for fiscal year 2008: $49,715,400,000, or
(5) for fiscal year 2009: $51,743,500,000,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate budget aggregates and increase the allocation of new budget authority to such committee for fiscal year 2005 and for the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009 to the extent such excess is offset by a reduction in mandatory outlays from the Highway Trust Fund or an increase in receipts appropriated to such fund for the applicable fiscal year caused by such legislation or any previously enacted legislation.

(b) ADJUSTMENT FOR OUTLAYS.—For fiscal year 2006, in the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that changes obligation limitations such that the total limitations are in excess of $42,792,000,000 for fiscal year 2006 for programs, projects, and activities within the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and if legislation has been enacted that satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (a) for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays and appropriate aggregates for such fiscal year for the committee reporting such measure by the amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a).

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. POINT OF ORDER PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) A report by the Committee on Rules on a rule or order that would waive section 302(f) or 303(a) (other than paragraph (2)) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 may not be called up for consideration (over the objection of any Member) except when so determined by a vote of a majority of the Members duly chosen and sworn, a quorum being present.

(2) A question of consideration under this paragraph shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided by a proponent and opponent of the question but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.

(3) This paragraph does not apply to any rule providing for consideration of any legislation the title of which is as follows: ''A bill to preserve Social Security.''

(b) WAIVER PROHIBITION.—The Committee on Rules may not report a rule or order proposing a waiver of subsection (a).

SEC. 402. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance appropriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) EXCEPTION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2007 and fiscal years 2008 for programs,

projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading 'Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $23,568,000,000 in new budget authority.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2006 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2006.

SEC. 403. AUTOMATIC VOTES ON EXPENSIVE LEGISLATION.

In the House, the yeas and nays shall be considered as ordered when the Speaker puts the question on passage of a bill or joint resolution, or on adoption of conference report, which authorizes or provides new budget authority of not less $50,000,000. The Speaker may not entertain a unanimous consent request or motion to suspend this section.

SEC. 404. TURN OFF THE GEPHARDT RULE.

Rule XXVII shall not apply with respect to the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

SEC. 405. EMERGENCY SPENDING.

(a) EXEMPTION OF OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is filed thereon, that makes supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism, then the new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, and receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for purposes of sections 302, 303, and 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for the provisions of such measure that are designated pursuant to this subsection as making appropriations for such contingency operations.

(b) EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.—In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is filed thereon, that designates a provision as an emergency requirement pursuant to this section, then the new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, and receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for purposes of sections 302, 303, 311, and 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—In the House, if a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under subsection (b), the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in paragraph (2). If such legislation is to be considered by the House without being reported, then the committee shall cause the explanation to be published in the Congressional Record in advance of floor consideration.

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any such provision is an emergency requirement if the underlying situation poses a threat to life, property, or national security and is—

(i) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(ii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iii) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(iv) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(d) ENFORCEMENT.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report that contains an emergency designation unless that designation meets the criteria set out in subsection (c)(2).

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

(f) DISPOSITION OF POINTS OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.—As disposition of a point of order under subsection (d) or subsection (e), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the point of order. A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent of the point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

SEC. 406. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

SEC. 407. ACTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 302(b)(1) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT.

(a) COMPLIANCE.—When complying with Section 302(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee on Appropriations of each House shall consult with the Committee on Appropriations of the other House to ensure that the allocation of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees are identical.

(b) REPORT.—The Committee on Appropriations of each House shall report to its House when it determines that the report made by the Committee pursuant to Section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the report made by the Committee on Appropriations of the other House pursuant to the same provision contain identical allocations of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees.

(c) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report providing new discretionary budget authority for Fiscal Year 2006 allocated to the Committee on Appropriations unless and until the Committee on Appropriations of that House has made the report required under paragraph (b) of this Section.

SEC. 408. CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES RESULTING FROM REALISTIC SCORING OF MEASURES AFFECTING REVENUES.

(a) Whenever the House considers a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report, including measures filed in compliance with section 201(b) or 201(c), that propose to change federal revenues, the impact of such measure on federal revenues shall be calculated by the Joint Committee on Taxation in a manner that takes into account—

(1) the impact of the proposed revenue changes on—

(A) Gross Domestic Product, including the growth rate for the Gross Domestic Product;

(B) total domestic employment;

(C) gross private domestic investment;

(D) general price index;

(E) interest rates; and

(F) other economic variables;

(2) the impact on Federal Revenue of the changes in economic variables analyzed under subpart (1) of this paragraph.

(b) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make any necessary changes to allocations and aggregates in order to conform this concurrent resolution with the determinations made by the Joint Committee on Taxation pursuant to paragraph (a) of this Section.

SEC. 409. PROHIBITION ON USING REVENUE INCREASES TO COMPLY WITH BUDGET ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) For the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution in the House, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall not take into account the provisions of any piece of legislation which propose to increase revenue or offsetting collections if the net effect of the bill is to increase the level of revenue or offsetting collections beyond the level assumed in this concurrent resolution.

(b) Paragraph (a) of this section shall not apply to any provision of a piece of legislation that proposes a new or increased fee for the receipt of a defined benefit or service (including insurance coverage) by the person or entity paying the fee.

SEC. 410. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the appropriate Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 411. ENTITLEMENT SAFEGUARD.

(a) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider an direct spending legislation that would increase an on-budget deficit or decrease an on-budget surplus as provided by paragraph (e) for any applicable time period.

(b) For purposes of this clause, the term ''applicable time period'' means any of the following periods:

(1) The period of the first 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) The period of the 5 fiscal years following first 5 years covered in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(c) For purposes of this section and except as provided in paragraph (d), the term ''direct-spending legislation'' means any bill,

joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) For purposes of this section, the term ''direct-spending legislation'' does not include—

(1) any legislation the title of which is as follows: ''A bill to preserve Social Security.''; or

(2) any legislation that would cause a net increase in aggregate direct spending of less than $100,000,000 for any applicable time period.

(e) If direct spending legislation increases the on-budget deficit or decreases an on-budget surpluses when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or decrease the on-budget surplus when taken together with all direct spending legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline assumed for the most recent concurrent resolution on the budget, except that direct spending effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted pursuant to reconciliation instructions since the beginning of that same calendar year shall not be available.

(f) This section may be waived by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(g) For purposes of this section, the levels of budget authority and outlays for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(h) The Committee on Rules may not report a rule or order proposing a waiver of paragraph (a).

SEC. 412. BUDGET PROTECTION MANDATORY ACCOUNT.

(a)(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain an account to be known as the ''Budget Protection Mandatory Account''. The Account shall be divided into entries corresponding to the allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget, except that it shall not include the Committee on Appropriations.

(2) Each entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (b). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

(b)(1) Upon the engrossment of a House bill or joint resolution or a House amendment to a Senate bill or joint resolution (other than an appropriation bill), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall—

(A) credit the applicable entries of the Budget Protection Mandatory Account by the amounts specified in subparagraph (2); and

(B) reduce the applicable 302(a) allocations by the amount specified in subparagraph (2).

(2) Each amount specified in subparagraph (A) shall be the net reduction in mandatory budget authority (either under current law or proposed by the bill or joint resolution under consideration) provided by each amendment that was adopted in the House to the bill or joint resolution.

(c)(1) If an amendment includes a provision described in subparagraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, upon the engrossment of a House bill or joint resolution or a House amendment to a Senate bill or joint resolution, other than an appropriation bill, reduce the level of total revenues set forth in the applicable concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year or for the total of that first fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years in an amount equal to the net reduction in mandatory authority (either under current law or proposed by a bill or joint resolution under consideration) provided by each amendment adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution. Such adjustment shall be in addition to the adjustments described in subsection (b).

(2)(A) The provision specified in subparagraph (1) is as follows: ''The amount of mandatory budget authority reduced by this amendment may be used to offset a decrease in revenues.''

(B) All points of order are waived against an amendment including the text specified in subparagraph (A) provided the amendment is otherwise in order.

(d) As used in this rule, the term—

(1) ''appropriation bill'' means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of fiscal year 2006 or any subsequent fiscal year, as the case may be.

(2) ''mandatory budget authority'' means any entitlement authority as defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) During the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain a running tally, which shall be available to all Members, of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 413. BUDGET DISCRETIONARY ACCOUNTS.

(a)(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain an account to be known as the ''Budget Protection Discretionary Account'';. The Account shall be divided into entries corresponding to the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, and the committee's suballocations, under section 302(a) and 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) Each entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (b). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

(b)(1) Upon the engrossment of a House appropriations bill, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall—

(A) credit the applicable entries of the Budget Protection Discretionary Account by the amounts specified in subparagraph (2).

(B) reduce the applicable 302(a) and (b) allocations by the amount specified in subparagraph (2).

(2) Each amount specified in subparagraph (A) shall be the net reduction in discretionary budget authority provided by each amendment adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution.

(c)(1) If an amendment includes a provision described in subparagraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, upon the engrossment of a House appropriations bill, reduce the level of total revenues set forth in the applicable concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year or for the total of that first fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years in an amount equal to the net reduction in discretionary budget authority provided by each amendment that was adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution. Such adjustment shall be in addition to the adjustments described in subsection (b).

(2)(A) The provision specified in subparagraph (1) is as follows: ''The amount of discretionary budget authority reduced by this amendment may be used to offset a decrease in revenues.''

(B) All points of order are waived against an amendment including the text specified in subparagraph (A) provided the amendment is otherwise in order.

(d) As used in this rule, the term ''appropriation bill'' means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of fiscal year 2006 or any subsequent fiscal year, as the case may be.

(e) During the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain a running tally, which shall be available to all Members, of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill or joint resolution.

TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 501. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON SPENDING ACCOUNTABILITY.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) authorizing committees should actively engage in oversight utilizing—

(A) the plans and goals submitted by executive agencies pursuant to the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993; and

(B) the performance evaluations submitted by such agencies (that are based upon the Program Assessment Rating Tool which is designed to improve agency performance);in order to enact legislation to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse to ensure the efficient use of taxpayer dollars;

(2) all Federal programs should be periodically reauthorized and funding for unauthorized programs should be level-funded in fiscal year 2006 unless there is a compelling justification;

(3) committees should submit written justifications for earmarks and should consider not funding those most egregiously inconsistent with national policy;

(4) the fiscal year 2006 budget resolution should be vigorously enforced and legislation should be enacted establishing statutory limits on appropriations and a PAY-AS-YOU-GO rule for new and expanded entitlement programs; and

(5) Congress should make every effort to offset nonwar-related supplemental appropriations.

SEC. 502. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON ENTITLEMENT REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that welfare was successfully reformed through the application of work requirements, education and training opportunity, and time limits on eligibility.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that authorizing committees should—

(1) systematically review all means-tested entitlement programs and track beneficiary participation across programs and time;

(2) enact legislation to develop common eligibility requirements for means-tested entitlement programs;

(3) enact legislation to accurately rename means-tested entitlement programs;

(4) enact legislation to coordinate program benefits in order to limit to a reasonable period of time the Government dependency of means-tested entitlement program participants;

(5) evaluate the costs of, and justifications for, nonmeans-tested, nonretirement-related entitlement programs; and

(6) identify and utilize resources that have conducted cost-benefit analyses of participants in multiple means- and nonmeans-tested entitlement programs to understand their cumulative costs and collective benefits.

SEC. 503. SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING THE ABOLISHMENT OF OBSOLETE AGENCIES AND FEDERAL SUNSET PROPOSALS.

(a) The House finds the following:

(1) The National Commission on the Public Service's recent report, ''Urgent Business For America: Revitalizing The Federal Government For The 21st Century,'' states that government missions are so widely dispersed among so many agencies that no coherent management is possible. The report also states that fragmentation leaves many gaps,

inconsistencies, and inefficiencies in government oversight and results in an unacceptable level of public health protection.

(2) According to the Commission, there are: more than 35 food safety laws administered by 12 different federal agencies; 541 clean air, water, and waste programs in 29 federal agencies; 50 different programs to aid the homeless in eight different Federal agencies; and 27 teen pregnancy programs operated in nine Federal agencies; and 90 early childhood programs scattered among 11 Federal agencies.

(3) According to the General Accounting Office (GAO), there are 163 programs with a job training or employment function, 64 welfare programs of a similar nature, and more than 500 urban aid programs.

(4) GAO also indicates 13 agencies coordinate 342 economic development programs, but there is very little or no coordination between them. This situation has created a bureaucracy so complex that many local communities stop applying for economic assistance. At the same time, the GAO reports that these programs often serve as nothing more than funnels for pork, have ''no significant effect'' on the economy, and cost as much as $_____ to create each job.

(5) In 1976, Colorado became the first state to implement a sunset mechanism. Today, about half of the Nation's States have some sort of sunset mechanism in effect to monitor their legislative branch agencies. On the Federal level, the United States Senate in 1978 overwhelmingly passed legislation to sunset most of the Government agencies by a vote of 87–1.

(6) In Texas, ''sunsetting'' has eliminated 44 agencies and saved the taxpayers $_____ million compared with expenditures of $ million for the Sunset Commission. Based on these estimates, for every dollar spent on the Sunset process, the State has received about $ in return.

(b) It is the Sense of the House that legislation providing for the orderly abolishment of obsolete Agencies and providing a federal sunset for government programs should be enacted during this Congress.

SEC. 504. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE GOALS OF THIS CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AND THE ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS.

(a) The House of Representatives finds the following:

(1) The concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 should achieve the following key goals:

(A) Ensure adequate funding is available for essential government programs, in particular defense and homeland security.

(B) Foster greater economic growth and increased domestic employment by eliminating those provisions in the tax code that discourage economic growth and job creation and by extending existing tax relief provisions so as to prevent an automatic tax increase.

(C) Bring the Federal budget back into balance as soon as possible.

(2) The Government spends billions of dollars each year on programs and projects that are of marginal value to the country as a whole.

(3) Funding for these lower priority programs should be viewed in light of the goals of this concurrent resolution and whether or not continued funding of these programs advances or hinders the achievement of these goals.

(4) This concurrent resolution assumes that funding for many lower priority programs will be reduced or eliminated in order increase funding for defense and homeland security while at the same time controlling overall spending.

(b) It is the Sense of the House of Representatives that the following programs should be eliminated:

(1) Title X Family Planning.

(2) Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

(3) National Endowment for the Arts.

(4) Legal Services Corporation.

(5) the Advanced Technology Program.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 154, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, spending is out of control in the Nation's capital, and if we do not work to control this spending, we will leave our children and grandchildren a legacy of debt, a legacy of a lower standard of living, a legacy of more government, of less freedom, of less opportunity.

Many people in this Chamber have risen tonight to say that we are not spending enough money. I think we should take a look at the facts.

Number one, Mr. Chairman, we are now spending over $20,000 for American families. For the first time since World War II are we spending this much money. For only the fourth time in the history of our Nation, and if we look back just 10 years, almost every government agency has grown by a huge multiple overinflation.

International affairs is up 93 percent; agriculture up 165 percent; transportation, 78 percent; education, 95 percent, and the list goes on and on and on. We have been growing government at twice the rate of inflation and 50 percent faster than the family budget.

We believe that these growth rates are unsustainable and let us just not look at the past. Let us look at the future.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, over the next decade Social Security is due to grow by 5.5 percent a year, Medicaid by almost 8 percent a year and Medicare by 9 percent a year. We have an explosion of government spending, and yet many in this Chamber want to spend even more, at the expense of American families.

Where is this leading us? Mr. Chairman, most recently, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Alan Greenspan said, As a Nation we may have already made promises to coming generations of retirees that we will be unable to fulfill.

According to the General Accounting Office, Social Security faces a serious and growing solvency and sustainability challenge that is growing as time passes.

According to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, referring to Social Security, such chronic and growing obligations in the Social Security program are properly understood by the American public, including investors, as a sign that the program is out of balance and headed for bankruptcy.

□ 2100

According to the trustees of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, ''We do not believe the currently projected long run growth rates of Social Security and Medicare are sustainable under current financing arrangements.'' The Comptroller General of the General Accountability Office said, ''How this is resolved could effect not only our economic security but our national security. We are headed to a future where we will have to either double Federal taxes or cut Federal spending by 50 percent.'' Let me repeat that. We are headed to a future where we will have to double Federal taxes or cut Federal spending by 50 percent.

Mr. Chairman, that is why it is so critical that today, not tomorrow, not next week, that we do something, something to begin to control spending in the United States Congress.

First, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) of the Committee on the Budget for bringing forth to this body a truly historic budget, the most fiscally responsible budget we have seen since the Reagan era, a budget that is serious about protecting the family budget from the Federal budget.

But a combination of hope and fear has propelled me, on behalf of the Republican Study Committee, to offer an alternative budget. The hope is, as historic as the gentleman's budget is, maybe given the seriousness of the challenge we have, maybe we can do just a little bit better on spending discipline. My fear is, as great as the budget is that the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) has brought to this House, I want it to be a real budget. I want to ensure that we have the mechanisms in place to ensure that we enforce the spending discipline.

How does this particular budget differ from the committee budget? There are a number of similarities, but let me describe a couple of differences. Whereas in the chairman's budget we have a discretionary savings of a little less than 1 percent, this budget would achieve savings of roughly 2 percent. It would further double the reconciliation savings in the Nussle budget. And finally, it includes a number of enforcement mechanisms to ensure that we can live with this budget, that the budget is something more than a suggestion, the budget is something more than a goal or an aspiration, that it is actually a limit on spending, that we draw a line in the sand and say we are going to take this much money away from American families and say this is it, we are going to live within our budgets.

Mr. Chairman, budgets tend to be about priorities; and, indeed, this budget, the Republican Study Committee budget, is about priorities. We have a priority of saving Social Security, and we congratulate our President for bringing this issue to the American people. I believe when the American people focus on Social Security, what

they will realize is that government has been part of the problem. They have raided the Social Security trust fund 59 times. Government took the money away from Social Security; government should give the money back.

How does government give the money back? Government can grow at a slower rate than it has in the past. The second theme of this budget, the second priority of this budget, is we believe we have to protect the family budget from the Federal budget. Is there really a compelling reason as families have to get around their kitchen table and have to make tough decisions that we in Congress cannot do the same thing? We do not believe that the Federal budget should grow faster than the family budget, and this budget achieves that goal.

Finally, we believe a budget ought to be a limit on spending. We ought to decide, subject to emergency spending that we understand, that we ought to draw a line in the sand and say this is all we care to take away from the American people; and when we tell the American people this is our budget, then this is the budget that we will live with.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) be permitted to control 10 minutes, or half of the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) for 10 minutes.

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

I will vote against this budget, and let me say why. It is because of my responsibility and duty to protect the base bill, the base resolution, the product that was worked and crafted in a very genuine way through the committee process, one that has the support of our majority, one that has the support of our leadership, one that has the support of our chairman, and one that I dare say has, and I believe has, the support of my friends who bring forth the budget resolution tonight.

As I said before when the Congressional Black Caucus came forth, anyone who has the guts to come out here with their own budget I have to applaud. I may oppose it, but I have to applaud it because I know what it takes to put together a budget. Whether the alternative budget has one person who supports it or 80 Members or 218 Members to support it, I commend the coalition for coming forth with their budget. I said the same to the Congressional Black Caucus because they have done this in a very responsible way every year I have been in Congress and for many year before. I really mean that. Anyone who is willing to put the sweat equity into it gets my admiration.

I reluctantly oppose this alternative because if given the opportunity to have a perfect world could we, should we work for more spending control? Yes, there is no question. For all of the haranguing that happens out here about the cuts, we know there are a lot more weeds in the garden we could pull; we know there is more reform that we could drive. We know we could work harder and probably find more spending to control.

We have some practicalities, however. One is we have some committees that have to do the work of achieving those reforms. I have worked with each one of those committees and the committee chairmen to arrange the agreements which bring the base resolution here today; and I respect that process, and I will support that process.

In addition, we have a President who is for really I think the first time since I have been in Congress willing to step up during a very challenging time in our Nation's history when we are at war and say even though it would be easy to use the war as an excuse and not worry about what is happening on the domestic side, the President of the United States has said we are going to control spending, work on the entitlement programs, and try to reform the programs and to meet the needs out there.

The fact that the RSC comes forward with a budget that goes a little further, as I say, I respect that; but I do not think that we are going to get the support behind it that we need in order to get it done. At the end of the day, that is what we need. We need the budget to pass so we have something to enforce.

I want to speak to that briefly because as congressional watchers may have seen or misinterpreted, the intramural discussion that went on and fighting that may have seemed to be happening between friends and colleagues, I interpret what the RSC was doing, the Republican Study Committee was doing with regard to enforcement to be the exact right attitude to have. That is if you are going to do the work of having a budget, then let us enforce it.

The good news from my standpoint is last year when we were not able to get a budget through both bodies, the House took the version we passed, we deemed it, and we enforced it. We stuck to it. At the final analysis of the Congressional Budget Office when all of the smoke cleared and they finally were able to close all of the books, you know what we blew that budget by, a $2.4 trillion budget, and we missed it by $400 million.

Now Members could say we missed it, but I would say for not having a budget in both the House and Senate and not having the budget being the force of law with the President, I would say that is a pretty good track record and one that I give a lot of credit to our Speaker, in particular, for having accomplished. I give them much credit not only on the work product of coming forward with a budget, but also their desire to enforce it. I stand ready to work shoulder to shoulder and side by side with them as we not only get that budget done, but enforce the budget the rest of the year. I commend them on their work product, and I reluctantly will vote against their budget.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for his kindness in providing time for me and also the chairman for providing the time he has provided to other Congressional Black Caucus members.

Mr. Chairman, I am both pleased and proud today on the alternative budget that we, the Congressional Black Caucus, have crafted. It is a sensible and fiscally responsible budget that takes into consideration the needs of the average working American. This budget does not cater to the wealthy, but addresses the needs of ordinary Americans coping with the daily economic challenges that they face such as education, jobs, and housing. In short, Mr. Chairman, the CBC alternative budget works toward eliminating disparities in housing, small businesses, economic, educational, and other disparities created by the administration's fiscal year 2006 budget.

First, as we all know, a sound education is a stepping stone to economic opportunity, success, and prosperity. The CBC alternative budget has a comprehensive approach to education and training by increasing funding for education and training programs by $23.9 billion over the majority budget. It provides funds for school construction, fully funds No Child Left Behind, and provides critical funding for Head Start, Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness Programs, and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA. For those in college, the CBC budget appropriates $450 million for Pell grants. In addition, the CBC budget funds the Perkins loan programs, job training, and vocational education programs that are critical in today's global economy.

Our young people, particularly African Americans, are lagging in education when compared to other groups. This budget aims to close the achievement gap here at home while making our students more competitive worldwide. The CBC understands that Federal support for community and regional development helps promote growth in economically distressed urban and rural areas. To remedy these economic disparities, the CBC budget ensures that the community development block grant programs will continue to improve housing conditions in low- to moderate-income neighborhoods.

Our budget adds $1.5 billion to CDBG grants and improves housing conditions for moderate-income families. I cannot emphasize enough the importance of CDBG grants. They assist cities and counties with creating jobs, increasing economic development opportunities, and expanding homeownership. CDBG provides for these services in a way that recognizes the unique needs of distressed areas in rural, urban, and suburban communities. It is the signature program for cities and counties to stimulate local economies. I know that from experience because I once served as the mayor pro tempore on the city council for Carson, California.

In 2004, CDBG assisted 168,938 households across America with their housing needs, including financial assistance, construction, rehabilitation, and other improvements. At least 95 percent of the funds support activities benefiting low- and moderate-income families.

The alternative CBC budget also allocates funding to the Small Business Administration and the Manufacturing Extension Partnership and provides additional funding for adult training and dislocated workers programs. By supporting these programs, the CBC is working to close the existing economic disparities in the United States and to help entrepreneurs and ordinary Americans realize the American Dream.

The CBC alternative budget also allocates additional funding for enforcement initiatives such as juvenile justice and prison reentry programs. The CBC understands we need to protect the homeland, and our budget adds $2 billion to meet urgent homeland security needs that face our Nation. The alternative budget therefore devotes additional resources for guarding against terrorist attacks through our rail and ports, including cargo screening that prevents nuclear or radiological weapons from entering the United States.

It also supports essential funding for the Centers for Disease Control to help us prepare for a possible biological attack. The CBC alternative budget ensures that cities, towns, and hamlets will receive the resources that are urgently needed to protect our citizens, resources that are absolutely needed for our cities and towns.

We can accomplish this, all of these priorities, by reducing the tax cuts from 2001 and 2003 from an individual's adjusted gross income that exceeds $200,000 and closing tax loopholes. I urge all of my colleagues to support this budget.

□ 2115

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), a member of the Budget Committee and a budget leader within the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, before I begin, let me just say that in addition to rising in support of this amendment budget, I also rise to support the efforts of the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) that he has done to move us in the right direction with the budget that he has released.

It was just a short time ago that I had the opportunity to finish reading a book by Chuck Colson which is entitled ''How Now Shall We Live''. And it is a title that is an intriguing title. It is a question that we really should all ask ourselves all the time. How shall we conduct ourselves in our private lives, in our lives with our families and our lives in our community, in our lives in our society, and it is really a question that every Member of Congress should be asking ourselves every day as we come down to the floor.

Now, with families, how shall we live. Well, we ask our families to do a simple thing, to live within our means. Families have many ways that we can be spending our money, on trips, on schools, on property, on houses and fancy cars. But at the end of the day, a responsible family knows it has to spend no more than it takes in at the end of the year and must live within its means because if it does not what will the family be doing but simply passing that financial burden on to their children and their grandchildren.

So Congress really has to set an example, and I guess you could say in a way we have been setting an example for years. But we have been setting a terrible example for families for years, and it is about time that we set a good one.

I serve on the Budget Committee, and if you ever come to those meetings you will see, from the other side of the aisle especially, their ways to live within our means is to increase the means by increasing the revenue by raising taxes, and they just did it last week again.

I have never had anyone explain to me how we improve the economy by taking more money out of the family budget and sending it down here to Washington so that we can spend it. So raising taxes obviously is not the answer to living within our means. It is spending less.

Just like families who have lots of things that we can spend money on, Congress has lots of things that we can spend money on and if you come to the budget meetings you will see. Every agency, every department, every program that comes before us, they all say the same thing basically, that they want more money to spend.

As a matter of fact, if you sat on a budget hearing last year you saw the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), who, where we put charts up on all the time of these various things, spending requests and what have you, the gentleman from Minnesota asked a question. He said, could you put up a chart behind us of all the agencies, all the programs, all the departments that have ever come before us to ask for their program, for their department to spend less money. And we all looked at the chart, and there was nothing on the chart, because no one ever asks for less money in Washington because we know we always spend more.

So I am rising in support of the bill sponsored by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) because it moves us in that right direction. It moves us in the direction of spending within our means. And how does it do it? Not really hard at all. One of the things it does is it limits our spending on nonsecurity discretionary by reducing the spending by 2 percent. 2 percent. Many families have to do that all the time. It is not a heavy lift to reduce our spending in that area. We should be able to do the same thing.

The second area is by reducing the growth in mandatory spending from 6.4 to 6.1 percent. We are still increasing spending there by almost twice the increase in the inflation rate, but we are just lowering the curve a little bit.

So how now shall Congress live? We shall live as families have to live, within their means. And this bill sponsored by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) does do that.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield a minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is very interesting listening to my colleagues make a presentation on their budget. And I would ask them really the real question, this is not about what Congress would do. This is about the needs of the American people.

It is interesting that if there was a serious intent about a budget that really was fair and did not burden the children of the future, we would not be adopting both the gentleman from Iowa's budget and the gentleman from Texas' budget, $1.5 trillion in new tax cuts over the next 10 years as proposed by the President and taking every single penny from Social Security.

The budget that is on the floor right now does nothing to close the disparities between African Americans, Hispanics and others less fortunate than others in the United States of America.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget, fair, balanced, closing the deficit, protecting our troops, but it understands protecting Medicaid and education funds and health care funds and homeland security.

The budget that is on the floor today now supports a trillion dollars plus in tax cuts and does nothing for catastrophic possibilities that may happen, such as a terrorist attack. This is the wrong direction to go. The Congressional Black Caucus closes the disparities and supports the investment in the American people.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), one of the most fiscally responsible Members of Congress.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for helping put together this package and for all the work that he has done on behalf of the Republican Study Committee and for all of my colleagues there that have worked so hard on this alternative budget.

I want to also commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for the budget that is presented here. It makes cuts of .7 percent in nondefense discretionary.

Finally, we are actually doing what families would do when a large deficit looms in the future, though we need to do far more than that. This budget would cut 2 percent. When you look at what lies ahead, when you look at the unfunded liabilities that lie ahead, this is kid stuff. We are going to have to do much, much more in the future. If we are inching toward bankruptcy in Social Security, we are flat running toward it with Medicare. And when you look at the liabilities there, we added $7 trillion in unfunded liabilities with the Medicare prescription drug bill, for example, that we are going to have to somehow deal with, that our kids and grandkids are going to have to somehow deal with.

We have got to get ahold of this deficit. The problem is not tax cuts. That is part of the solution. We need more revenue coming in. You do that by cutting taxes. We have seen that time and time again. The problem here is spending. There is a culture of spending in this institution that is just difficult to stop. This alternative budget makes some progress toward that end, but I again want to stress this is kid stuff compared to what we are going to have to do in the coming years to get a handle on this culture of spending.

I commend my colleagues for putting this forward. I urge this House to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to an observation the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) made that this was the most fiscally responsible budget since the Reagan years. I was surprised, first of all, that he chose the Reagan years as a frame of reference. Those are the years that the mushroom deficits first appeared. We had deficits of $200 billion, 5.6 percent of GDP in the early 1980s. It took us 15 years to get to those deficits. That would not be the kind of model that I would choose. If you want something to model a budget after, then there is a much more recent and much more valid model and that is what we did in 1990, 1993 and 1997.

In 1990, both sides sat down, President Bush took part in the negotiations through his staff and we came to the first agreement for the settlement of the budget deficit. The Bush balanced budget agreement of 1990 and 1991, laid the foundation for what we accomplished in the 1990s. In 1993, we did the Clinton budget. In 1997, we finished it up with the Balanced Budget Act. All of those acts contained three elements, the PAYGO rule which we are proposing to reinstate, caps on discretionary spending backed up by sequestration, and a multiyear 5-year budget, not just a 1-year budget but a 5-year budget with goals to attain each year. That is what is lacking here, the budget process, the budget discipline, the budget plan.

If you want to see where this budget is likely to lead us, I would like to say once again that everybody should look in his mail and he or she will find an analysis of the President's budgetary proposals for fiscal year 2006. This is essentially the President's budget with a few changes to it, but it is basically his budget. As I have said, you only have to read two pages. You come to table 1.1 and you look in the far right-hand column and you will see the total debt accumulation according to CBO that will be incurred if we follow the President's budget through 2015. That total is $5.135 trillion and that is before anything for fixing the alternative minimum tax which CBO tells us is going to cost at least $640 billion, and before anything is added to the cost side of the ledger for the war in Iraq. This is where we are going if we adopt this budget, right back where we were in 1980 with the budget that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) said he admired so much as fiscally responsible.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, growing government and putting us on a path to doubling taxes on the American people meets nobody's definition of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA), a real leader on budget enforcement in this Congress.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time and I thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership on this very important issue which I think is one of the most important issues that our Nation faces in the long term.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hensarling amendment. I do so because of a lot of reasons. I do so because the amendment in this budget is about simplification. It changes our budget functions from 19 that are really unrelated to the way we spend money around here to four simple budget functions, defense, homeland security, nondefense discretionary and mandatory spending, making the budget much simpler and easier to understand. It is about honesty. It creates a rainy day fund where we actually budget for emergencies. Every single year we spend Federal money on emergencies but we never budget for them. It seems to me if we know we are going to spend money, we ought to be honest and we ought to budget for it. It also is about accountability. It makes all of us more accountable because it has mechanisms on how we can enforce the budget which I think is the least we can do is pass a budget and stick by it and do what we say we are going to do to the American people. But most of all it is about fiscal responsibility. It starts the process of moving from the measurement of success on how much we spend to how well we spend. It does so in a way, as has been pointed out, it reduces nondefense discretionary spending by 2 percent, it reduces the size of growth in government in mandatory spending by just a little bit, and there will be those that say this is very draconian. But it reminds me of a lot long ago when I was in the private sector and I was in other budget process meetings, I would sit down with general managers of the business and I would say, your expense budget is reduced and maybe it is reduced by as much as 10 percent. You might expect the world was going to come to an end, we were going to lose all our customers, we were going to lose all our employees, but every single year the fact of the matter was that at the end of the year after we reduced our expense budget and we measured how well we spend not by how much we spend, we grew our market share, we served our customers better, our employees were more secure in their employment because our company was stronger and more successful. In other words, we learned how to do more with less and we were better off for it.

I think that government should be no exception because no family and no business is an exception to the challenges that we face. This budget gets us on the path of being able to meet those challenges in a very responsible way. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), an outstanding freshman Member.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I want to first start by thanking the gentleman from Texas for offering this budget alternative. I think it is a fiscally conservative, sane budget and I think it is much needed here in Washington, D.C. Furthermore, I would like to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for putting forward a very strong, fiscally conservative, reasonable budget for the American people that is not just good for our priorities here in Washington, D.C., like funding national defense, like funding homeland security, but it is also a good way to rein in government spending and eliminate government programs that have gotten out of control and maybe are not responsive to individual taxpayers.

□ 2130

So I compliment our chairman in that regard.

But, Mr. Chairman, the reason why I address the House tonight is because

we have a better alternative, a much more fiscally alternative budget put before us by the gentleman from Texas. This budget would further reduce spending, would further rein in government growth, and would take on the mandatory spending programs that are going to bankrupt our country.

What the gentleman from Texas does with this alternative budget is rein in government spending and mandatory programs further, further reduce nondiscretionary spending, while at the same time funding the President's budget when it comes to defense and homeland security, two top priorities of this Congress. But, additionally, it continues the tax cuts. It continues returning the taxpayers' money to them at home.

So I think it is important that we keep all those notions in mind as we vote for this budget. I encourage those on the other side of the aisle who ask for more fiscal discipline to come on over and vote for this budget because it is a reasonable thing to do, the right thing to do. It is the right thing to do for the taxpayers, the right thing to do for the American people; and I encourage them to vote for the budget.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), one of the outstanding conservative leaders of this Congress, the chairman of the 100-member Republican Study Committee.

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), who is a man of principle and a man of personal courage, in his quest to restore fiscal discipline to Washington, D.C. In just a few short years, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) has emerged as a national leader on fiscal restraint in Washington, D.C., and it is an honor for me to be associated with his handiwork in support of the Hensarling amendment.

I too join in the chorus of those conservatives who have spoken tonight in commendation of the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE), who has, in fact, produced the most conservative budget since the historic years of the Reagan administration. And the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), who history may be calling him to other duties sometime soon, will leave a lasting and indelible mark on the budget at the Federal level, and we are grateful for his principled leadership and support as well.

I do support the Hensarling amendment, though, which today was endorsed by the 350,000-member National Taxpayers Union, Americans for Tax Reform, just to name a few, because it is long past time for Congress to put our fiscal house in order.

The OMB estimates the total fiscal outlays in 2005 will be a stunning 33 percent higher than outlays as recently as fiscal year 2001. We have seen extraordinary growth in various departments, including spending in the Department of Education, which has grown at almost twice the rate of even military spending. Spending at the Labor Department will have risen 26 percent during the same period.

The RSC budget, known as the Hensarling amendment, would provide for needed restraint by reducing nondefense-related discretionary spending by 2 percent and calling for $57 billion more in savings than the Committee on the Budget's budget; but better yet, the RSC's budget would dramatically enhance the possibility that Members will adhere to the spending levels set out in the budget resolution by providing bold initiatives in process reform, point of order protection, forcing Congress to define emergency spending and account for it in the budget, creating budget protection accounts that would allow spending cuts to be directed toward deficit reduction or tax relief, just to name a few proposals.

The RSC budget is an opportunity for Members of Congress to vote for the President's number on defense and homeland security and a little bit less than the Committee on the Budget's number on everything else. Voting for the RSC budget is voting for finding more savings in the largest category of Federal spending, mandatory spending. And voting for the RSC budget is voting for a way to enforce the budget that the House passes and to embrace a series of budget process reforms, which, if they are not successful in the Hensarling amendment, may yet be entertained by the 109th Congress in the months and days ahead.

I strongly support the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), his courage, his principle; and I urge support of all of my colleagues of the Hensarling amendment.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

For some people, Mr. Chairman, we just cannot get enough government. But we are drowning in a sea of red ink already.

This is not a debate about how much we are going to spend on health care and education and housing. This is a debate about who is going to do the spending. We believe families should do the spending. We believe good things come from freedom, from opportunity, and freedom for families to choose the health care that is right for them, to choose the education opportunities for their children that are right for them, to find the best job in a competitive market economy. We cannot have unlimited government and unlimited opportunity. The Republican Study Committee believes in unlimited opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, we urge the adoption of this amendment; but should it fail, please, we ask the House to vote for the Nussle budget.

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

As I said before, I rise with reluctant opposition. What the RSC has done is bold; it is worth consideration. It will be part of the consideration as we go through the process, I am sure, throughout the rest of the year as well as we consider the budgets in years to come. But I would ask, as the author of the amendment just did, that while consideration be given that we adopt the underlying bill. And, therefore, I oppose the amendment, but with a great amount of respect and admiration for the work that has been done.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) will be postponed.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1334, PROTECTION OF INCAPACITATED PERSONS ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–20) on the resolution (H. Res. 162) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1334) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the removal to Federal court of certain State court cases involving the rights of incapacitated persons, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 109–21) on the resolution (H. Res. 163) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken tomorrow.

PROTECTION OF INCAPACITATED PERSONS ACT OF 2005

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1332) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the removal to Federal court of certain State court cases involving the rights of incapacitated persons, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1332

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Protection of Incapacitated Persons Act of 2005''.

SEC. 2. REMOVAL OF CERTAIN CASES TO FEDERAL COURT TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF INCAPACITATED PERSONS.

(a) RIGHT OF REMOVAL.—Chapter 89 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1453. Protection of rights of incapacitated persons

''(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, not later than 30 days after available State remedies have been exhausted, an incapacitated person, or the next friend of an incapacitated person, may remove any claim or cause of action described in subsection (b) to the United States district court for the district in which the claim or cause of action arose, or was heard.

''(b) The claim or cause of action referred to in subsection (a) is one in which the State court authorizes or directs the withholding or withdrawal of food or fluids or medical treatment necessary to sustain the incapacitated person's life, but does not include a claim or cause of action in which no party disputes, and the court finds, that the incapacitated person, while having capacity, had executed a written advance directive valid under applicable law that clearly authorized the withholding or withdrawal of food or fluids or medical treatment in the applicable circumstances.

''(c) In hearing and determining a claim or cause of action removed under this section, the court shall only consider whether authorizing or directing the withholding or withdrawal of food or fluids or medical treatment necessary to sustain the incapacitated person's life constitutes a deprivation of any right, privilege, or immunity secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

''(d) The United States district court shall determine de novo any claim or cause of action considered under subsection (c), and no bar or limitation based on abstention, res judicata, collateral estoppel, procedural default, or any other doctrine of issue or claim preclusion shall apply.

''(e) As used in this section—

''(1) the term 'incapacitated person' means a born individual who is presently incapable of making relevant decisions concerning the provision, withholding, or withdrawal of food, fluids or medical treatment under applicable law; and

''(2) the term 'next friend' means an individual who has some significant relationship with the real party in interest, and includes a parent.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 89 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1453. Protection of rights of incapacitated persons.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam 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. 1332, the bill currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1332, the Protection of Incapacitated Persons Act of 2005, which I introduced today with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Madam Speaker, the Florida courts are poised to determine that Terri Schiavo will have her feeding tube removed on Friday. This legislation will protect Ms. Schiavo from starving to death by allowing her to have a Federal court consider her case anew, unrestricted by the findings of the State court.

H.R. 1332 authorizes the removal of cases in State court to U.S. Federal court to vindicate the Federal rights of incapacitated persons under the United States Constitution or any Federal law. Such proceedings would be authorized after an incapacitated person has exhausted available State remedies and the relevant papers must be filed in Federal court within 30 days after the exhaustion of available State remedies.

What is going on in Florida regarding Terri Schiavo is nothing short of inhumane. She is facing what amounts to a death sentence, ensuring that she will slowly starve to death over a matter of weeks. Terri Schiavo, a woman who smiles and cries and who is not on a respirator or any other 24-hour-a-day medical equipment, has committed no crime; and she has done nothing wrong. Yet the Florida courts seem bent on setting an extremely dangerous precedent by saying that we must stop feeding someone who cannot feed herself. Who is next? The disabled or those late in life? This legislation is humane and the right thing, not only to protect Terri Schiavo, but also to reinforce the law's commitment to justice and compassion for all, even the most vulnerable.

The bill applies to anyone who might find themselves in Terri Schiavo's situation, namely, those who are in an incapacitated state and facing a court order authorizing ''the withdrawal or withholding of food or fluids or medical treatment necessary to sustain the incapacitated person's life.'' The bill applies only to incapacitated persons, not to convicted criminals or those facing the death penalty, for example.

Furthermore, it applies only to those who have not executed in advance a written directive, commonly known as a living will, that clearly authorizes the withholding or withdrawal of food, water, and medical treatment in the event the person becomes incapacitated.

What Terri Schiavo and all disabled people deserve in contested cases is for justice to tilt toward life. When a person's intentions regarding whether to receive lifesaving treatment are unclear, the clear choice is to provide an innocent person with the opportunity to have a Federal court provide a ''double-check'' for life under Federal law, unencumbered by the decisions of a State court. A measure of a Nation's commitment to innocent life is measured in its laws by the extent to which the laws go to save it. This bill takes that extra step, not just for Terri Schiavo but for all of us. And I urge every Member of this House to take that step with me and overwhelmingly pass this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2145

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

Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill because it is a dangerously reckless way to deal with some very serious issues.

The Committee on the Judiciary was supposed to have a hearing to examine this legislation, or rather another piece of legislation on this subject. This bill was introduced only a few hours ago. That hearing today was canceled and then we were told that this bill would be brought up.

We are dealing with some of the most difficult issues likely to come before this Congress, end of life issues, discerning the wishes of those unable to speak for themselves, ensuring due process and a fair and careful fact finding process.

Does this legislation do the job, or does it make matters worse? Has anyone looked closely at this bill? Have we

had a hearing? Have we had a markup? Has anyone had a chance to look at the competence of its drafting, at the effects of its language? No.

There is no way to make these judgments easy, even when the expressed desires of the patients are clear and unambiguous. Where there is disagreement on the medical facts or on the wishes of the patient, these cases can be heart rending, and sometimes bitter, beyond the comprehension of those who have been fortunate enough not to have to make those decisions.

Unfortunately, we have no choice. Even a decision to do nothing is a decision with consequences. Someone eventually will have to make that decision, either the patient or someone on behalf of the patient. In a dispute, a court must make the final call. I am grateful that burden has not fallen on my shoulders.

So what does this bill do? It would place the Federal judge and then Federal appellate judges in the middle of a case, after State courts, doctors, family members, counselors and clergy have struggled with that case perhaps for years. After everything is over, everything determined, everything adjudicated, and the participants finally sighing a sigh of relief that it is over, then a Federal judge jumps in.

It does not deal just with feeding tubes. It would allow intervention in any decision affecting any kind of medical care. Read the bill. It even says that the cause of action does not include a claim or cause of action in which no party disputes and the courts find that the incapacitated person while having capacity executed a written directive, et cetera.

What does that mean? It means that after someone writes a living will and says I do not want to be resuscitated, or do not use painful treatment beyond a certain point or whatever, and after the courts in that State have found that that is what happened, that that is what the person meant and that those instructions are to be followed, some busybody from outside can now come in and start the process all over again, notwithstanding the fact finding in the State courts, because we do not trust State courts any more. We do not trust the elected State courts, we want the unelected Federal judges that we normally excoriate in this Chamber. Now suddenly they are trustworthy and we want to come and say they should start a whole new proceeding after everything is over and drag the case on, to the anguish of the family members, for another few years.

This bill allows a large number of people, not just the spouse or a relative, to intervene in these cases, years into the proceeding, or even after everyone thought the proceeding was finished. Even if the incapacitated person has executed a written advance directive, any party can drag the matter into Federal court simply by ''disagreeing.'' That is what the bill says.

Do we have no respect for families? Do we have no respect for the carefully established procedures our State legislatures and courts have set up to wrestle with these difficult situations? Do we have no interest in writing a law for the whole country that might actually do the job right?

Unfortunately, the leadership is determined to vote on this important life or death issue without giving the Members of this House the opportunity to actually look at the issue or even read the bill or to think about it.

These things should not be done in haste tonight. That may be par for the course these days, but it is irresponsible and shows real contempt for the families who will have to live with this.

If you think this is the only way to prevent the disconnection of Terri Schaivo's feeding tube, that we should not legislate this way, we should give Members the opportunity to read bills, we should not ride roughshod over State judiciaries, but here we have an emergency because the case is coming down right away in Florida, consider this: The Florida legislature is considering its own legislation on this matter. There is no need to enact radical legislation unconsidered for the whole country just for this one case. Florida, for better or worse, is addressing it.

We should take back this bill and look at it carefully. People should at least read it. We should hold hearings. We should get expert witnesses. We should tighten up the drafting so that not any busybody can come and insert himself or herself into a family's anguish. We owe American families that much.

I urge that this bill not be passed tonight, and that we stop, look, listen and think.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Protection of Incapacitated Persons Act of 2005, and I rise at this late hour to commend the author of this legislation, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER). I also offer commendation to its lead cosponsor, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Without the vision and the compassion of this chairman and this physician-turned Congressman, we would not be here tonight, and in all likelihood Terri Schiavo's life would begin to end this Friday when her feeding tubes are removed.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) just said, a nation's commitment to life can be judged by the way it treats its most vulnerable. The courts in Florida at this very hour are poised to have Terri Schiavo's feeding tubes removed Friday. But in a stroke of rhetorical and legislative brilliance, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) has instead offered, instead of removing her feeding tubes, that Congress will make it possible to remove her case to Federal court.

Under the protection of the Incapacitated Persons Act of 2005, individuals in an incapacitated state would have the opportunity to have their cases removed to the Federal courts. The District Court's consideration is restricted to determining whether the State court's ruling violates any right, privilege or immunity secured by the Constitution.

I must say I am a bit befuddled by the gentleman from New York's objections to this bill. It seems to me that many of our colleagues on the left are often content, and rightly so, to have the Federal courts defend the constitutional rights of Americans, and here in the case of one of our most vulnerable citizens, the arguments are lost on me as to why as to securing those constitutional rights the Federal District Court would not be the proper jurisdiction.

And with this I close: The Bible tells us we have three duties; to do justice, to love kindness, to walk humbly with our God. This is a deeply meaningful moment to this Member of Congress. I am grateful to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) for his leadership. I am profoundly grateful to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) for his compassion and his vision in bringing this bill to the floor. In so doing, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) brings justice and kindness to the law in this extraordinary case and comes alongside the family of Terri Schiavo to say the American people hear you and are anxious to bring you relief.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this measure this evening.

I must note in passing as I was listening to my colleague from Indiana I know speak from the heart, but I find irony that he talks about perceived inconsistencies by people on our side of the aisle.

I note that this is the same majority party that would seek to deny the Supreme Court the authority to be able to deal with matters that relate to marriage. They think that that is not appropriate for the Federal court. They do not trust the Supreme Court to deal with these personal issues. But if they are thinking that they can continue with efforts to have government interfere with some of the most painful, personal areas, then they are willing to cast aside consistency and move forward.

I have watched as a Member of this Chamber a consistent effort to try and

interpose some people's version of what they sincerely believe from the heart, and I respect that.

But I have watched, for instance, in my State, where citizens have struggled with these sensitive issues of end of life. I come from Oregon. I have watched Oregonians struggle with a question of profound significance of how we are going to deal with end-of-life questions; who is going to have control, where is government going to intervene and how far are we going to extend it.

I have watched for 4 years as the Bush administration has engaged in an assault against the decision of the voters of Oregon, not unelected bureaucrats, not unelected judges. Oregonians, not once, but twice, decided to be the first State in the Union that was going to try and deal with these sensitive personal issues openly and honestly. Because I will tell you that in every State of the Union, every day, decisions are made by physicians and families that end up shortening life, maybe even terminating life.

The difference is in Oregon, that is the first State where we decided we are actually going to have a legal framework that deals with this, that provides guidance. The assisted suicide that we have requires not one but two doctors to work with citizens, to be able to provide a framework, finding among other things that they are at the end of their life, the last 6 months, and that they are not doing this out of an act of desperation or depression.

In fact, there is pretty pervasive evidence that by having this framework and giving people control, there are probably fewer suicides, because people have a sense that they control their own destiny, and that armed with this and a prescription that would end their life, many of them choose not to move forward.

But we have watched the assault against the decision of Oregonians, approved by the voters, by the Bush administration through the courts, that to this point has been thwarted. We found people in this Chamber who have seen fit to criminalize the practice of medicine by injecting the decision of prosecutors to determine the intent of physicians in these most personal of matters. Thus far, at least, it has been resisted.

Well, Madam Speaker, the assault by ideologues and the intolerants who would impose government on these most personal decisions continues. We have seen it in Florida. This is a case in Florida we have all been following, where the politicians repeatedly have been seeking to intervene over the objection of the husband in this case.

The courts in Florida have seen fit to render judgment, but it is not good enough for folks. They want to go ahead over the objection of the parties involved, and they want to remove this to the Federal courts. As I pointed out, the same people that wanted to deny the authority of the Federal courts to deal with issues; for example, of marriage, to interfere with decisions with which they disagree.

You may not be from Oregon or Florida, but make no mistake, this is a drumbeat to take away the authority of citizens to deal with these most personal of matters. No one will be safe if we allow this path to continue. Families, local courts, voters, are going to be overruled by people in their zeal to tell others how to lead their lives.

I strongly urge that this misguided proposal be rejected.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), the principal cosponsor of this resolution.

□ 2200

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I practiced medicine for 15 years prior to my election to this body; and, unfortunately, I personally had to get involved on many instances in cases like this. And I would just share with Members there were instances where I did support families' wishes to withdraw food and water. For me, the dividing line always was, are you prolonging the death? Are you prolonging suffering or are you prolonging life?

The case that has precipitated this piece of legislation does not involve a dying person. It does not involve a person with a terminal disease. It is not a person in a vegetative state. She has an active EEG. She has eyes that respond, a face that tries to smile. She tries to vocalize.

In my opinion, this legislation that the chairman has brought forward is essentially the same thing as the bill I introduced last week. My legal remedy was a habeas corpus method of dealing with it. The chairman has, I believe, actually come up with a better solution; the removal act I think is a better way to deal with this.

I would just simply point out to all of my colleagues, we do not actually in this bill make a determination that her feeding tube will stay in. It simply allows a Federal review to make sure her rights under the Constitution are properly protected, the right to due process, the right to equal protection, and as well her right to life.

The annals of medical history are filled with numerous cases of people in these semi-comatose states who come out of it. And as we all know, the mother and father and the brothers and sisters desperately do not want her to be starved to death and that the original guardian in this case found the testimony of the husband that she, Terri, had prior voiced no life sustaining measures should she ever be in this condition. His testimony was not credible.

Let me tell Members, I have been there; and when people have voiced a sentiment that they do not want heroic measures should they ever be in this type of condition, it is brought up immediately. It is not brought up 7 years later. The person comes in, they have had a stroke, a car wreck and you hear immediately from the family members, Uncle Joe or grandma said if they were ever like this, she would not want life-sustaining measures. You do not have a 7-year pause in this case.

Just to close, we do not actually say this woman will continue to get her feedings. All we simply say is there will be a review; and I think there desperately needs to be a review. This is unprecedented for a judge to order the withdrawal of food and water from somebody. It has never been done before to my knowledge. And then to order that the family members cannot put a glass of water up to her mouth, this constitutes, in my opinion, cruel and unusual punishment.

I commend the chairman for what he has done.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member on the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary, both for his very thoughtful presentation and as well for the difficult position that we are in in highlighting the difficult position we are in to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle and proponents of this legislation that I too do not want to see Miss Schiavo lose her life or begin to lose her life Friday with the termination of any sort of assistance. But we find ourselves in a very complex and difficult posture.

One might argue that the more appropriate vehicle for this particular case is a private relief bill that we believe may be offered in the other body because this is certainly not a poster case for any sort of right way to handle this very tragic circumstance.

I agree with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) that if you had had evidence that someone articulated their desire to not be in this condition, it seems that you would have brought this at an earlier time.

I think what draws me to this particular legislation and wishing that we had been able to do, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) has suggested, and that is to have a full hearing on this matter, is to be able to answer these very difficult questions.

I think what draws me to this initiative is the fact that it does point to the fact that there is no written document, and there is an oral representation by someone that Miss Schiavo does not want to remain in this condition. The written document qualification is, I think, an important aspect of the initiative, and it has merit, and it gives the bill certainly more credibility.

Where I have difficulty, of course, is the definition of ''next friend.'' I think

it is too broad. It lends itself to the criticisms of my colleagues, which is, who is defined as such. We appreciate the passion of the parents of this young woman. I think they have legitimate standing. But ''next friend'' defined as an individual who has some significant relationship, does that mean a church member and family members are fighting against it?

So more thought on this particular bill as it expands itself to incapacitated persons is what I think that we would have needed. I think also we have a circumstance as to whether or not this does mean that you would interfere in all kinds of medical procedures as opposed to this unique and special circumstance. Is a person incapacitated temporarily or for a long period of time? If it is a temporary incapacitation, meaning they have come in with a terrible tragic accident and may have the ability to recover, what does that mean in terms of this particular initiative? Does it then come in at that point or is it a long-term incapacitation?

The idea that someone could argue or could utilize the courts, in this instance the courts in the State of Florida, to act on their desires to eliminate the feeding of an individual to me is abhorrent. But I hope that this legislation would not then be the precedent for interference in a woman's right to choose, and I think this is a difficulty when you jump the legislative process and come from a written legislative initiative and then come to the floor of the House with no opportunity to ask the hard questions and to answer the hard questions as well.

I would hope that the Private Relief Bill that is proposed in the other body is a route that is taken. I believe a bill that is as broad as this one needs a full hearing, and I believe that this also cries out for bipartisanship.

All of us feel the pain that the parents of this young woman are experiencing. All of us feel the pain of the dilemma of the decision-making as to what should happen. And all of us sense that there is a greater opportunity for her, meaning that she should have the opportunity, or many of us feel that she should have the opportunity, to live. I do. But I am certainly concerned that we would put it in this format with no opportunity for a full hearing, no opportunity for amendment, and no opportunity to fully understand the broadness of this legislative initiative.

I think the Federal court and the constitutional provisions have a great deal of merit. I think that this particular party has the right to have their constitutional rights assessed. I would hope that all of us would have that right.

There are those who choose to die and those who choose to live. It would be far better to have done so in a broader way.

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

Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has said that the Private Relief Bill is the way to go rather than the legislation that is before us. If the Private Relief Bill were introduced or came over from the Senate, Terri Schiavo would be dead before we could consider it.

I would draw the Members' attention to rule XIII clause 1(a)(3) of the rules of the House of Representatives that says that the Private Calendar is provided in clause 5 of rule XV to which shall be referred all private bills and all private resolutions.

There is no exception to that.

And rule XV clause 5 says that the private calendar shall be called only on the first Tuesday of every month, and at the Speaker's discretion, in addition, the third Tuesday of the month.

Furthermore, clause 5 of rule XV says that the Speaker may not entertain a reservation of the right to object to the consideration of the bill or resolution under this clause.

That means that private bills go through without debate.

And furthermore, under the clause that I have just cited, two Members may object to the private bill in which case it is recommitted to the committee.

So if only two Members are opposed to a private bill and come to the floor and object, that kills it once and for all.

Now, those are the procedural hurdles against the private bill coming up. And that is why the only way to deal with this issue in a timely manner is through public legislation such as the bill that is currently under consideration.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

The genius of our federalist democracy is that it maximizes the power of people to govern themselves by explicitly requiring that those decisions that can be made at the local level are within the purview of local government. Those decisions that can be managed at a State level are within the purview of the State government, and that only in exceptional cases can Federal power override the power of State and local governments.

This is a very tragic situation. It is a difficult and serious issue. It is one that every State legislature has struggled with. And the laws in our different States are different because the people across our large and diverse democracy differ on some of these issues.

I personally believe that the reason America is still vital and strong is because we are a federalist democracy, and we do have this wonderful vitality and differences in how we govern ourselves at the State level.

For 7 or 8 years this has been a tragic and disputed case in Florida. It has been through the Florida court system. It has had review. And we are setting the precedent in this bill of creating a Federal option when people do not like what the laws they made for their own State deliver to them.

Under our system, they should just change those laws, and they had time to do that. It does not make me happy to speak against this bill. I am not on the committee. I have not had background in it, but I know from talking to many Members on the floor that this is a matter of very deep concern to them. They are very concerned about what we are doing here tonight, and I just want to put on the record not only has this bill had no hearings but Members had no notice. And many Members will be very surprised tomorrow morning to find out that we passed this bill in suspension.

That is an insult to democracy on such an important issue that I regret that this has come to the floor and I personally oppose it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the State of Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for yielding me time.

□ 2215

I stand here as a Member representing the great State of Florida and as someone who served in the Florida Senate when this gut-wrenching issue was debated intensely almost 2 years ago, where we determined that Terri Schaivo would be allowed to have her feeding tube be reinserted by order of the Governor, who had decided that he was going to be able to usurp a court decision. That was ultimately ruled unconstitutional and for very good reason.

There is no doubt that this is a family tragedy. In fact, this is just about the most personal and heart-wrenching of all matters that could arise in any family, but this is a family matter, where there is no room for the Federal Government in this case or in any case that a family has to make the most personal of decisions when dealing with an end-of-life decision.

This case in particular related to Terri Schaivo has been through 10 court decisions, 10 court reviews, and each time the courts have sided with Terri's husband and Terri Schaivo's wishes, where they have ruled that she made it clear that she would not have wished to remain in a persistent vegetative state.

There is no reason on earth why the U.S. government should step in to circumvent the wishes of one dying woman, and the gentleman from Florida, my colleague from the great State of Florida, maintains that Terri is not in a persistent vegetative state. Yet, doctors who have examined her, and I

would imagine that my colleague from the State of Florida has not examined Ms. Schaivo, doctors who have examined her have consistently said that she is in a persistent vegetative state. In fact, it is only physicians who the Schindlers have employed who have said she is not, and they have reviewed her via videotape. The doctors that have actually examined Ms. Schaivo have determined that she in a persistent vegetative state.

The courts independently arrived at the decision that they believe that Terri wished to never remain in a persistent vegetative state. They interviewed her husband, her sister-in-law and friends of the family, but the decision that they reached was based on the testimony independently retrieved from her brother, from her sister-in-law and friends. They all testified that Terri had made her intentions clear.

The court and the doctors that examined Ms. Schaivo found that she has no cerebral cortex; that the reactions and responses that we have seen on TV dozens of time, that she seems to respond to her parents when they talk to her, that those are all reflexive, that they are not direct responses to interaction with people.

The doctors have examined her, again have examined her, that have reviewed her records, that have reviewed her MRIs have said that she is in a persistent vegetative state.

This is a horrible case. No matter what the facts are, it is a horrible case, but Terri Schaivo made her wishes clear, and we should not interject this body, the Federal Government, the United States Congress, into a personal family matter.

We are taking one set of facts for one family, which is the tragedy of one family and applying it to tens of thousands of families who have or will have loved ones in nursing homes, in hospice facilities or even those being kept alive by their families in their own homes. We are reaching all the way into very personal family cases in communities all across the country, and we are trying to apply a one-size-fits-all solution to all of them. That is totally inappropriate, and I think if we ask just about any family in America whether they think it would be okay if the United States Congress made an end-of-life decision for their loved ones, they would resoundingly say no.

I find it particularly hypocritical that those that talk about the defense of marriage now want to interject the Federal Government between a husband and his wife on what was a personal family matter. I ask that we think about how we would feel if, God forbid, our own loved one were in a persistent vegetative state and were in the circumstances and faced the circumstances that Terri Schaivo does. Would we want the United States Congress making the decision or would we want to be involved in that decision ourselves solely on our own?

I think that most families would resoundingly say that they want to make that decision. There but for the grace of God go I.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for yielding me time, and for bringing this bill, H.R. 1334, the Protection of Incapacitated Persons Act, to the floor, and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), my physician colleague, as coauthor of this bill.

I think part of the question here is whether or not Terri Schaivo is truly in a persistent vegetative state. I practiced medicine for 26 years, and in my opinion, no, I have not examined Ms. Schaivo, but I trust my colleague the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON). I agree that she is not in a persistent vegetative state. The pictures of her, we have seen them on television, the balloon that she followed with her eyes, the smiles, the recognition of her family.

I think this lady deserves the right to live, and as a physician Member of this body, I feel very compelled to stand up here and passionately support this bill, and I hope my colleagues on the other side will join us because I think it is the right thing to do.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, this House has seen plenty of outrage, but this is the most outrageous thing I have ever seen.

You come with a bill that is not on the calendar. You pop it out in the middle of the night, when all the Members are down at the White House on the Republican side having dinner with the President. You try and change what is going on in a court because you do not like what is going on in a court.

How do you know what is going to come out of those courts in Florida? Oh, no, let us put it up in a Federal court or let us change everything.

The Members on the other side of this aisle do not believe in process. You do not believe in government by law. You believe in raw power. If you have power, you can bring anything out here at any time and run it through here without any debate and no hearings and no anything. You ought to be ashamed of yourself that you have no shame, that you would come on this floor like this with a bill that is as complicated as this and do it without a single moment of hearing. It is a disgrace.

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

Madam Speaker, I would just refer the membership to the text of the bill on the top of page 3, which says, and I read it, ''In hearing and determining a claim or cause of action removed under this section, the court shall only consider whether authorizing or directing the withholding or withdrawal of food or fluids or medical treatment necessary to sustain the incapacitated person's life constitutes a deprivation of any right, privilege or immunity secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States.''

Now, in every civil rights lawsuit that was removed to Federal court, the Federal court applied privileges and immunities and protections provided by the Constitution of the United States or Federal law, and all this bill does is to allow the same type of review on whether someone's Federal rights are deprived by action of the State court in the Federal court.

If we did not do this in the civil rights revolution of the 1960s, this country would be a lot different place and a lot worse place than it is today. It was Federal judges that applied Federal law in those cases, and if it was good enough to apply them in the civil rights cases of the 1960s, why is it not good enough to deprive a person who is incapacitated the same type of Federal judicial review on their Federal rights in a Federal court?

We should not deprive an incapacitated person of a judicial review in a Federal court of their Federal civil rights, and that is why this bill ought to pass.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Madam Speaker, the phrase that the distinguished chairman just read is a catch-all phrase. If a person thinks a court in a State is depriving someone of civil rights they can go into Federal court under a section 1983 action and say that there is an alleged deprivation of Federal rights under current law.

This is far broader. What we have heard from the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida about the facts of the case are compelling, but I would remind everybody this bill is way beyond the facts of this case.

It establishes for any interested person, someone who has a significant relationship with the incapacitated person, whatever that means, no definition, a right to come in, overturn what the courts have decided, overturn what the family has decided, what she has decided and subject that family to the agony of perhaps years of further litigation.

Maybe that has to be done in some cases, I do not know, but this kind of slapdash legislative procedure with no hearing, no consideration, no real understanding of what this bill does in cases far beyond Terri Schaivo should not be on this House floor tonight, and I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the Chair for allowing me to

speak on this important bill tonight. I thank my colleague from Florida for bringing this issue before us tonight. Truly time is of a critical nature in this case.

Madam Speaker, all I would offer at this point is we would not be here discussing this bill if this patient had written down advance directives prior to her illness, and that is an important point that is being lost in this debate. This bill does nothing to undo a living will or an advanced directive.

An advance directive is available to any of us. A person does not need a lawyer to have one. They can go on the Internet, type in living will under their search engine and they will get a variety of options a person can complete themselves, leave with their family physician, their care giver, their hospital. I would urge people to consider filling out and filing an advance directive well in advance of any such illness and save families, spare families the difficulties that we have seen evidenced in this case.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Madam Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that this is a complicated bill, and it is an unusual procedure that we are bringing this matter before the House of Representatives tonight. However, if we do not deal with this issue, by the time we get around to having hearings and markups and debates and perhaps a conference committee this woman will have died, and that is why I think it shows the compassion of this House of Representatives and those who are supporting this bill to allow a Federal court to view whether or not this woman's civil rights, secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States, have been violated. I think she is entitled to have that kind of a Federal review before a final decision is made on whether to allow her to starve to death or to die of dehydration, and that is why we are here tonight.

It shows that the Congress can be compassionate, and it shows that we can deal with issues promptly, rather than saying oops, maybe something could have been done in the Federal court in a review of her Federal civil rights, but it is too late because she passed away.

Please pass the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1332, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 2230

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to use the time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF PAUL WOLFOWITZ AS PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD BANK

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, having watched that last bill, I continually am surprised in this House that I think I have seen everything, and then I see another one like this one tonight. But on the television today we saw an even more amazing thing. We saw the architect of the Iraq war and all the problems that still remain, the killings, the massacring of civilians, the instability of the government, the inability for them to pick their leadership, their inability to give security to the people of Iraq, we see that every day on the television. It is all the creation of a man named Paul Wolfowitz and his friend, Mr. Rumsfeld, the Secretary of War. The two of them together have put together this disaster that we now face.

Now, one would think that, given the failure of the planning and all of what went on in the Iraq war, you would be about to see the end of Mr. Wolfowitz one way or another. But history has some really interesting things in it.

Some of you may remember the Vietnam War. There was an architect for the Vietnam War. His name was Robert McNamara. Robert McNamara led us into the swamp; 58,000 people died. Tons and tons of folks died on the Vietnamese side. We wasted money. We put ourselves deeply in debt. And when it was over, Lyndon Johnson made him the head of the World Bank. Who would think that today the President of the United States would reward a man who has created the mess in Iraq with the job of being the head of the World Bank?

Now, what does the World Bank do? At the end of the Second World War we set up four institutions. We set up the World Bank, the United Nations. We set up the International Monetary Fund. They were all to stabilize what was going on economically and tie us together in trade.

And we take a man who is an avowed American imperialist, who believes in establishing hegemony across the whole world on the base of military power. That is really what the neocons believe. And the President says, you know, this is just the kind of guy we need at the head of the World Bank.

What does the World Bank do? Well, if a country wants to build a dam or they want to do some road improvement projects or they want to do some AIDS prevention or some AIDS treatment, they come to the World Bank and ask for loans. Imagine the world coming to the feet of Paul Wolfowitz and trying to get him to understand about rebuilding. This is a man who has flattened Afghanistan and flattened Iraq, has come in here and asked for $80 billion again and again and again, even today, 80 more billion dollars, and they still do not have the water running and the sewage moving, and they do not have electricity, and they do not have the basic requirements of a civil society in Iraq. And he comes in here, now to be the head of the World Bank. We are going to give him billions of dollars to hand out to the world to rebuild the very mess that he created. What in the world is the President thinking?

I suppose he thinks, well, maybe, you know, Paul created all those problems over there, bombed everything and led our neocon ideas, that if we could just get enough power, we just bomb enough, you could have a city like Fallujah in Iraq. It is a city of about 400,000 people. It is flat. Just like we did in the Second World War to Dresden, and we did with the atomic bomb in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. He flattened that city.

Well, that was to save it, you know, because they were so resistant in that city to American democracy that the only solution Paul Wolfowitz and his confreres in the department of war could think of was to bomb it flat. And now he is the World Bank president, and he will be letting the loans to put Fallujah back on its feet. Man, I have seen everything.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. OSBORNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

ALCOHOL AND NCAA ADVERTISING IS A BAD MIX

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Madam Speaker, I do know Paul Wolfowitz and I guess I do not recognize the Paul Wolfowitz I know in comparison with the recent remarks. I hope people will evaluate him on what he has accomplished, which I think is rather substantial.

Madam Speaker, this weekend the NCAA basketball tournament begins. The tournament advertising provides millions of dollars to fund the NCAA. It is the primary source of funds for the NCAA. In 2003, alcohol producers spent $52 million on 4,747 beer commercials on college sports. Nearly one-half of the $52 million spent on alcohol advertising in 2003 was spent on the basketball tournament. Alcohol is the primary product marketed on NCAA sports broadcasts today.

I think this is a bad idea. Why? Number one, this advertising violates the NCAA's own bylaws. The NCAA bylaws, according to their handbook, are as follows: ''Advertising policy of the association are designed to exclude those advertisements that do not appear to be in the best interest of higher education.''

The leading cause of death on college campuses is alcohol related; 1,400 college students die each year from alcohol-related injuries. We have lost 1,500 in Iraq in 2 years, and we agonize over those deaths. We have 1,400 annually that die on college campuses. More than 70,000 students are victims of alcohol-related sexual assault, 500,000 students are injured under the influence of alcohol each year, and two of five college students currently are binge drinkers and sometimes are problem drinkers.

It does not seem to me that it is very logical that we would have the major social problem on college campuses be alcohol, and on the other hand turn around and use our athletic teams to promote alcohol advertising. It seems inconsistent, and it does seem to be in my mind at least to violate the bylaws of the NCAA.

Furthermore, the average young person today starts consuming alcohol at age 13, not 23, not 21. Age 13. So this has some tremendous implications I would like to discuss a little bit further because even though we are concerned about alcohol consumption on college campuses, and this is very damaging, I am even more concerned about alcohol consumption of teenagers because kids identify with athletes. Kids like sports. They see athletes on the television screen and in the stadium, and they want to be like the athletes, and there is a subtle connection between what they see on the courts and on the field and what they see on the commercials, which usually are young people, attractive people having a good time involved in alcohol-related activities. Therefore, there is a definite lure and a movement to move those kids toward consumption of alcohol.

The younger children are when they start to drink, the more alcoholism results. In other words, a young person who starts using alcohol at age 15 or earlier is 400 percent more likely to become alcohol-dependent than someone who starts consuming alcohol when they are the legal drinking age of 21. This causes tremendous devastation of these young people.

Also the younger you are when you start consuming alcohol, the more cognitive dysfunction occurs. Hence the second graph I would like to point out here. These are images of a teen, of teen brain activity performing memory tests. This is a 15-year-old male nondrinker. The brain is firing pretty well. This is a 15-year-old male heavy drinker. This is a young person not under the influence of alcohol, but someone who uses alcohol regularly and is a heavy drinker. You can see the differences in cognitive function. You can see the differences, the problem-solving ability that would be changed in these cases.

So our young people are having a difficult time because of alcohol. At the present time it is estimated that there are 3 million teenagers who are full-blown alcoholics. And those addicted to other kinds of drugs would number probably in the hundreds of thousands. It is a huge problem, much more weighted toward alcohol consumption.

Also alcohol kills six times more young people than all illicit drugs combined. So methamphetamine, cocaine, heroin, we can lump them all together, and alcohol kills six times more young people than all of those drugs combined. Also, under-age drinking costs the United States $53 billion annually, a huge cost.

So I think that we should really rethink this policy of the NCAA. There is no question that under-age drinking is still going to occur even if that advertising policy were to change.

Madam Speaker, I would say in conclusion that alcohol advertising on NCAA sports, number one, appears to violate the NCAA's own bylaws. And, secondly, such advertising promotes alcohol consumption on the college campus and also on the junior high school and on the high school campus. This is certainly very negative as far as our country is concerned.

I hope my colleagues will join me in simply urging through a resolution that the NCAA cease and desist this practice of alcohol advertising on amateur sports, particularly NCAA sports, because it does appear to be in violation of their own bylaws.

□ 2245

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRIBUTE TO DR. MELVIN E. BANKS

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

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to recognize Dr. Melvin E. Banks of Chicago, Illinois, on his company's 35th anniversary. Dr. Banks is the owner of Urban Ministries, Incorporated, which is the largest African American owned and operated Christian publishing and media company.

At the age of 12, Dr. Banks discovered the Lord and his subsequent calling after sharing his testimony on the back roads of Birmingham, Alabama. At that time an elderly gentleman overheard his testimony and provided the young Banks with a Bible verse that would have significant impact on his future pursuits. Hosea 4:6 states, ''My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge.'' Upon hearing those words, Dr. Banks knew immediately that God's purpose for his life was to help spread knowledge of the gospel from an African American perspective.

After founding Urban Ministries in 1970, Dr. Banks and his small staff operated out of the basement of his home for 12 years. As Dr. Banks' faith grew, so did his media ministry. In 1982, Urban Ministries occupied the second floor of a building located at 1439 West 103rd street in Chicago, Illinois. Guided by a vision that others did not see, Dr. Banks moved Urban Ministries in 1996 to its current 46,000 square foot headquarters in the Chicagoland area.

Today, Urban Ministries serves over 40,000 Sunday school teachers throughout the United States, Haiti, the Bahamas, Nigeria and South Africa. Under Dr. Banks' leadership, souls have been touched and prayers have been answered as Urban Ministries moves closer to its goal of reaching every black Christian church with Christian education products and services.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Banks holds a Bachelor's Degree from Moody Bible Institute as well as undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate degrees from Wheaton College in Illinois.

So on this day, I congratulate Dr. Banks on this momentous milestone in his company's history. My fellow colleagues, please join me in extending best wishes to Dr. Banks on 35 years of success and for another 35 years of success that surely will be approaching.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CHILD PREDATOR ACT OF 2005

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, media stories about sex crimes against children are presently being reported at an alarming rate in the United States. These crimes are also some of the most underreported of criminal acts. Last month in Colorado, an ex-convict for sexual assault of a child, a child predator, continued his dastardly deeds against kids and assaulted several children. This child molester was able to slither and sneak into a quiet Colorado community and prey on the innocent children because of registration loopholes in current law.

One of the victim's grandmothers said, ''People have the right to know where sex offenders are living. The police should know. The public should know.'' We know the number one thing child predators desire is to remain anonymous. Those days are over. No longer can ex-convicts for child sexual assault move in and out of our neighborhoods without us knowing who they are. While some States have registration laws for convicted child predators, when those criminals move across State lines, they slip through the system.

We know that the recidivism rate of a convicted child molester is extremely high. When many leave the penitentiary, they continue their evil ways against our greatest natural resource, our children.

So today, Madam Speaker, I am introducing my first bill, the Child Predator Act of 2005, to hold these outlaws accountable and impose tougher sentences for child predators who reoffend. This act closes loopholes in the present law and places tools in the hands of parents who want to safeguard their children from these people. This legislation amends the Wetterling Act of 1994 in six ways.

First, the Child Predator Act defines the term ''child predator'' as a person who has been convicted of a sexual offense against a victim who is a minor if the offense is sexual in nature and the minor is 13 years of age or younger.

Second, child predators must report change of residence within 10 days of a move.

Third, the Child Predator Act requires community notification. Child predators would have to notify, at a minimum, schools, public housing and at least two media outlets such as newspapers, television stations or radio stations covering that community.

Fourth, child predators who knowingly fail to register would be charged with a Federal felony.

Fifth, the Child Predator Act would also mandate a national registration database. This would be available on a free access Internet Web site.

Finally, the Child Predator Act would require prominent designation of a convicted offender as a child predator.

The National Center For Missing and Exploited Children confirms that the sexual victimization of children is overwhelming in magnitude, yet largely unrecognized and underreported in the United States. Statistics reveal that one in five girls and one in 10 boys are sexually exploited before they reach adulthood. Less than 35 percent of those child sexual assaults are reported to authorities.

While through previous legislation we have significantly reduced the prevalence of this terrible and real nightmare to children, we must stay the course. We must remain ever vigilant and keep in this fight. Child predators, like their criminal counterparts in other arenas, are innovative. They stalk neighborhoods, playgrounds, Cub Scout dens, houses of worship, and as of late they exploit the Internet to target youngsters.

Madam Speaker, we must put child predators on notice and let them know once and for all that we will not tolerate this continuing victimization of children. I wish to extend an invitation for Members of this body to consider enlisting in the Victims Rights Caucus that I recently founded and cochair with the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS).

During my 22 years as a felony court judge in Houston, Texas, I have seen scores of victims come through my courtroom. Ironically, as large a contingent that victims are, they are one of the most underrepresented groups in the United States. This session of Congress, in cooperation with my fellow representatives, I hope to change this.

We must always remember that victims do not choose to be victims. As L.H. Harrington of the President's task force on victims of crime once said, ''Somewhere along the way, the criminal justice system began to serve lawyers, judges and defendants. Victims are treated with institutionalized disinterest. The neglect of crime victims is a national disgrace.''

Madam Speaker, to be a victim is an unforgettable nightmare but to become a victim at the hands of the criminal justice system is an unforgivable travesty. The first duty of government is to protect its citizens. We as a people are not judged by the way we treat the rich, famous and influential but by the way we treat the weak, the innocent, the children.

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NO DEMOCRACY IN THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, we have just concluded our legislative day. A number of incidences and legislative initiatives have been addressed that I would like to comment on in this opportunity that I have during this special order.

We just completed our discussion dealing with incapacitated persons. I do want to remind my colleagues that the issue is not to ignore the tragedy of the case in Florida, it is to recognize the broadness of the responsibility of the Members of the United States Congress. The point that I made earlier, that I wish to clarify, is that I too would not like to see this loss of life if there is some alternative. But I did suggest that because this legislation that has just passed the floor of the House would have had a better approach, which is to have a full hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary and other committees of jurisdiction, that the same relief could have been given to this distressed situation by offering a private relief bill.

The opposition noted that a private relief bill would take a long time through the legislative process. Let me remind my Republican colleagues who are in the majority that rules could have been waived to move a private relief bill forward expeditiously as quickly as any bill that we have just put on the floor. So it is certainly a misstatement for anyone to rise to the floor of the House and suggest that an action of a private relief bill could not have brought relief and that the party in question in Florida might be dead before that occurred when they know full well that this House is controlled by Republicans and if they desired to move a private relief bill forward quickly, it could have been done.

And then, Madam Speaker, I want to quickly comment on a bill that appeared before us in the Committee on the Judiciary where not one single Democratic amendment was accepted.

In fact, the Republican majority made it very clear that they had a perfect bill from the Senate and they really did not want to do anything in the Committee on the Judiciary. So when amendments were offered by Democrats to protect veterans, it was denied. When amendments were offered

by Democrats to increase the allowance for private and parochial schools that might be exempted when someone filed for bankruptcy, it was disallowed. When we asked to protect those who are paying the tuition of their children, it was disallowed. When we asked for relief dealing with identity theft debts, when someone would steal your credit cards, debt would pile up and all of a sudden you might have to pay that for some ridiculous reason, we asked for relief in that instance, it was denied.

When we asked for relief for those who were sexually assaulted and therefore we did not want the liability to be extinguished when someone went into the bankruptcy court, it was denied. It was denied that if you received dollars through a natural disaster such as the terrible flooding and hurricanes in Florida and you wanted to protect those dollars that you got from a natural disaster against a bankruptcy filing, it was denied.

Frankly, the democracy in this body has simply been denied. Democracy has shut down. This is a one-party government, one party in the administration, one party in the House, one party in the Senate, and there is no room for democracy. What a shame on us that we would push democracy in Afghanistan and Iraq and around the world, places that I have been, and we simply cannot have democracy in this body on behalf of the American people.

Let me also suggest that I am looking forward to responding to the request by Supreme Court Justice Rehnquist by offering a court security act for 2005 which responds to Justice Rehnquist and other Supreme Court Justices asking for more protection of judges and courthouses in America. It is a travesty that we would have the terrible, tragic act in Atlanta and the killing of the relatives of a judge in Illinois. It is time now to provide resources, training and, of course, security mechanisms to ensure that justice does occur, justice by way of protecting our courts and our court systems and all the parties who go into our court system for fairness and justice. I hope my colleagues will join me when I file the Securing American Courts Act of 2005. We owe our justice system that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THIRTYSOMETHING CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I just want to say that it is an honor again to address the House and the American people, also. I am sharing this hour today with the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), also. It is a pleasure to be here on the floor with her one more time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Once again it is a pleasure to be here with you.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, if I may take just a moment to talk about a friend of ours and a pillar in Florida. Mr. Bill Lehman, Congressman William Lehman went on to glory today. He served our country well. He was blessed to be here for some 91 years. He passed away with his family by his side. He served in the 17th Congressional District, Madam Speaker, from the time of 1973 to 1992 with great distinction.

□ 2300

He was one of the longest serving, if not the longest serving, chairmen of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and did good works while he was here. A quiet man but a man that enjoyed to have a good time, and we will appropriately honor him with an hour here on the floor, designated by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), Democratic leader, at a later date, with reflections of friends that served with him in the Congress and also those Members who knew him well. And we send our prayers and appreciation to his family for allowing him to serve this great government of ours and play his role in democracy as the annals will reflect.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. My colleague from Florida is always so eloquent, and one of the things that has struck me from the time I have been privileged to serve in the Congress, for about 10 weeks now, is that we really stand on the shoulders of giants in this Chamber and there are precious few that fall into that category and that deserve that accolade. And Congressman Lehman was most definitely one of them.

I am privileged to represent a good portion of his district. I can only hope, as I am sure the gentleman can because he also represents a portion of his former district, that both he and I and our colleagues from South Florida can even begin to fill his shoes. Certainly it is our responsibility to carry on his legacy, and I know that is what we will strive to do every day on this floor, and I look forward to the hour that will be devoted to his life.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity. Not only I, but former Congresswoman Carrie Meek, the three of us had an opportunity to take a picture together. Congressman Lehman, in 1972, in the newly created 17th Congressional District, he ran for it. As the gentlewoman knows, he served in local government also and ran for that seat and won. So we are the only three that have served in the 17th Congressional District, and that was a good time. We have an opportunity to celebrate not only his life, but we will have an opportunity to celebrate his spirit for years to come. And I know that he is there with his good friend, Dante Fascell, and they are talking about old times when they used to run this House.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That is right, Madam Speaker. And if the gentleman will continue to yield, the one thing I want to add is that for those who did not know Congressman Lehman, his name was far more widely known because there are far too numerous to mention car dealerships across Florida and, quite honestly, Congressman Lehman was a leader in transportation for good reason, because there are thousands and thousands of drivers who began their driving careers thanks to Mr. Lehman and his family. And he has been not just a pillar of the community but a giant when it comes to transportation, and I think that should not be lost on this body.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments; and like I said, we will honor him appropriately on this great House floor.

Madam Speaker, I just want to once again thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for allowing us to represent the minority side here tonight and also to all of the leadership on the Democratic side. And being a Member of the House, it is always a great honor and privilege to come to the floor. So many Members before us have had this opportunity.

The 30-something Working Group that was created, and we have to talk about this every time because we have to make sure that Members understand that we are here to come to this floor to share good information and to make sure the American people know exactly what we are doing for them and also in some instances what we are doing to them, and I think it is very important that we remember that.

We have been talking a lot about Social Security lately, but tonight we are going to talk about the deficit. And I want to once again commend those groups that are out there on the Social Security front, before we get into the budget, that have been out there working very hard.

The President today made some comments from the White House. One thing that he did say, and I am glad that he has decided to come with the American people, was that privatization of Social Security will not resolve the Social Security issue. Some may say crisis; I say issue because Social Security is going to be solvent for the next 47 years, providing 100 percent of the benefits to the American people as they enjoy today, the 48 million Americans who celebrate benefits from Social Security, including survivor benefits that individuals that are receiving from those individuals that have passed on and have left something for their children.

Social Security will not end tomorrow. So I said we are going to be here on the budget. But it is interesting, when we start talking about the budget, that none of the philosophy or principles, because there is no plan, is not reflected in the budget. So we will talk about that a little bit more. But I want to just say that Democrats believe that for every issue that is facing our Nation, it is our responsibility to ensure the policies that we pursue are consistent with the values that we cherish. These guiding principles are particularly crucial when it comes to our children and the future generations.

The Bush administration budget and the Republican leadership budget fall short of protecting or investing in our children, in our young people. It is fiscally reckless, adding trillions to the deficit over the next 10 years, but we teach our children to save and be fiscally responsible.

It is morally irresponsible to slash health care programs that are for young people and seniors, I must add, in my opinion. Education and youth development programs that provide our children opportunities to achieve the American Dream are crucial.

In Proverbs it tells us to ''train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old, he will not depart from it.'' I think that it is important that we hold that as a value and cherish that here in this House. If the lessons to our children and young people are reflected in the House Republican budget, then we have failed them and ourselves and the future of the democracy.

We have only about 20 more minutes to talk, but we are going to share some of the values of the Democratic budget versus the Republican budget. And I must say there are some individuals that are well intended on the majority side, I must add; but they are being overwhelmed by individuals who are willing to fight for others and not fight for all. So I think it is important that we share the facts here tonight.

And I would love to here some of the gentlewoman's opening comments, and hopefully we can get into some of these charts we have so that we can share with the American people what is happening here in this House.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Absolutely, Madam Speaker. And I think it has to be said that the gentleman has been an incredible leader in co-chairing with our colleague from Ohio this 30-something Working Group. We are really here to talk to our generation, to talk to the American people in our generation about the policy decisions that are made here in Washington and how it affects them.

I think the gentleman is right. I think we have a number of well-intentioned colleagues on the other side. But, unfortunately, this train is being driven by the right. It is being driven by the right wing of the Republican Congress. They are driving the train here, and the moderate voice is just completely snuffed out. Absolutely snuffed out.

And I think we should spend a little bit of time talking about how the Bush administration's budget affects education because a lot has been said and the President has touted this Pell grant increase as being so fantastic and how he has really made a commitment to expanding access to higher education. When we sift through the facts and the reality as to how he gets to that $100 increase in Pell grants, it is really astonishing that they would claim it is an increase.

Essentially, when he was campaigning in 2000, the President pledged to make college more affordable and accessible by increasing the maximum Pell grant for college freshmen to $5,100.

□ 2310

He broke his promise once again. Once again, he says one thing and does another. They talk about numbers over here, and they are much higher or much lower, the opposite of what they promise, again and again.

Since 2001, just to give the facts, the cost of attending a four year public college has increased by more than $2,300. And what was President Bush's response? To increase the maximum Pell Grant by $10 to $4,150 in 2006. But that would only pay for 4 percent of the college cost increases since 2001.

The way he finances this Pell Grant increase is by cutting, essentially decimating, many, many other student aid programs. We have a chart here that I will move over and try to walk you through.

Essentially the Bush budget completely eliminates the Perkins loan program, a $66 million cut. If that proposal is enacted, more than 670,000 borrowers in 2006 alone would lose out on loan forgiveness if they choose to serve this country by becoming teachers, law enforcement officers or serve in the military. It totally eliminates that program.

The Bush budget forces millions of low and middle income students to pay thousands more for their college loans, because they eliminate the current low fixed consolidation benefits. According to the nonpartisan, their numbers, Congressional Research Service, this change will force the typical student borrower to pay about $5,500 more in college loans.

The President also, in order to give you a measly $100 increase in your Pell Grants, he also completely eliminates the funds for Gear Up, for Upward Bound and for the Talent Search programs. These programs ensure that high risk students succeed in high school and move on to college. If the President has his way, nearly 1.3 million students, 70 percent of whom are minorities, will lose the support they need to make it to college.

This is how we are improving access to higher education in the Bush budget. It is just astonishing.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, reclaiming my time, I am so glad that the gentlewoman pointed that out, because I think it is important that the Members pay very close attention to what is happening. I think not only do we have the constitutional responsibility, but we have the responsibility to the people that elected us in our districts to make sure we are not followers, but leaders in this process.

I can tell you I take no pleasure, Madam Speaker, to be a part of a Congress that oversees the highest deficit in this history of the Republic. I must say at no other time in this country's history we have had the deficit that we have right now in, and it is very unfortunate that this is going to be passed on to not only my children and grandchildren, but definitely those that are yet unborn.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and I are both parents. In many instances our children are going to be okay because of who we are and why we are here. But I can tell you that my constituents, and I know your constituents, did not say, well, I want to send you all to Congress so you can have better health care than I have, so that your children will have better opportunities than my children have. They sent us here to make sure we do not hand their children a bad deal. Because the goal of any parent or grandparent is to make sure that their children and grandchildren have a better opportunity than what they had.

I have a chart here that I want to share with the Members. As you can see, this is what has happened as relates to the backsliding here into the deficit ditch. This deficit went from a surplus, I must add, during the Clinton years when he started, and this House I must add, balanced the budget without one Republican vote, I must add, balanced the budget, and we were into surplus, some $263 billion in the surplus.

Now we have found ourselves in a downward spiral since this administration and this emboldened Republican

majority here in this House has taken us to some $4 trillion projected deficit. I think it is important that we understand that this is real money, these are just not numbers, and it is taking our children even further down.

I have another chart here, and I am going to talk rather quickly because I know we have to move on here. This is what is going on as relates to the interest payments on the deficit, on the debt, and I think that it is only getting worse.

As you can see here, in the 2004 budget, money that is being spent, we are spending more money on paying down the debt, and this number here is actually in the billions, I must add, some $150 billion in the 2004 budget. But better yet, here in education we are spending less than we are spending on taking down the debt.

Also as you start looking at the environment here in purple, we are spending far less than we are spending in paying off the debt because of irresponsible spending. And if you go further over, our veterans, our patriots, so many of us talk about them. I am on the Committee on Armed Services, we have a lot of chest beating going on in that committee about who loves the troops and who does not love the troops, and who loves veterans and who does not love veterans, and folks start talking about the tattoos on their chest that they love the troops and all of this.

But I can tell you one thing as it relates to our spending in the 2004 budget, it does not reflect our values. I was talking about Proverbs a little bit more, but I will come back to that a little later.

I think it is important for us to also look at the amounts spent by 2010 if we continue onto this track. This big red mountain here is not education, it is not the environment, it is not transportation, it is not spending money on our veterans, making sure that we hold up our end of the deal that we said we would provide to them if they serve our country. No, it is the debt. It is the Federal debt as the way we see it now and the way it will be seen up until 2010.

I think it is also important for you to see education and where it stands as it relates to the debt and environment and veterans and so on.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman will yield on the debt, I want to just follow up with what you are saying about debt. If we can come on over to this chart, this talks about how the debt actually impacts families. Because debt, when you talk about trillions, one thing I noticed about this job that we have that our constituents so graciously gave us, is that when you start talking about billions and trillions of dollars, people's eyes start to glaze over. I have learned the difference between a billion and a trillion, and it is a lot of money. And what this debt means is a lot of money to the average family of four.

Going up the scale here with the ever-increasing debt that the Bush budgets have put on us, we are now going to reach, in 2004, the Bush budget raises the debt tax, which is basically what the debt costs every family of four in America, right now it is costing every family in America almost $4,400.

You go up the scale with the Bush budget proposal, and we are not even talking about Social Security, we are talking about what we have got right here, right now, not even talking about privatizing Social Security. By 2015, each family of four would have $10,500 that they essentially would responsibility for in terms of a debt tax and how much the debt was going to cost them.

That is where we have gone in this country. We are just going to keep adding and adding and weighing people down. What happens with our generation, on the front page of the South Florida Sun Sentinel the other day, I was flying up here, and the front page talked about ''Generation Debt.''

Our generation is Generation Debt, because we are not the generation of savers. Our parents and our grandparents were the generation of savers, but we are not. So we are already shouldering a tremendous amount, way more than we should, in personal debt. On top of that, the President heaps this on top of us also, and it is just wrong.

If you are going to talk about what we are doing here, you have to talk about jobs and technology and how that is going to affect our generation.

The number one issue for young people right now, for our generation, is finding a job. We supposedly have this fantastic reemergence of the economy, but job creation is still totally flat.

The current unemployment rate for individuals 16 to 19 is 17 percent. And, more and more, those young people need a job. We are not just talking about a paper route anymore, we are talking about kids who are 16 to 19 years old who need to earn a salary to help pay the family's bills. If they do not have a job, then their family is falling down flat. And the President's budget contains absolutely no job growth stimulation proposals, it squanders $1.6 trillion on tax breaks to people who do not need them.

Job training: We have no proposals for job training. In fact, the President cuts job training in his budget. He consolidates it into a single block grant, and then cuts the funding for these programs, for job training programs, by $146 million.

He eliminates the Advanced Technology Program, and I am trying to speed along also, which funds research and emerging technologies.

His budget slashes by nearly 60 percent the funds from the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program, which is a program that helps small manufacturers with new technologies.

And lastly, our generation cares about the Internet. There are so many opportunities in expanding access to high speed Internet. This President has proposed to slash broadband assistance guaranteed loans by $190 million, and he has called for the total elimination of broadband telecommunications grants.

Are they thinking about our folks? They are clearly not. They have no interest in what is going to happen to the generation coming behind the one that already has theirs.

□ 2320

That is what we have got to do. We have got to make sure we can refocus the attention that is paid to our generation because no one is thinking about us.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I can tell the gentlewoman that tomorrow on this floor Members will not only vote on the Republican budget but will also vote on the Democratic budget that we have put forth, and I must say that our budget will balance out in the next 10 years.

There has been so much cake and ice cream given out in the last 4 years and from the majority side. I want us to confuse Members and start talking about the President. The President proposed the budget of course, but we come up with our own budget. And I can tell you if you think the President's budget is bad, you need to look at the majority-side budget.

I can tell you some of my friends are Republicans and I can tell you this, here in the House, some of them are fiscal conservatives but they do not want to make a career decision as it relates to their position in this House to vote against their very own budget.

I will also tell you this, if one is a fiscal conservative there is no way in the world they can vote for that budget. I am very proud of the work that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and others have done on the budget. In our Democratic budget we have given $1.6 billion more than the Republican budget for veterans health care and also for other programs for 2006, and $17 billion more over the next 5 years. The Democratic budget also reversed the $798 million cut to veteran affairs which helped veterans and their families.

I must also share, not only with the Members, 77 percent of the troops that are in Iraq and Afghanistan are under the age of 30 years old. These young people should be paid the attention that the Congress should reflect their future and their families' future, and I think that is important.

I do not want to get too far away because I want to make sure people truly understand this because I know there are about 100 charts in this Chamber. I can tell you for every chart we have, we not only have the source, this is from the Treasury International Capital System from the House Committee on the Budget, the Democratic staff.

This is what foreign countries like China and others, what they pay for our debt. We go to them. We ask them

for money. They buy our bonds and they pay our debt. Now we are 44 percent indebted to foreign countries. And you can see how it has risen since the majority party has been emboldened by having the President in the White House. First it was 30 percent in 2000. In 2001 it was 30 percent. In 2002 it was 34 percent. In 2003, 37 percent; and 2004, 44 percent and climbing. There is no decline. There is no effort to bring a decline now.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. There is a name for that.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. What is the name?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Borrow and spend.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That is very interesting because I heard some folks in here talking about borrowing and spending and blaming us. There is more spending that is going on, but it has not just been about the war. It has been about irresponsible policy-making here.

I want to say we want to thank those that contact us via e-mail. We receive quite a bit of e-mail from not only the American people, but also even within this Capitol complex. If you want to e-mail us at 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov, we would appreciate it.

If you want to learn more not only about Social Security but about the Democratic budget, you can go on to Democraticleader.house.gov/30something. But you can go on the Democratic leader's Web site and get what we are doing here and what we are proposing.

I think it is also important for us to talk about. One may say, why are you all talking about what the Republican budget, what they are doing to the American people?

The reason why we are talking about it is because we are not in the majority. We fought all day on this floor, 5 hours of amendments, 5 hours of debate to fight on behalf of the everyday worker and retired American in this country. And if we were in the majority, it would be totally different. Those numbers I gave on veterans, the veterans would have what they need. The true budget balancing will happen in 10 years. We have made Social Security, the issue of privatization, we can tell the President to stop spending the taxpayers' money and burning Federal jet fuel, because it is not going to happen.

So until we are able to get the majority, then we will not be able to do some of the things we are doing; but we will fight to the bitter end to make sure that we protect American people and their values.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. In the last several weeks I have tried to talk about the impact on women that the Bush administration's policies have had. For example, there are 20 million women in this country without health insurance and millions more who can barely afford to pay their premiums; but this budget does nothing to hold down health care costs. It slashes Medicaid by a total of $45 billion over the next 10 years. That is a devastating cut on women and children because women account for over 70 percent of adult Medicaid beneficiaries.

In terms of violence against women, the President's budget cuts the Violence Against Women Act programs by $19 million; child care, the budget freezes funding for the Maternal and Child Health block grant and eliminates the Universal Newborn Screening Program.

Now, I have a 19-month-old. You have young children. I have passed legislation in Florida that ensured that we expanded screening for genetic anomalies and problems in newborns, and this Bush budget reverses all of that progress.

If we do not make sure we screen newborns for hearing problems, then we will have learning disabilities that are directly related to hearing abnormalities and without any excuse. But we have got to make sure that we think about children and families when prioritizing and that is what we could do. And the proof is in the pudding that we do not.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Does the gentlewoman have something else to talk about?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I also wanted to talk a little bit about health care because one of the most important issues that we have in this country is the skyrocketing cost of health care.

We have 45 million Americans who do not have health insurance. That means when they are sick, they cannot go to the doctor and they have to let their health care problems spiral out of control until they have to go to the emergency room to get the problem solved. And young Americans, our generation, are the most likely group to be insured. We think we are invincible. We think we are not going to have to worry about having health insurance and going to the doctor, so we go without. But more often we also cannot afford it.

Thirty percent of young adults age 18 to 24 have no health insurance at all. Compare that with 18 percent of adults who are 35 to 44 and only 1 percent of seniors. So the health care crisis disproportionately affects our generation, and there is nothing in the Bush budget to improve that. Where is this President's leadership on expanding access to health care?

When I go down the street, when I go to the supermarket at home, when I go to street festivals, people stop me in the street. I have heard the gentleman talk about people stopping him in the street and talking about issues that are important to them. The thing that they stop me on the most often is education and health care.

They say, if my baby girl or my baby boy is sick, I have no health insurance and I cannot get them shots. If they have a cold, I cannot bring them to the doctor. I have to wait until the problem is bad enough to bring them to the emergency room, and no mother or father should have to suffer through something like that.

This President needs to exercise some leadership in this budget on how to solve this problem and he has not. It is an abdication of leadership.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I want to close and touch a little on CDBG, which is the Community Development Block Grants.

The Republican budget cuts funding for Community Development Block Grants by $8 billion over the next 5 years. These cuts will likely fall on Community Development Block Grants which the Republicans have proposed to eliminate, I must add eliminate. These cuts will have a significant negative impact on the ability of State and local governments to be able to provide housing and community development needs.

Last year, 1.6 billion of CDBG dollars were used for housing, and the result of that was 120,000 homeowners received assistance for rehabbing or working on their homes; and 11,000 families became first-time home buyers, and 19,000 rental units were being rehabbed.

The proposed CDBG cuts will have a particularly severe impact on the resources provided by housing and job training, domestic violence prevention, child care assistance, homeless assistance, small business development, and other services.

The Democratic budget provides $2 billion more than the Republican budget for 2006 and $9 billion for over the next 5 years. Community and regional development will be eliminated and the downward spiral of these block grants will be detrimental to so many communities.

I want to say to the city and county mayors, you need to call your Congressman and your Congresswoman and the Members of the other body and the administration and say the cutting of what we need will hurt our communities.

□ 2330

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam 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 this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to highlight an important

issue that has been the topic of much discussion across the country, Social Security. The Republicans in Congress have joined together to form teams to highlight important issues facing our Nation today, and I am proud to serve as the chairman of the Retirement Security team and to be joined by a number of my colleagues to discuss this important topic tonight.

First, I would like to invite the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), my colleague, to share with us some of her perspectives on Social Security and how we address those challenges.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Kentucky for yielding and allowing me to participate in this debate.

Madam Speaker, as we begin tonight, I tell my colleagues I just have to comment, listening to my colleagues from across the aisle, one would think if they were listening to this great debate that we are having here that they believe everything depends on the government; the panacea has to be the government; the solution to the problems, it has all got to be the government.

As we talk about Social Security, we want to welcome them and invite them to come participate in the debate, but I find it so interesting. They do not bring new ideas to this debate, and they keep saying let us let the government tend to it, but they do not want to talk about the importance of developing an ownership society. They do not want to talk about giving power to the people.

I always wonder when I hear someone say government is the solution, government has got the solution, leave it to government, let them work it out, let us grow a bigger government. I think about Ronald Reagan and how he always said it is all about the people. It is all about the people. That is where the solutions lie.

Whatever the debate is, whatever our colleagues across the aisle, whatever their view is on Social Security reform, I would hope that no one will oppose a discussion on this issue.

We are brought here to Washington, those of us that are elected, and we come to Congress to participate in big issues that are going to impact individuals' lives and the American people's lives. It is true that our country has a range of problems that we are facing right now, but I think it is fair to say and I think that my colleague would agree with me that strengthening and stabilizing Social Security is at the top of that list.

I would invite our colleagues from across the aisle to join us in this debate, bring some ideas and to participate in how we should look at Social Security for future generations. I think it is very unfortunate that so many across the aisle are following the lead of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader, and nearly every Democrat in the House has chosen to stifle debate, rather than to engage in it, and I think that is not leadership. It is really obstructionism.

Madam Speaker, about a week ago, President Bush visited Memphis, Tennessee, which is just outside of my district, and I would have liked to have been there and been a part of that, but things did not quite work out that way for me on last Friday. That did not stop the Democratic National Committee from attacking both the President and me in a statewide radio ad.

Their ad was misleading at best, and it essentially said that we should not even debate reform. They are essentially saying that we should bury our head in the sand and ignore the problem until it just goes on and runs over us. I can tell my colleagues, the DNC attack ad generated two calls. Only two calls to my Shelby County, Memphis, area office in opposition to any type reform. They spent all their money, 70 stations, State-wide, and we got two negative calls. Fifty calls from people who said I think we can talk about Social Security reform but let us not squash the discussion.

In fact, I have an e-mail from a man in Collierville, which is in Shelby County near Memphis, and he says: I was listening to WREC radio today and heard a rather obnoxious DNC commercial telling me to contact you to vote against the President's effort to modify Social Security. I am contacting you but rather to encourage you to work with the President to pass a reform.

On the day of the President's visit, a front page article in the local news section of the Nashville Tennessean read, Bush trip puts Democrats' focus on Blackburn. President in Memphis for next stop in Social Security debate. All this because we want to have a discussion. We want to talk about a very real problem and what we are going to do about it.

Now, is it not amazing, here in America, here in the United States House of Representatives, here in Congress, when you want to lead on a discussion and bring to the attention of the American people something that is a problem, then it makes you a political target. That is absolutely incredible. Facing a problem, addressing and defining a problem and then working to find a solution, that is what is called leadership.

Since last fall, I have been holding town hall meetings and discussions across my district, and we have been talking about Social Security reform in these. We are letting constituents know the process that we are going through and how we are searching for the right thing, the right steps to take, and I will not sugarcoat things here. Some people are absolutely opposed to the discussion. They will not consider the idea of reform, any kind of reform, but that is not the norm. I found that most people are not only willing to discuss reform, but they have their own ideas of what we should do, and that tells me something. People are thinking about this issue.

The Democrats in the House are unwilling, really unwilling to discuss the topic. They refuse to come to the table and say, okay, let us see what we can do to fix this problem. They are out of touch with mainstream America. They were out of touch in the last election cycle, and they remain out of touch today.

I have brought with me today, Madam Speaker, a handful of the thousands of e-mails that I have received to share with you.

Here is one from a gentleman in Arlington, Tennessee. It is also in Shelby County, down near Memphis, and he says: While I agree privatization accounts should not be the number one focus, they are a significant factor in this issues reform. Please accept the correspondence as a vote in favor of President Bush's proposal. He goes on and details some of the things that he likes and does not like about what he is hearing.

On the other side, I have got one from a woman in Nashville, Tennessee: I am opposed to the privatization of Social Security. I am in favor of reform, but there are many people who could pay more into Social Security or maybe take less out.

Another man from Collierville, Tennessee: Can you help pass Social Security reform? I would appreciate the opportunity to invest a percentage of my Social Security payments.

Does that not sound like a pretty good debate. These people are not afraid to discuss it. America is discussing the issue. We would like to think that the Democrats would also.

We have several bills in the House and the Senate that are proposing different reforms, and I want Tennesseans to know that I am going to continue to review these ideas, to talk with them about the bills that are being brought forward, and we will continue to support committee action on a range of proposals.

Some of the e-mails that I have received ask why we are doing this now, why we cannot just put it off for another decade. It is similar to refinancing your house. You refinance your home mortgage today and get a much lower interest rate than you could probably 10 years from now. Why would you wait when conditions will never be better than they are now? Well, that is where with what we have to do with Social Security. Conditions for reform will not get any better than they are now. It makes no sense to wait.

□ 2340

Last week I wrote an op-ed that ran in the Memphis Commercial Appeal newspaper where I talked about four indisputable facts regarding Social Security that we should all be able to agree on regardless of our party affiliation or ideology. Those facts are these: in 1950, there were 16 workers paying into Social Security for every one retiree. Today there are only 3.3

workers for every retiree, and by the time my two children who are in their mid-twenties retire, there will only be two workers for every retiree. We have 13 years when the Social Security will begin taking in less money than it pays out to retirees.

It is time for us to move forward. We know that the American people are engaged in this debate. We know that they are participating in this debate. I have had a survey on my Web site running for a week now, and I have had a tremendous response to this. I will tell my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they had better start taking part in this very real, very lively discussion because there is a widespread view that we should do something and do it now. The only people willing to work on this are the Republicans and the Republican leadership in Congress.

It is a disservice to our Nation that our colleagues across the aisle do not want to participate. It is not why we were sent here to Congress.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) who has been such a leader in our conference and is so eager to participate in this conversation.

There is a lot of misinformation about Social Security that is being promulgated across this country, but I think the most important facts that we can share with our constituents is that of every program and every idea that has been put forward, nobody wants to change anything for today's seniors, and there is a good reason for that.

For today's seniors, there are enough workers in the system that their Social Security check is protected. They are going to be fine. For those people that are about to retire, there are enough workers and enough money in the system to protect them. But for younger workers who are going to bear the responsibility for those who retire before them, there will not be enough workers to provide for their Social Security check. So what we want is to allow younger workers to begin to build their own nest egg so they can prepare for their own retirement as they shoulder the responsibility for those that retire before them.

Madam Speaker, I welcome the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) and thank the gentleman for being part of this discussion tonight. I know the gentleman is involved in talking about Social Security in his community. Please discuss some of what you hear and some of the misconceptions.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this issue. She is a tremendous leader and a clear voice in the House on this issue.

The President has recently been in my district, and I thank the President for his leadership on this issue as well, and for him taking on one of the most important issues we face as a Nation today and critical to future generations of Americans.

The President understands that we solve problems through leadership and leaders do not pass along problems to future Presidents or future generations. It was an extraordinary event when the President was in South Bend, Indiana, at Notre Dame, which I know is an institution very dear to the gentlewoman's heart, and the numbers who engaged in the dialogue on this issue were astounding.

There were over 8,000 people at the Joyce Center at Notre Dame. They came to listen to the President talk about this issue. And there were 200 people outside of the Joyce Center that were protesting the President. I would say that is a pretty good ratio. That reflects the common sense of the American people. They understand we have a problem.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, that is very reflective of the numbers in my district. There were about 2,000 inside listening to the President. There were a number of organizations that tried to stir up a lot of activity outside to protest. There were about 100 people outside protesting.

That morning AARP had held their own roundtable, their own town hall meeting in order to share why they thought the President was wrong on this issue. They of course have massive organization, a huge mailing list, and they actually got 40 people to their town hall meeting. So I think people know that the organizations that are saying there is no problem and we should not be doing anything about it, whether it is to seniors as in seniors that are retired or seniors as in seniors in college that might be found on the Notre Dame campus, both of those groups are eager to talk about it and be part of the discussion.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Madam Speaker, that is absolutely true. I think one of the reasons that the President got reelected and I think one of the reasons the gentlewoman has been reelected in a very competitive district is people appreciate leadership. It is easy to be against things, but we are elected as public servants to be for solutions; and the harder the issue, the more responsibility we have to step up to the plate and solve the problems that we face as a Nation.

What I heard the President say when he was in South Bend is we have a problem. We can call it a crisis, whatever we want; but it is clearly and undeniable challenge, and I think the American people understand that.

I heard the President say it is not the seniors' problem. If you are retired or near retirement, your benefits are safe and secure and you are going to get everything you have earned, and all options are on the table. This is a debate that should be engaged in by all. The President said it does not matter if it is a Republican idea, a Democrat idea, any good idea will be embraced and be part of the solution.

I think it is important that we focus on the facts. Recently, I sat in a hearing of the Committee on Ways and Means where David Walker who is the Comptroller General of the United States, a former trustee of Social Security, and he made a pretty profound statement that we need to focus on nonpartisan facts and a bipartisan solution. I think it is important that we all engage in this debate to find a solution that benefits every single generation.

He talked about the Social Security trust fund. In his words, the trust fund has no economic value. He called it an accounting device. One of the earliest lessons I learned in business was that balance sheets and income statements are fiction, and cash flow is reality. That is a challenge that we face is in the short term we have a cash flow problem. In the medium and long term, we have a solvency problem, and that is what we are talking about and that is what we have to solve.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, sometimes I use the analogy of the American family. Adults in that family come home from work, and from every single paycheck if they put $100 in a cookie jar for their children's college education, and then they borrow to buy a car, buy clothes, go on vacation, whatever they used it for, when the child is 18, they would have a cookie jar full of IOUs. And there is still the bill for the college tuition and no money in the cookie jar. That is essentially what has happened.

Social Security was a pay-as-you-go system. Whatever came in, whether it was taken out as part of your payroll tax or part of your income tax or part of your FICA, it went into the general treasury. Those dollars paid old age benefits and paid for services that the government provided.

So none of the dollars have been saved. Maybe many of us wish, especially those of us about to retire, wish this was not a tough or impending crisis, wish back when it was established in 1945 and subsequently that they had truly put the money aside in a trust fund and it had been earning interest. But that was not done back then and it has not been done, and so we need to wrestle with the facts.

We have some good ideas. We have some ideas that will make this a good system that will be there for our children. We know it will be there for our moms and dads. My mom is 82. Obviously, I want to make sure that everything is fine for her. And I want to make sure that for those about to retire, the trust they have had in the system that they be reassured that their benefits are secure.

□ 2350

But when we talk about it as a crisis, I will use another analogy and say it is like jumping off an 80-story building. As you pass the 40th floor, you can say, well, nothing bad has happened yet, but clearly intervention is needed. And intervention is needed today in Social Security.

Mr. CHOCOLA. I do think facts are very important in this debate. We need to focus on the facts because the facts are what is going to lead us to a solution. Unfortunately, our friends on the other side of the aisle really do not offer any solutions. They just criticize principles that the President has offered and others have offered. They call some of these principles a risky scheme. They say that we are putting Social Security at risk. But the reality is the riskiest thing we can do is nothing. The riskiest thing we can do is ignore this problem and pass it on to future generations and really suffer, I think, very negative consequences.

These are certain things we know. We know that the system cannot pay the benefits that are promised. If we do nothing, we know that there will be a benefit cut to future retirees of about 27 percent. We know that we have a $10.4 trillion unfunded liability. That is in present dollars. That is, if we had $10.4 trillion, and that is with a T, in the bank today earning interest that we could fund the unfunded liabilities. If we had to pay every year, it is something like $27 trillion that we have in unfunded liability. Just to put that in perspective, the current national debt is just over $7 trillion. So the unfunded liability that we know that we have to face in the future is four times the size of the national debt today. People say, well, if we would find a solution that would require us to make transition financing or transition costs, that might be $1 trillion or $2 trillion. The reality is that is not additional debt. If the Federal Government accounted like every business in America, and I will not get in the weeds here and talk about accrual accounting, but if the Federal Government recognized its unfunded liabilities like every business does, we would already have that on the books. It would already be part of our national debt. So finding a way to move some of these costs up is not additional debt, it simply, as the gentlewoman from Tennessee said, is prepaying our mortgage. It is finding a way to spend money now to reduce our real costs in the future and preserve the system, make it stronger and make sure it is here for every generation.

It has been one of the greatest programs in our Nation's history. It has served our seniors well. We need to make sure that the system is there to continue to serve future generations just as well as it is serving our seniors today.

Mrs. NORTHUP. It is amazing that people talk about this being a risky solution when, in fact, the riskiest thing we could do is to do nothing. The fact is that as we wait, each year it grows worse. In fact, right now because Social Security is bringing in a surplus, we still have a few years left where we could use those dollars to help fund a transition. For every year we wait, we lose one of these years that we are in surplus and we pick up at the other end of the 75-year spectrum that we are looking at, a year where we have $600 billion of additional unfunded liability. So we not only give a year of transition up, we gain a year where we have huge, impossible-to-meet deficits and unfunded liabilities.

I came to the House 8 years ago. There has not ever been a leader in the White House and certainly resolving this problem is going to take all the leadership potential that we have in this country and we need the White House. There has never been a leader in the White House that was willing to roll up their sleeves and to say, Let's work our way through this, let's bring everybody to the table, let's put all the ideas on the table and certainly a solution is going to take multiple ideas and maybe more than just one idea, personalized accounts or whatever. But if we had done this right when I first came to Congress back in 1996, before I understood how serious and how quickly the situation was deteriorating for future generations, I think if we had addressed the problem then, we would have gotten 8 more years of surpluses and certainly those surpluses before we had the war on terror, before we had some of the other challenges, and we would not be where we are today if we had addressed those. And so to wait even one more year is going to make the situation more costly, more difficult, we are going to lose a year of surplus that could help finance this transition. That looks like a crisis to me.

Mr. CHOCOLA. I think it is certainly a crisis depending on your time frame and certainly our seniors today are fine, those about to retire are fine, but those retiring in the future will face this crisis if we do not act now. Those that say that there is no problem, that there is no need to act until the year 2042 when the trust fund is exhausted really need to answer the question, how are they going to pay the benefits? If they would come to the floor or they would offer their solution by saying, well, if we raise payroll taxes by 50 percent, maybe we could address this crisis and they may be right. But the reality is that more Americans pay payroll taxes than they do income taxes. When you want less of something, increase taxes on it. When you increase taxes on jobs, it would be devastating to our economy, it would be devastating to many low- and middle-income families.

I think it is critical that we find a package of good ideas, and personal accounts may be one of those good ideas, but the people that want to raise taxes have to, I think, face up to the devastating effects that they would have on our economy and our families and they also have to face up to the fact that we have already raised taxes since Social Security was put into place 22 times. Each one of those times it did not solve the problem. If you add in when we raised the cap on earnings, which is currently $90,000, the total goes up to 39 times. And so it is critical that we find this package of good ideas that not only solves the problem today but permanently solves the problem so future Members of this body do not have to come down and engage in this debate and say why we failed to act and did not live up to our responsibility as elected officials.

Mrs. NORTHUP. We know that we could not possibly tax our way out of these problems, we could not raise taxes enough and have a viable economy left if we tried to solve the Social Security problem with tax increases. We can look across the ocean to economies, for example, France where they did not address the Social Security problem, the Social Security challenge that they have there and because now the cost of those senior survivor benefits are so high in France, their economy is crumbling under the weight of those costs. In fact, no matter what solution we have, we depend on growth in this economy to fund the transition. And so we have to have two things. We have to have a plan to save and strengthen Social Security for our children. It is safe for today's seniors but for our children, to make it safe and secure and solvent for them, and we need a growing economy so that they can have those good jobs, so that they can build the personal accounts while they meet the Social Security needs for those that were in the workforce before them. And so growth and a new plan to enhance the Social Security for future generations are both needed. We cannot trade a growing economy in order to strengthen Social Security, because raising taxes would have a chilling effect on our economy and at the same time it would only be a very short-term fix.

I think these conversations, conversations with the American people, conversations with our constituents when we go back home and conversations between each other are helping us grow to better understand, better analyze the problem and to put forth good ideas. I am excited about the ideas that are being put forth. They are not scary to me. They are exciting.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana to share with us his closing thoughts.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Again I would like to thank the gentlewoman for her courageous leadership on this, willing to take the risk of leadership to solve important problems for our Nation. I, too, hear when I am at home doing town hall meetings, why do we not put the money aside, why do we not spend it on general fund items like Congress has been doing for 60 years now. There is a mechanism to make sure that the money can only be used for Social Security benefits. That mechanism is called personal accounts. When you allow people to set aside part of their payroll taxes into a personal account, that they have some discretion on how that money is invested in a very safe and secure investment. That money is theirs. It cannot be used for any other

purpose and it is going back to a term that has been used in the past, a personal lockbox for every individual.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership. This is a debate that will be ongoing and one that is critical to the future of our Nation.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE HONORABLE PETE SESSIONS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE) laid before the House the following communication from Charles Bauer, Chief of Staff of the Honorable PETE SESSIONS, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 8, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the 3rd Judicial District Court of Henderson County, Texas, for testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

CHARLES BAUER,
Chief of Staff.

COMMUNICATION FROM OUTREACH COORDINATOR OF THE HONORABLE PETE SESSIONS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Flo Helton, Outreach Coordinator of the Honorable PETE SESSIONS, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 8, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the 3rd Judicial District Court of Henderson County, Texas, for testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

FLO HELTON,
Outreach Coordinator.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE PETE SESSIONS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable PETE SESSIONS, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 15, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the 3rd Judicial District Court of Henderson County, Texas, for testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS,
Member of Congress.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today and March 17 and 18.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1160. An act to reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program through June 30, 2005, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 384. An act to extend the existence of the Nazi War Crimes and Japanese Imperial Government Records Interagency Working Group for two years.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), the House adjourned until today, Thursday, March 17, 2005, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the fourth quarter of 2004 and the first quarter of 2005, pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. VANESSA GRIDDINE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 9 AND NOV. 16, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Vanessa Griddine	11/9	11/11	Austria	236.07	305.00						305.00
	11/11	11/14	Italy	1,548.00	2,000.00						2,000.00
	11/14	11/16	Russia	20,850	728.00						728.00
Committee total					3,033.00						3,033.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

VANESSA GRIDDINE.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. MARGARET PETERLIN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 23 AND NOV. 28, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Margaret Peterlin	11/28	11/30	Austria, Kosovo, Greece		2,210.00		(3)				2,210.00
Committee total					2,210.00						2,210.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

MARGARET PETERLIN, Jan. 2, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. VANESSA GRIDDINE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 2 AND DEC. 17, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Vanessa Griddine	12/2	12/4	Lithuania		510.00				(4)		510.00
	12/4	12/7	Bulgaria		271.00						271.00
	12/7	12/10	Morocco		978.00						978.00
	12/10	12/11	Tunisia		232.00						232.00
	12/11	12/13	Algeria		214.00						214.00
	12/13	12/17	Italy		2,550.00						2,550.00
Committee total					4,755.00						4,755.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[4] Business center.

VANESSA GRIDDINE.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. VANESSA GRIDDINE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 23 AND DEC 28, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Vanessa Griddine	12/23	12/28	Ukraine		1,236.00						1,236.00
Committee total					1,236.00						1,236.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

VANESSA GRIDDINE, Jan. 28, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. ALCEE HASTINGS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 9 AND NOV. 16, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Alcee Hastings	11/9	11/11	Austria	236.07	305.00						305.00
	11/11	11/14	Italy	1,548.00	2,000.00						2,000.00
	11/14	11/16	Russia	20,850	728.00						728.00
Committee total					3,033.00						3,033.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Chairman, Jan. 26, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. ALCEE HASTINGS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 4 AND DEC. 17, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Alcee Hastings	12/2	12/4	Lithuania		510.00						510.00
	12/4	12/7	Bulgaria		271.00						271.00
	12/7	12/10	Morocco		978.00						978.00
	12/10	12/11	Tunisia	280.02	232.00						232.00
	12/11	12/13	Algeria		214.00						214.00
	12/13	12/17	Italy	1,922.00	2,550.00						2,550.00
Committee totals					4,755.00						4,755.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Chairman, Jan. 26, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. ALCEE HASTINGS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 23 AND DEC. 28, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Alcee Hastings	12/23	12/28	Ukraine		1,236.00						1,236.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. ALCEE HASTINGS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 23 AND DEC. 28, 2004—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Committee total					1,236.00						1,236.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Chairman, Jan. 25, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. JANICE McKINNEY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 23 AND FEB. 27, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Janice McKinney	2/23	2/27	United Kingdom		1,118.18		6,087.33				7,205.51
Committee total					1,118.18		6,087.33				7,205.51

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Mar. 3, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO VIETNAM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 8 AND JAN. 14, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Darrell Issa	1/8	1/14	Vietnam		781.00		2,077.65				2,858.65
Sam Stratman	1/8	1/14	Vietnam		781.00		4,192.00				4,973.00
Committee total					1,562.00		6,269.65				7,831.65

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DARRELL E. ISSA, Chairman, Feb. 2, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. John Boehner [5]	11/23	11/28	Austria, Kosovo & Greece								
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[5] Expenses not yet available.

JOHN A. BOEHNER, Chairman, Feb. 23, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Ed Whitfield	11/3	11/7	Turkey		0.00		671.76		516.00		1,187.76
Hon. Darrell Issa	11/21	11/24	Czech Republic		500.00		6,683.00				7,183.00
	12/1	12/4	Thailand		1,137.00		0.00				1,137.00
	12/16	12/18	Austria		642.00		0.00				642.00
	12/18	12/20	Ukraine		599.50		0.00				599.50
	12/20	12/21	Ireland		486.00		0.00				486.00
Hon. Joe Barton	12/11	12/15	Argentina		1,149.00		2,661.30				3,810.30
Michael Goo	11/21	11/27	Czech Republic		2,160.00		4,911.78				7,071.78
Bruce Harris	11/21	11/27	Czech Republic		2,160.00		4,911.78				7,071.78
Mark Menezes	12/11	12/16	Argentina		1,540.00		473.45				2,013.45
James Barnette	12/13	12/17	Argentina		1,540.00		4,782.00				6,322.00
Michael Goo	12/10	12/20	Argentina		2,156.00		1,052.00				3,208.00
Chris Knauer	12/5	12/7	England		914.00		813.74				1,727.74
	12/7	12/8	Netherlands		417.00						417.00
	12/8	12/11	France		1,386.00				129.74		1,515.74
Margaret Caravelli	11/20	11/27	Czech Republic		2,160.00		5,700.78				7,860.78
Kurt Bilas	11/20	11/25	Czech Republic		2,136.00		4,258.57				6,394.57
Richard Frandsen	10/25	10/29	Switzerland		2,107.84		920.70				3,028.54
Paige Anderson	11/21	11/27	Czech Republic		1,860.00		4,258.57				6,118.57
Hon. John Shimkus	10/12	10/13	Qatar		327.00						327.00
	10/13	10/15	Iraq								
	10/15	10/16	Germany		264.00						264.00
Hon. Mike Rogers	12/16	12/16	Belgium								
	12/16	12/19	Luxembourg		396.00						396.00
Committee total					26,037.34		42,099.43				68,136.77

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOE BARTON, Chairman, Mar. 3, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Kenya Bennett	11/30	12/1	Berlin								
	12/1	12/3	Amsterdam								
	12/3	12/5	Warsaw								
	12/5	12/7	Rome				5,665.43				5,665.43
Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.	12/8	12/11	Canada		246.00		1,128.34				1,128.34
Philip Kiko	12/8	12/11	Canada		246.00		1,128.34				1,128.34
Committee total					492.00		7,922.11				8,414.11

[1] Per diem constitues lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., Chairman, Feb. 4, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Bill Pascrell, Jr.	10/12	10/13	Qatar		330.00		(3)				330.00
Hon. Bill Shuster	10/12	10/13	Qatar		330.00		(3)				330.00
Hon. Todd Platts	10/12	10/13	Qatar		330.00		(3)				330.00
Hon. Bill Pascrell, Jr.	10/13	10/13	Iraq				(3)				
Hon. Bill Shuster	10/13	10/13	Iraq				(3)				
Hon. Todd Platts	10/13	10/13	Iraq				(3)				
Hon. Bill Pascrell, Jr.	10/14	10/15	Germany		270.00		(3)				270.00
Hon. Bill Shuster	10/14	10/15	Germany		270.00		(3)				270.00
Hon. Todd Platts	10/14	10/15	Germany		270.00		(3)				270.00
Hon. John Mica	10/15	10/20	Italy		1,962.00		5,585.75				7,547.75
Hon. Lincoln Davis	12/07	12/10	Pakistan		777.00						777.00
Hon. Chris Chocola	12/07	12/10	Pakistan		777.00						777.00
Hon. Lincoln Davis	12/11	12/12	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
Hon. Chris Chocola	12/11	12/12	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
Hon. Lincoln Davis	12/12	12/13	Uzbekistan		228.00						228.00
Hon. Chris Chocola	12/12	12/13	Uzbekistan		228.00		8,086.88				8,314.88
Hon. Lincoln Davis	12/13	12/14	Germany		382.00		7,751.32				8,133.32
Committee total					6,334.00		21,423,95				27,757.95

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Feb. 16, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	11/6	11/7	Middle East		225.00		(3)				
	11/7	11/9	Middle East		540.75		(3)				
	11/9	11/10	Middle East		148.00		(3)				
	11/10	11/11	Middle East		238.00		(3)				
	11/11	11/12	Europe		253.00		(3)				1,404.75
Hon. Jo Ann Davis	11/6	11/7	Middle East		225.00		(3)				
	11/7	11/9	Middle East		540.75		(3)				
	11/9	11/10	Middle East		148.00		(3)				
	11/10	11/11	Middle East		238.00		(3)				
	11/11	11/12	Europe		253.00		(3)				1,404.75
Hon. Mac Thornberry	11/6	11/7	Middle East		225.00		(3)				
	11/7	11/9	Middle East		540.75		(3)				
	11/9	11/10	Middle East		148.00		(3)				
	11/10	11/11	Middle East		238.00		(3)				
	11/11	11/12	Europe		253.00		(3)				1,404.75
Hon. Leonard Boswell	11/6	11/7	Middle East		225.00		(3)				
	11/7	11/9	Middle East		540.75		(3)				
	11/9	11/10	Middle East		148.00		(3)				
	11/10	11/11	Middle East		238.00		(3)				
	11/11	11/12	Europe		253.00		(3)				1,404.75
Hon. C.A. Ruppersberger	11/6	11/7	Middle East		225.00		(3)				
	11/7	11/9	Middle East		540.75		(3)				
	11/9	11/10	Middle East		148.00		(3)				
	11/10	11/11	Middle East		238.00		(3)				
	11/11	11/12	Europe		253.00		(3)				1,404.75
Hon. Jane Harman	11/6	11/7	Middle East		225.00		(3)				
	11/7	11/9	Middle East		540.75		(3)				
	11/9	11/10	Middle East		148.00		(3)				
	11/10	11/12	Middle East		628.00		(3)				5,886.29
Commercial aircraft transportation							4,344.54				
Kevin Schmidt	11/6	11/7	Middle East		225.00		(3)				
	11/7	11/9	Middle East		540.75		(3)				
	11/9	11/10	Middle East		148.00		(3)				
	11/10	11/11	Middle East		238.00		(3)				
	11/11	11/12	Europe		253.00		(3)				1,404.75
Kathleen Reilly	11/6	11/7	Middle East		225.00		(3)				
	11/7	11/9	Middle East		540.75		(3)				
	11/9	11/10	Middle East		148.00		(3)				
	11/10	11/11	Middle East		238.00		(3)				
	11/11	11/12	Europe		253.00		(3)				1,404.75
Marcel Lettre	11/6	11/7	Middle East		225.00		(3)				
	11/7	11/9	Middle East		540.75		(3)				
	11/9	11/10	Middle East		148.00		(3)				
	11/10	11/11	Middle East		238.00		(3)				
	11/11	11/12	Europe		253.00		(3)				1,404.75
John Keefe	11/6	11/7	Middle East		225.00		(3)				
	11/7	11/9	Middle East		540.75		(3)				

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2004—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	11/9	11/10	Middle East		148.00		(3)				
	11/10	11/12	Middle East		628.00		(3)				5,886.29
Commercial aircraft transportation							4,344.54				
Wyndee Parker	12/8	12/10	North Africa		326.00						
	12/10	12/11	North Africa		182.00						
	12/11	12/12	North Africa		214.00						
	12/12	12/15	North Africa		1,530.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation							6,023.21				8,275.21
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	12/12	12/15	Europe		294.75						
Commercial aircraft transportation							6,838.31				7,133.06
Michael Merrmans	12/12	12/15	Europe		294.75						
Commercial aircraft transportation							6,155.81				6,450.56
Michael Ennis	12/12	12/15	Europe		294.75						
Commercial aircraft transportation							6,155.81				6,450.56
Kevin Schmidt	12/12	12/14	South America		566.00						
	12/14	12/16	South America		450.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation							3,038.04				4,054.04
David Barth	12/12	12/14	South America		566.00						
	12/14	12/16	South America		450.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation							2,538.04				3,554.04
Robert Myhill	12/12	12/14	South America		566.00						
	12/14	12/16	South America		450.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation							3,143.04				4,159.04
Hon. Bud Cramer	12/27	12/29	Europe		676.00						
	12/29	12/30	Europe		242.00						
	12/30	01/3	Europe		1,428.00						
Commercial aircraft transportation							6,568.56				8,914.56
Committee totals					5,394.00		15,287.68				7,2001.65

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

PETER HOEKSTRA, Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1227. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenbuconazole; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2004-0410; FRL-7699-2] received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1228. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clofentezine; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0022; FRL-7699-8] received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1229. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Captain Dan W. Davenport, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1230. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received February 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1231. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received February 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1232. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations — received February 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1233. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Kern County Air Pollution Control District [CA 311-0471a; FRL-7878-3] received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1234. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Idaho: Incorporation by Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program [FRL-7877-4] received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1235. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plan for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Nashville, Tennessee [R04-OAR-2004-TN- 0003-200428(a); FRL-7881-7] received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1236. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Delegation of Authority [R03-OAR-2005-PA-0001; FRL-7880-4] received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1237. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Arizona [AZ104-0083; FRL-7875-2] received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1238. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Revised Format for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference for South Dakota [R08-OAR-2005-SD-0001; FRL-7878-6] received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1239. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Redesignation of the City Weirton Including the Clay and Butler Magisterial Districts SO2 Nonattainment Area and Approval of the Maintenance Plan; Correction [R03-OAR-2004-WV-0002; FRL-7882-4] received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1240. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Notice of Availability of Class Deviation; Assistance Agreement Competition-Related Disputes Resolution Procedures [FRL-7863-3] received January 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1241. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes: Washington; Yakima PM-10 Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance Plan [WA-04-006; FRL-7866-4] received January 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1242. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes: Washington; Yakima County Nonattainment

Area Boundary Revision [WA-04-005; FRL-7866-3] received January 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1243. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1244. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to the Taiwan Relations Act, agreements concluded within the last sixty days, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3311(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1245. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the Board's Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2004, as required by the Government Performance and Results Act and the Accountability of Tax Dollars Act of 2002; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1246. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1247. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1248. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting in accordance with OMB Circular No. A-11, Part 2, the Final Annual Performance Plan for FY 2006; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1249. A letter from the Executive Director, National Council on Disability, transmitting the Council's Annual Performance Report to the President and Congress Fiscal Year 2003, as required by the Government Performance and Results Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1116; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1250. A letter from the Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act for Calendar Year 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1251. A letter from the Director, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the 2004 report on the Apportionment of Membership on the Regional Fishery Management Councils pursuant to section 302 (b)(2)(B) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act; to the Committee on Resources.

1252. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of a report required by Section 202(a)(1)(C) of Pub. L. 107-273, the ''21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act,'' related to certain settlements and injunctive relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1253. A letter from the Administrator, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Capital Investment Plan (CIP) for fiscal years 2006-2010, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2203(b)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1254. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River Mile 838.9 to Mile 830.0, Caruthersville, AR [COTP Memphis-04-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1255. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Wolf River Chute, Mile 1.0 to Mile 3.0, Memphis, TN [COTP Memphis-04-004] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1256. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; McCellan-Kerr Arkansas River Mile 0.0 to 1.0, Benzal, AR [COTP Memphis-04-005] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1257. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; McCellan-Kerr Arkansas River Mile 118.8 to 119.5, North Little Rock, AR [COTP Memphis-04-007] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1258. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; McCellan-Kerr Arkansas River Mile 118.0 to 118.5, Little Rock, AR [COTP Memphis 04-008] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1259. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; West Point, Yorktown, VA. [CGD05-04-187] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1260. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Spa Creek, Annapolis, MD [CGD05-04-192] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1261. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Ferry Bar Channel, Baltimore Harbor, MD. [CGD05-04-194] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1262. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Delaware River, Phildelphia, PA and Camden, NJ [CGD05-04-195] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1263. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Emergency Safety Zone; Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia Beach, VA [CGD05-04-205] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1264. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Elizabeth River, Norfolk, Virginia [CGD05-04-213] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1265. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Elizabeth River, Portsmouth, Virginia [CGD05-04-222] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1266. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Great American Duck Derby, Intracoastal Waterway, Delray Beach, Florida. [CGD07-04-119] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1267. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; World Championship Super Boat Race, Deerfield Beach, Florida [CGD07-04-121] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1268. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; 2004 Holiday Boat Parade of the Palm Beaches, Riviera Beach, Florida. [CGD07-04-141] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1269. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations: 2004 Boca Raton Holiday Boat Parade, Riviera Beach, FL. [CGD07-04-142] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1270. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations, Holiday Parade of Boats; Charleston, SC. [CGD07-04-144] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1271. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Port Arkansas Channel — Tule Lake, TX [CGD08-05-011] received March 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1272. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gippsland Aeronautics Pty. Ltd. Model GA8 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-19442; Directorate Identifier 2004-CE-31-AD; Amendment 39-13956; AD 2005-01-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1273. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2000-NE-13-AD; Amendment 39-13950; AD 2005-02-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1274. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D-209, -217, -217A, -217C, and -219 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-80-AD; Amendment 39-13948; AD 2005-02-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1275. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasiliera de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135BJ Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-19526; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-140-AD; Amendment 39-13952; AD 2005-02-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1276. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 and MD-11F Airplanes Equipped with Pratt & Whitney PW4000 Series Engines [Docket No. FAA-2004-19449; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-07-AD; Amendment 39-13951; AD 2005-02-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1277. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757 Series Airplanes Equipped With Rolls Royce Model RB211 Engines [Docket No. 2003-NM-252-AD; Amendment 39-13955; AD 2005-02-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1278. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 and MD-11F Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-19262; Directorate Identifier 2004-NM-54-AD; Amendment 39-13953; AD 2005-02-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1279. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-70-AD; Amendment 39-13954; AD 2005-02-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1280. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-200, -300, and -300F Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-19201; Directorate Identifier 2003-NM-100-AD; Amendment 39-13959; AD 2005-03-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1281. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-279-AD; Amendment 39-13957; AD 2005-03-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1282. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes; and Model 757-200 and -200CB Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-221-AD; Amendment 39-13958; AD 2005-03-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1283. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Corporation, Ltd. Model 750XL Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2004-19444; Directorate Identifier 2004-CE-33-AD; Amendment 39-13960; AD 2005-03-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1284. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Effluent Limitations Guidelines, Pretreatment Standards, and New Source Performance Standards for the Transportation Equipment Cleaning Point Source Category [OW-2004-11; FRL-7866-7] (RIN: 2040-AE65) received January 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1285. A letter from the Vice President for Government Affairs, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting notice that Amtrak fully intends to comply with its legal requirement and will submit its FY06 Legislative and Grant Request shortly, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 24315(a)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 162. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1334) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the removal to Federal court of certain State court cases involving the rights of incapacitated persons, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–20). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 163. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 109–21). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. SIMMONS):

H.R. 1329. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to treat nonhuman primates as prohibited wildlife species under that Act; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SALAZAR:

H.R. 1330. A bill to provide that Social Security contributions are used to protect Social Security solvency by mandating that Trust Fund monies cannot be diverted to create private accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 1331. A bill to provide for a fair and equitable resolution of claims relating to the work opportunity credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. DELAY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. KELLER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 1332. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the removal to Federal court of certain State court cases involving the rights of incapacitated persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary. considered and passed.

By Ms. HART (for herself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. WU, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FORD, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FARR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 1333. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize physical therapists to evaluate and treat Medicare beneficiaries without a requirement for a physician referral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. DELAY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. KELLER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 1334. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the removal to Federal court of certain State court cases involving the rights of incapacitated persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 1335. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase the mandatory retirement age for members of the Capitol Police from 57 to 60 years of age; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 1336. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to clarify the classification of laser light sources for semiconductor manufacturing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. HERGER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CASE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CANNON, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. BOYD):

H.R. 1337. A bill to support certain national youth organizations, including the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FARR, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 1338. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to permit refinancing of student consolidation loans, increase Pell Grant maximum awards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 1339. A bill to amend the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 to clarify allowable payment terms for sales of agricultural commodities and products to Cuba; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on International Relations, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 1340. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the reporting fee payable by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to educational institutions for reports or certifications which such educational institutions are required by law or regulation to submit to the Secretary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 1341. A bill to require each State to provide a minimum level of access to health care to all citizens of such State as a condition for participation in Federal health care funding programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 1342. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1560 Union Valley Road in West Milford, New Jersey, as the ''Brian P. Parrello Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. HERSETH (for herself, Mr. ROSS, Mr. FORD, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 1343. A bill to require reimbursement for non-TRICARE health insurance premiums paid by certain members of reserve components during the period the members were not eligible for TRICARE coverage; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 1344. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. HAYWORTH):

H.R. 1345. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the tip tax credit to employers of cosmetologists and to promote tax compliance in the cosmetology sector; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CASE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 1346. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a more equitable geographic allocation of funds appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs for medical care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 1347. A bill to provide funding for projects to reduce traffic congestion and improve travel options in the metropolitan Washington region; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1348. A bill to provide for nuclear disarmament and economic conversion in accordance with District of Columbia Initiative Measure Number 37 of 1992; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1349. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide a comprehensive regional approach to economic and infrastructure development in the most severely distressed regions in the Nation; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 1350. A bill to eliminate the safe-harbor exception for certain packaged pseudoephedrine products used in the manufacture of methamphetamine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 1351. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to encourage owners and operators of privately-held farm, ranch, and forest land to voluntarily make their land available for public access under programs administered by States and tribal governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania (for herself and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan):

H.R. 1352. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to claim a work opportunity credit for hiring military service personnel returning from service in Iraq or Afghanistan and for hiring their dependents and dependents of deceased personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 1353. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the provision of scientifically sound information and support services to patients receiving a positive test diagnosis for Down syndrome or other prenatally diagnosed conditions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SIMMONS (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1354. A bill to provide uniform criteria for the administrative acknowledgment and recognition of Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. POE (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DENT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. WAMP, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H.R. 1355. A bill to improve the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Program by providing new protections for children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOLBE (for himself and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should establish an international education policy to foster mutual understanding among nations, promote a world free of terrorism, further United States foreign policy and national security, enhance United States leadership in the world, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota (for herself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution calling upon the President to order an immediate moratorium on the rendition of persons to Syria and all countries that routinely use torture as reported by the Department of State's 2004 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution urging the appropriate representative of the United States to the 61st session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to introduce a resolution calling upon the Government of the Republic of Belarus to cease its human rights violations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. NEY (for himself and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H. Res. 159. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on House Administration in the One Hundred Ninth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. PITTS):

H. Res. 160. A resolution condemning the conduct of Chief Minister Narendra Modi for his actions to incite religious persecution and urging the United States to condemn all violations of religious freedom in India; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H. Res. 161. A resolution electing a certain Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H. Res. 164. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a National School-Based Health Centers Month to raise awareness of health services provided by school health centers; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H. Res. 165. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the One Hundred Ninth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H. Res. 166. A resolution urging Turkey to respect the rights and religious freedoms of the Ecumenical Patriarch; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 20: Mr. WATT.

H.R. 21: Mr. EVANS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WATSON, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. KIND, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 22: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 32: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 37: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 68: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 97: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 110: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 115: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 127: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 136: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 139: Mrs. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 180: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 213: Ms. WATERS and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 215: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 216: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 222: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 269: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 280: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 282: Mr. POMBO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MELANCON, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 303: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 314: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 328: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 333: Mr. SANDERS and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 341: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 358: Mr. OBEY.

H.R. 366: Mr. UPTON, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 373: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 376: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 421: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 480: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 496: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 500: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 515: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 525: Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 535: Mr. SNYDER and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 551: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FARR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 554: Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 562: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 583: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H.R. 594: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 602: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 668: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 669: Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 691: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 700: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 731: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 739: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 740: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 741: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 742: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 759: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 766: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. HALL, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 769: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 772: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 788: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 792: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 793: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 800: Mr. BUYER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mrs. EMERSON, Miss MCMORRIS, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H.R. 810: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 839: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FARR, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 859: Mr. GRAVES and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 867: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 877: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 908: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 913: Mr. GOODLATTE and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 916: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SHAW, Mr. STARK, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 923: Mr. GORDON and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 934: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 952: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 983: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 985: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. SHERWOOD.

H.R. 987: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 998: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BONNER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. HERSETH, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1001: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 1048: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1059: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1073: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1074: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1075: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1078: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1088: Mr. FORTUÑO, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1105: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1125: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1130: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1185: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1204: Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WALSH, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 1216: Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1217: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. CARSON, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1218: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1226: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H.R. 1227: Mr. WALSH, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 1238: Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 1245: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. WATSON, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1248: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1277: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1290: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1298: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1305: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. CLAY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. PENCE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FORD, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. BERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 87: Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. CALVERT.

H. Con. Res. 90: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Con. Res. 96: Mr. WYNN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MALONEY.

H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Res. 67: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H. Res. 84: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H. Res. 90: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. SANDERS.

H. Res. 142: Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H. Res. 145: Mr. BOOZMAN and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 148: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H. Res. 155: Mr. BAIRD.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 525: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 15 of 2005 petitioning the United States Congress to issue a Congressional Gold Medal to Welles Remy Crowther for his bravery and sacrifice in saving dozens of people from certain death on September 11, 2001, resulting in his own death that day; which was referred to the Committee on Financial Services.